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Abstract

Local experiences within tourism have been a growing trend for the past years. Tourists want to experience what the locals do: where they eat and where they sleep. They can use their smartphone to access services that offer what they are looking for. Smartphones are easily accessed. Various travel apps are analyzed, by focusing on a travel app for local experiences; Lokalii. This thesis is written in collaboration with the developers of the app. Lokalii is an app that offers experiences curated by private individuals. Anyone can show off their talent, and offer an experience. The app gives the users the opportunity to experience a city like locals do. Users can learn new things, see new places in a city, and develop relations to the hosts of the experiences.

New companies can often develop products or services that change the market. In several cases, these can be described as disruptive innovations. This thesis seeks to explore whether Lokalii can be described as a disruptive innovation, as defined by Clayton M. Christensen. This has been done by conducting focus groups. The information from the focus groups combined with analyzes of mobile app design theory, innovation theory and experience design theory, gives a comprehensive image of Lokalii. Disruptive innovation is a theory that have been used by many scholars, and criticized as well. This thesis use the theory on an entrant, to see if it is possible to describe it, based on various aspects from both the theory and the app.
Acknowledgements

Writing this master’s thesis has been an interesting and exciting journey. There have been many laughs as well as frustrating moments. Most of all, it has been an inspiring journey. I would like to thank the following people who have helped me get across the finishing line.

Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisor, Gunnar Liestøl, for your feedback, dialogue and commitment to the various topics.

*Lokalii* has been so kind to let me work with them for the past year. Pouria Ruhi, thank you for your collaboration, and for the information you have provided me with. I would also like to thank my informants, for taking the time to participate in this project. Victoria Kristine Armstrong Solli and Anton Joe Aune, thank you for proof reading this thesis.

To my fellow students in “Lesesalgjengen”, Cathrine, Susanne, Frederik and Magnus, thank you for the support, the discussions, and the laughs. You have been a great support for the past two years.

To my family and friends: thank you. I would not have been able to do this project without your love and support. Last, I must thank my significant other for all the support, discussions, help, and for dealing with me no matter how tiresome and annoying I have been. Stefan Rijic, thank you for always being there for me.
# Table of contents

1 Introduction .......................................................................................................................... 1

1.1 Research question ........................................................................................................... 3

1.1.1 Layout of the thesis ........................................................................................................ 4

1.2 Previous research and contribution of the thesis ............................................................ 5

1.3 The collaboration with Lokalii ......................................................................................... 6

1.3.1 Pouria Ruhi on Lokalii ................................................................................................... 7

1.4 Tourism .............................................................................................................................. 8

1.4.1 Definition of experience .................................................................................................. 9

1.4.2 Similar apps .................................................................................................................... 9

2 Theoretical perspectives ..................................................................................................... 17

2.1 Tourism ............................................................................................................................ 17

2.1.1 Tourism and the Internet .............................................................................................. 18

2.1.2 Tourism in Norway ....................................................................................................... 19

2.2 Innovation ......................................................................................................................... 20

2.2.1 Definition of innovation ................................................................................................ 20

2.2.2 Radical and incremental innovation ............................................................................ 21

2.2.3 Sustaining and disruptive innovation .......................................................................... 21

2.2.4 Media innovations ......................................................................................................... 22

2.3 Disruptive innovation by Clayton M. Christensen ............................................................ 24

2.3.1 Four principles of disruptive technology ..................................................................... 25

2.3.2 Adjustment of the disruptive innovation theory ........................................................... 25

2.3.3 Digital Disruptive Intermediaries ............................................................................... 28

2.4 Innovation in tourism ....................................................................................................... 29

2.4.1 Airbnb and Uber ............................................................................................................ 30

2.4.2 Airbnb and Uber as disruptive innovations .................................................................. 30

2.4.3 Shared economy .......................................................................................................... 32

2.4.4 Lokalii compared to Airbnb and Uber ....................................................................... 32

2.5 Experience design ............................................................................................................. 34

2.6 Human computer interaction and mobile usability .......................................................... 37

2.6.1 Human Computer Interaction ..................................................................................... 37

