

PLEASE NOTE! THIS IS SELF-ARCHIVED VERSION OF THE ORIGINAL ARTICLE

To cite this Article: Meristö, T. & Kantola, T. (2016) Worry Management – a Future-Oriented Management Innovation of Wellbeing Services. In I. Bitran; S. Conn; K.R.E. Huizingh; O. Kokshagina & M. Torkkeli (Eds.) Proceedings of the 2016 ISPIM Innovation Summit, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia - 4-7 December 2016 - Moving the Innovation Horizon. Lappeenranta: Lappeenranta University of Technology Press, 1-6.

URL: <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1865193434?accountid=12003>

Worry Management – a Future-Oriented Management Innovation of Wellbeing Services

Tarja Meristö*

FuturesLab CoFi Laurea University of Applied Sciences
E-mail: tarja.meristo at laurea.fi

Tarja Kantola

Laurea University of Applied Sciences
E-mail tarja.kantola at laurea.fi

* Corresponding author

Abstract: The context of the work is wellbeing services and their development work both at system level as well as at service experience level. This means that both providers' and customers' viewpoints are considered and the holistic view is seen as a dynamic system. The concept called Worry Management is a management innovation in the field of visionary leadership. The research design includes interdisciplinary elements from societal, economic, technological and political sciences and the empirical research consists of the study fulfilled in 2015-2016 in Porvoo City region. The group of actors participated to this process consisted of representatives from Porvoo City, Save the Children Association, Experience experts, Mental Health Association, Childrens' Day Care, Matural Clinic as well as private companies from the field of child protection services.

Keywords: wellbeing service ecosystem, visionary leadership, child protection, worry management, future-orientation, proactive action

1 Problem formulation and current understanding

The unpredictability of the operational environment has increased. It is not only the issue of industries and individual companies but also of the public sector. E.g. the wellbeing services and the status of the welfare state are under re-formulation because of the cost effectiveness requirements but also because of the network society where the roles and positions of different actors will vary and the citizens' role concerning his or her wellbeing is increasing (Tuohimaa et. al. 2015). Digital society will rebuild institutions and other actors towards networks and ecosystems with new requirements for their management, too. Hierarchical, often control based models are too slow and inefficient in turbulent times.

Management and leadership systems are systematically analyzed and different typologies in the course of time have been presented. Ansoff (1965, 1978) presented his concepts for corporate strategy and corporate planning in turbulent times and Anthony (1965) his framework for planning systems concerning strategic, tactic and operational planning. Eppink (1978) analyzed in his work the need for flexibility and the management of

unforeseen, which can be considered as a first draft of visionary leadership described and conceptualized later on by Nanus (1983). The role of non-specific information, often based on the emotions and feelings, was risen by Mintzberg (1987) when he used the expression crafting strategy.

In this paper we will describe the challenges concerning the visionary leadership in the field of wellbeing services (Meristö et al. 2016). The current understanding of the problem is, that instead of proactive approaches the management systems focus on the reactive actions (Meristö et. al. 2016). Problem is also, that all the actors in this field are not aware of each other and the practical ecosystem around the customer works only partially.

Information modelling is a tool towards holistic view and efficient co-operation among all the actors in the ecosystem. With the help of one case study in a specific region in Finland we have created a wellbeing service information modelling (WIM) prototype, which has been tested both among students and real-life actors from the case field in child protection. Benefits and pitfalls as well as bottlenecks have been recognized, among them as one of the key elements is the leadership based on early warning signals (Meristö & Kantola 2016).

2 Research questions and research design

The research questions are: 1) what are the main features of visionary leadership in the wellbeing service area, 2) how to define it conceptually and 3) how to implement that into practice at ecosystem level as well as at individual level.

The context of the work is wellbeing services and their development work both at system level as well as at service experience level. This means that both providers' and customers' viewpoints are considered and the holistic view is seen as a dynamic system. The research design includes interdisciplinary elements from societal, economic, technological and political sciences and the empirical research consists of the study fulfilled in 2015-2016 in Porvoo City region. The group of actors participated to this process consisted of representatives from Porvoo City, Save the Children Association, Experience experts, Mental Health Association, Childrens' Day Care, Matural Clinic as well as private companies from the field of child protection related services (Meristö et al 2016). In practise, the first step was the interviews among the ecosystem actors, the second step the preliminary workshop in order to produce the shared vision, the third step was to arrange the series of future workshops mapping the actors to the ecosystem and formulating the future development paths for the case in question. Based on scenarios, the SWOT analysis were constructed both from the viewpoint of the family and from the professionals' viewpoint as a part of the ecosystem.

The practical tool in implementation phase will be WIM, i.e. wellbeing service information modelling, which includes all the actors form the ecosystem and the information flows between all the actors. The main goals for the WIM are on one hand to describe the holistic view with information flows, but also to support all the actors to use early warning signals as a part of the basic data base before it is too late. Last, but not least, the final goal is the empowerment of the customer, e.g. the mother in a family with child protection needs.

3 Key Concepts and Findings

The main results and contribution from theoretical viewpoint is the concept of **worry management**, which means in the field of innovations new approaches to leadership and management focused on the use of weak signals, called in the terms of health and social care professional as worries. This will bring to this context a new definition of data and information used as a basis for the decision-making in practise. It will also broaden the concept of visionary leadership from business uses to the field of wellbeing ecosystems with multi-actor perspectives and with multi-voicedness (Johansson et al, 2010).