2.6.2 Mobile usability ............................................................................................................ 37

2.6.3 Principles for mobile app design ................................................................................ 38

2.7 Summary ......................................................................................................................... 40

3 Methods ................................................................................................................................ 41

3.1 Focus groups .................................................................................................................... 41

3.1.1 History of the focus group ............................................................................................ 42

3.1.2 Criticism of focus groups .............................................................................................. 42

3.2 Focus group as the selected method ................................................................................. 43

3.2.1 Methods of selection ................................................................................................. 44

3.2.2 Designing the interview guide ................................................................................... 46

3.3 The implementation of the focus groups ......................................................................... 47

3.3.1 Interview with Pouria Ruhi ......................................................................................... 49

3.3.2 Analysis and findings ................................................................................................... 49

3.4 Quality of the thesis ......................................................................................................... 50

3.4.1 Reliability, validity and generalizability ....................................................................... 50

3.4.2 Captivation and disengagement .................................................................................. 51
1. Experience design in tourism
1.1 The focus groups
1.2 General background

2. Mobile app design
2.1 The first focus group
2.2 The second focus group

3. Media innovation
3.1 Media innovation for Lokalit
3.2 Media innovation – the four Ps and one S
3.3 Lokalit as a media innovation
3.4 Media innovation
3.5 Radical and incremental innovation

4. Experience design in Norway
4.1 Experience design
4.2 10 principles
4.3 Summary

5. Innovation
5.1 Innovation theories
5.1.1 Pouria Ruhi on Lokalit and innovation
5.1.2 Media innovation – the four Ps and one S
5.1.3 Lokalit as a media innovation
5.1.4 Radical and incremental innovation
5.2 Disruptive innovation
5.2.1 Market
5.2.2 Cost
5.2.3 Simplicity
5.3 Summary

6. Experience design in tourism
6.1 Concept
6.2 Functions and features
6.3 Experience design in Norway
6.4 Summary

7. Discussion and conclusion
7.1 Mobile app design
7.1.1 The concept
7.1.2 Functions in the app
7.1.3 Features in the app
7.2 Innovation
7.2.1 Media innovation
7.2.2 Radical and incremental innovation
7.3 Disruptive innovation
7.3.1 Market
7.3.2 Cost
7.3.3 Simplicity
7.3.4 Other principles – disruptive innovation
7.4 Experience design
7.5 Conclusion
7.5.1 Research question
7.6 Findings
7.6.1 Media innovation
7.6.2 Lokalii ................................................................. 103
7.7 Concluding remarks .................................................. 103
7.7.1 Limitations and further research .................................. 103

References ............................................................................ 105

Figure list with references ..................................................... 109

Appendix 1: .......................................................................... 113
Appendix 2: .......................................................................... 115
Appendix 3: .......................................................................... 116
Appendix 4: .......................................................................... 117
Appendix 5: .......................................................................... 119
Appendix 6: .......................................................................... 120
Appendix 7: .......................................................................... 122

Figures
Figure 1: “Akerselva with an inflatable boat” ........................................ 1
Figure 2: Infographic about travel apps in the world.................................. 8
Figure 3: TripAdvisor “things to do” .................................................... 9
Figure 4: VisitOSLO .................................................................... 11
Figure 5: Stay.com ....................................................................... 11
Figure 6: Exploro’s map and Nanook .................................................... 12
Figure 7: Airbnb experiences .......................................................... 13
Figure 8: How an experience from Exploro is displayed ............................ 14
Figure 9: An experience from Airbnb experiences .................................... 15
Figure 10: Experiences from Lokalii and Airbnb experiences ................... 33
Figure 11: “10-minute hand-brewing lesson” in Lokalii ......................... 49
Figure 12: “Contact me” button in Lokalii ......................................... 55
Figure 13: Categories in Lokalii ...................................................... 56
Figure 14: Search field in Lokalii, TripAdvisor, VisitOSLO and Stay.com .... 57
Figure 15: Booking process in Lokalii ............................................... 61
Figure 16: Two Facebook posts from Lokalii ....................................... 67
Figure 17: Experiences from Lokalii and Airbnb experiences .................. 74
Figure 18: Different prices in Lokalii ................................................ 75
1 Introduction

Let’s say that James and Nancy are travelling to Oslo on vacation. They have never visited the city before, so they decide they want to experience as much of Oslo as possible, just not the typical tourist traps. Some friends suggest that they should use an app called Lokalii when travelling. Both James and Nancy download the app before they leave for Oslo, and check out what the app can offer. They discover some cool experiences, by using the search function, as well as browsing through categories. James and Nancy want to explore something urban, and they discover experiences by browsing through this category in the app. The couple decide to try something different, by meeting the locals. Therefore, they want to book the experience “Akerselva with an inflatable boat”, because they think it looks exciting. They like the photos that the host provides, and the information about the trip. James and Nancy do not know where Akerselva river is, and they have some questions. Because of this they choose to contact the host via the “contact me” function. The host responds quickly and gives them all the information they need. A couple of days before their departure to Oslo, they decide to book the experience. In the app, they request a booking for their proposed date and time. They then receive a confirmation e-mail with their booking details, and are now looking forward to experiencing Oslo like locals.

During the planning process, they try various travel apps. One of the apps is TripAdvisor, and James and Nancy want to see what the top things to do in Oslo are. They soon realize that they can use TripAdvisor to find restaurants and such, but not to find local experiences. They also try VisitOslo and Stay.com, which are both Norwegian apps. VisitOslo gives them a good overview of what is happening in the city.

Figure 1: “Akerselva with an inflatable boat”. On the left, the experience is showed. On the right is the information about the experience, which is located (in the app) under the “check availability” button (Lokalii AS, 2016b).
Stay.com shows them tips for cafés and restaurants that are recommend by the residents of Oslo. However, neither of these apps give them the opportunity to see what locals have to offer. Nevertheless, they can still use the apps to plan, and use them during their trip. On their second day in Oslo, they are eager and ready for their boat-trip on Akerselva river. They meet the host, and have an amazing adventure down the river. During the trip, they stop for a bite to eat at Mathallen, which Akerselva river runs by, because the host wants them to meet his friends, and experience more of what Oslo has to offer. The experience originally includes grilling in a park, as seen in figure 1, but they would rather visit Mathallen. Here they buy some lunch and a beer. They make several new friends, and makes plans to meet them at a later point in their trip. Both the host and his friends are pleasant, and they recommend several places to visit during their stay in Oslo.

James and Nancy realize that Lokalii’s concept is quite unique, since it offers local experiences, which give the users a personal aspect. This personal aspect consists of the communication before the booking, and during the participation. The contact that the tourists get when they purchase an experience through Lokalii is special. Not only do they get an experience, as promised, they also get the human touch that comes with it. One of the features that make Lokalii unique is that the voice in the app is from the host for each experience, and not from Lokalii. The hosts choose exactly what they want to write about themselves. They choose a fitting experience and describe it. The role of the host is to facilitate the experience, and to show a part of their city. The users also get the opportunity to get to know new people, so the personal aspect of the app goes both ways. In this way, using the app is quite a personal experience. In many cases the users can make a new friend. This is something that James and Nancy admire about the app, and that makes the service special.

This scenario can be described as the ideal interaction with Lokalii. It shows how the app works, and some of the unique functions and features that it contains. The acquaintances that they made during the experience are a part of what they experienced as unique. James and Nancy made new friends, which they will keep in contact with. They have already invited them to come and visit them in their city. This shows that by using the app, and participating in an experience can give the users a different feeling and emotional attachment. Lokalii can work as a facilitator for an expansion of networks, for new relations, and for the exchange of

---

1 The screenshots from the different apps show the sellers first name and a picture of them. This is information that is open to everyone who has downloaded the app, or that visits the company’s website.
experiences. Just as James and Nancy experienced through their participation in “Akerselva with an inflatable boat”. This thesis seeks to explore the travel app market in general, and Lokalii in particular. It will identify the unique functions and features that the app contains. By using different innovation theories will the concept of Lokalii be described.