The worry zones defined by Eriksson et al in 2006 divides the worry into four categories: no worries at all, a little worried, uncertain worry zone and the zone of a great worry. In terms of futures research this means the rate of uncertainty recognized, from certain via probable to uncertain, including the gray zone with wild cards and black swans (Taleb 2016). In the next list these four worry categories are described more deeply, although briefly, as seen in the sector of wellbeing.

1. No worry zone

One feels that another person or entity is well and the relationship to the person works well. For example, when working with the child one feels that he/she has knowledge and skills to support the child's growth and development and that the things goes to an intended good direction.

2. Small worry zone

One has small worry in mind, even repeatedly. However, he/she has a strong confidence on his/her own possibilities to help. Special help or cooperation is still not needed.

3. The appreciability worry zone (gray zone)

In the appreciability worry situations, one feels a growing concern and need for more support and control, but is often at the same time uncertain "sufficient evidence" and may be afraid overblown. Support and control are not opposing action, when the aim is to promote another self-reliance and life skills. What matters is that one would not be made dependent on any more support ("Helping to helpless") than the control at all ("Subordination helpless").

Gray worry zone is characterized by the lack of clarity. The only thing that is perfectly clear is that the situation is not possible to determine or control alone. Thus, co-operation and dialogues a needed.

4. Zone of great worry

The employee feels that his/her means are at the end and evaluate that the client, a child, young person or family is in a danger, unless the situation will not change immediately. Necessary co-operation partners are wanted to mobilize to

action immediately. If, however, methods for crisis are available, even big worries will decrease. However, if that kind of work is not organized, self-service system itself will be in crisis when facing every crisis.

The zone of worries cannot be used for classifying or registering any clients, pupils, families or even anyone. It is only meant to structure one's own working situation and need for co-operation. It means, this tool must not use for discrimination of clients, but helping them to get support early enough.

Table 1 The categories of worry zones (Eriksson et al in 2006).

No worry 1	Small worry 2	Appreciability worry 3	Great worry 4
No worry not at all.	Worry or wondering being in mind. Confidence on own possibilities is good. Thoughts about needing more additional power resources.	Worry is substantial. Own resources are depleted. Need for additional resource and increased control.	Worry is really great. Own means are at the end. The situation has to change immediately.

4 Contribution and practical implications

The results are practical and put the highlights on proactive and virtual co-operation and its requirements in the child protection ecosystem network. The results base on literature and practical findings from the participatory futures workshops and web-surveys. Based on this, one of the key results from our case workshops is the concept *worry management*. It is similar to the concept of *visionary leadership* (Nanus, 1992) used in the business context, but in our case the focus is not only in organisations or eco-systems, but in individuals and in the signals anticipating their future behaviour examined by various actors in the (child protection) eco-system (Meristö et al 2016).

The development suggestions for the ecosystem included very strongly also the co-operation between the different actors and the coordination as well. Leadership issues at all levels arose to the core. Weak signals, their role and significance for the child protection needs are crucial in all future scenarios, but especially in the proactive scenarios whether they are in virtual or face-to-face context.

5 Feedback wanted from the audience

The development and research work of this conceptualization will continue in the form of wellbeing service information modelling. Comments wanted:

1. *What kind of added value you would see in the worry management issue in the field of innovation research generally and especially in the field of management innovations?*
2. *In our research we have focused on management in turbulent times, in unpredictable contexts concerning weak signals called worries by the wellbeing ecosystem actors – do you have any metaphors or examples from that type of approaches in other branches to benchmark our work?*
3. *What kind of new perspectives (conceptual or methodological) would you bring to our research? At the moment we have used interdisciplinary framework with futures research and service design methods combined to action research paradigm.*

References and Notes

Ansoff, H. I. (1965) Corporate Strategy. MacGrawHill.

Ansoff, H. I. Igor (1978) Planned Management of Turbulent Change. The Encyclopedia of Professional Management. MacGrawHill.

Anthony, R. (1965) Planning and Control Systems: A Framework for Analysis. Harvard University Press.

Eppink, D. J. (1978) Futures Research: Is It Used? Long Range Planning, Vol. 14, pp. 33-36.

Eriksson, E., Arnkil, T.E. & Rautava, M. (2006). Ennakointialoigeja huolten vyöhykkeellä. Verkostokonsultin käsikirja - ohjeita verkostomaiseen työskentelyyn. Stakesin työpapereita 29/2006. <http://www.stakes.fi/verkojulkaisut/tyopaperit/T29-2006-VERKKO.pdf> (in English: Dialogues for anticipation on the zone of worries. The handbook of network type working.)

Johansson, S., Kaario, P., Kankainen, A., Kantola, V., Runonen, M., Vaajakallio, K. & Kuikkaniemi, K. (2010). Cookbook – Extreme Service Design Method Recipes for creative collaboration. Aalto University.

Meristö, T. & Kantola, T. & Lankinen-Lifländer, M. (2016). Smart Tools and Service Opportunities for Child Protection Ecosystem in the Future: Case Family View. RESER Conference, Naples Sept.2016.

Mintzberg, H.(1987) Crafting Strategy. Harvard Business Review, Vol. 65, No 4, pp. 66-75.

Nanus, B. (1992). Visionary Leadership: Creating a Compelling Sense of Direction for Your Organization. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Tuohimaa, H., Ranta, L., & Meristö, T. (2015). Wellbeing Service Innovations – a Collaborative Case Study in Finland. In Proceedings of The XXVI ISPIM Innovation Conference held in Budapest (Hungary) on 14 June to 17 June 2015. Editors: E. Huizingh, M. Torkkeli, S. Conn, and I. Bitran. LUT Scientific and Expertise Publications 40. Research Reports.