1.1 Research question

Based on the scenario, there are some questions that can be asked regarding Lokalii. Such as, what functions and features separates Lokalii from other travel apps? What does the users of Lokalii think about the service? Does Lokalii offer something new? How does the app work for their users? Is there a market for the app? Does Lokalii create a new market for travel apps? Can Lokalii be described using an innovation theory? Can Lokalii be described as a disruptive innovation? All these questions will be answered through the thesis. These questions have been used as a base for the research question:

**How can Lokalii’s concept, with the functions and features of the app, be described as a disruptive innovation?**

Here, functions are meant as the specific elements that the app contains, and how these are recognized by the user. Also, how the different functions are similar, or different from other apps in the travel market. A function can e.g. be described as the “contact me” button, that can be seen in figure 1. It is the different elements that an app offers. Features are meant as how the app is perceived for the users, and what feelings they are left with after using it. They are the characteristics of the service, which can be explained as how the users experience the service. To answer the research question, this thesis will deal with theories of tourism, innovation, experience design and mobile usability. These theories, combined with an examination of Lokalii’s concept, will form the basis for answering the research question. Theories of tourism and the travel industry will create a background for understanding where Lokalii has emerged from. In addition to show how the tourism market has changed.

Innovation, and innovation theories will be used to analyze Lokalii’s concept. Different innovation theories will be presented. The focus will be on disruptive innovation, because the theory has been used to describe similar services, such as Airbnb and Uber. Therefore, it will be interesting to examine Lokalii in this perspective, to examine whether it can describe the service. The theory of disruptive innovation was initially presented in The Innovator’s Dilemma, written by Clayton M. Christensen. This book was first published in 1997 (Christensen, 1997). In an article from Harvard Business Review, Christensen specified the
theory (Christensen, Raynor & McDonald, 2015). These publications will serve as a base for my understanding of the theory, and they will be a part of the analyzes. Theories concerning experience design in tourism are important to include, because they concern a new way of travelling, where the experiences that occur during a trip are emphasized. Most of the research regarding experience design is theoretical. Therefore, it will be interesting to view whether the theory can be applied to Lokalii. As a part of answering the research question, theories of mobile usability and human computer interaction will be highlighted, and applied to Lokalii. Based on these theories, and design principles for apps, 10 principles for good app design will be compiled (Gove, 2016, pp. 4-26). These principles will be used to analyze the functions and features in the app. In addition to how the users perceive the app. Based on this, what works for the users, and what Lokalii should prioritize for making the impression of the app better will be viewed.

The empirical findings in this thesis will be based on data from two focus groups. These focus groups will be organized with the same informants, but with different purposes. The first focus group will deal with the concept of Lokalii, and how the concept fits with Oslo and the market in Oslo. The second focus group will be held after the informants have participated in an experience from Lokalii. The informants must book an experience through the app. The focus groups will be held to get the informants thoughts and impressions of the app, and the concept of Lokalii. By conducting two focus groups, various aspects of the app will be investigated, giving a broader view of the app. The focus group questions will be closely connected to the research question. The founder of Lokalii, Pouria Ruhi, will be interviewed. To get his opinions on the creation of the app, and what he believes that the app provides people with, and why people need Lokalii. The analysis will consist of different topics, such as mobile usability, innovation (with an emphasis on disruptive innovation) and experience design. The focus groups will be analyzed together, within the different theories. It will be highlighted which focus group the statements are from. This study will explore the various topics and theories. The mission is not to give a conclusive answer, it is rather to view how different theoretical traditions can describe a new service.

1.1.1 Layout of the thesis

This thesis will start with examining various theoretical approaches, then focus on data collection, and finally, how and why focus groups were selected as the method of analysis. In
addition, there will be given a short description of the interview with Ruhi. After this, the three analysis chapters will be presented. These are divided into the categories, mobile app design, innovation and experience design in tourism. Here, relevant findings from the focus groups will be presented, and put in the context of the theoretical approaches. The last chapter will include a discussion of the findings, and a conclusion with an answer to the research question.

1.2 Previous research and contribution of the thesis

The theories that will be presented in the thesis are widespread, and they derive from different disciplines. Clayton M. Christensen introduced the theory of disruptive innovation in his book *The Innovator’s Dilemma* (1997). Clayton M. Christensen is the most prominent scholar on the theory. With his book *The Innovator’s Dilemma* (1997), he described a theory that has been used by many scholars, but that also have been criticized. Based on this criticism, he has specified the theory accordingly. This has been done in cooperation with Michael Raynor and Rory McDonald in the article *What Is Disruptive Innovation?* (2015).

Radical and incremental innovation has been addressed by many scholars. Joseph Schumpeter was the first to put the theories in an economical perspective, in his book *The Theory of Economic Development* (1934). Robert D. Dewar and Jane E. Dutton have also focused on the theories, in their paper *The Adoption of Radical and Incremental Innovations: An Empirical Analysis* (1986).

Several scholars have also addressed media innovation. Among others, Tanja Storsul and Arne H. Krumsvik in the book *Media Innovations: A Multidisciplinary Study of Change* (2013), which give a description of various media innovations and the discipline. Leyla Dogruel has through several articles focused on defining the discipline, as well as giving a description of why the discipline is different from other innovation theories. This has been done through the articles *What is so Special about Media Innovations? A Characterization of the Field* (2014) and *Opening the Black Box. The Conceptualising of Media Innovation* (2013).

Tourism is also a large part of this thesis, and widespread field. It has been researched for many years, with different approaches. Experience design is a theory that fits within the discipline of tourism studies. This theory has been interpreted in different ways, but the main
focus has been on the offering of memorable experiences during a trip. Ils Tussyadiah has described a theoretical foundation for the theory in tourism in the article *Toward a Theoretical Foundation for Experience Design in Tourism* (2014). Daniel R. Fesenmaier is also well known within the field of tourism and experience design. He has written and co-written different articles, such as *Tourism Experience and Tourism Design* (2017) and *Measuring Emotions in Real Time. Implications for Tourism Experience Design* (2014), which was written with Jeongmi Kim.

Human computer interaction and mobile usability are comprehensive disciplines. They concern a large field, which have been researched for years. Jakob Nielsen is one of the scholars that have researched mobile usability, and he is well known within the discipline. He has co-written the book *Mobile Usability* (2013) with Raluca Budiu. Jenny Gove, from Google, has assembled 25 principles for mobile app design in *Principles of Mobile App Design: Engage Users and Drive Conversions* (2016), which gives a thorough examination of what an app should offer to its users.

This thesis contributes to different theoretical disciplines by addressing them, and applying them on a case; *Lokalii*. This can give new perspectives to several of the theories, such as experience design, and to some extent disruptive innovation. The theories will be put in the context of *Lokalii*, and by doing so, new information will be created about the service. Combined, this will create new understanding of how a travel app can be described as an innovation, in addition to how innovation theories can be used to view a newly established company.

### 1.3 The collaboration with *Lokalii*

I contacted the team behind of *Lokalii* in May 2016, and asked them if they would consider collaborating with me on my thesis. Because they had not tested the app on many users, this was something that they were interested in. We agreed that I could help them to test the app with users, and in exchange they could provide me with necessary data and insight. During the thesis, I have been in regular contact with the founder of *Lokalii*, Pouria Ruhi. The app was launched in November 2015, but it was not until May 2016 that the users could book an experience through the app. There have been several updates to the app since the first launch. Functions and features such as reviews and ratings, booking, contact me, categories, etc. have
been implemented in the app. During the thesis, I have gathered insight about the number of users, downloads, purchases and so on. While it will not be enough to base my findings on these statistics, I will utilize these insights where appropriate to provide a better understanding. The focus during the thesis will be on the concept of Lokalii, with the functions and features that the app contains. It will not be on the business model of Lokalii, because I have not had access to it, and it is not relevant for answering the research question.

As of May 3rd, 2017, Lokalii has 10 000 downloads, and 2300 users that have registered a user profile (P. Ruhi, personal communication, May 3, 2017). The service also offers over 300 different experiences (Vissgren, 2017).

1.3.1 Pouria Ruhi on Lokalii

Pouria Ruhi, the founder of Lokalii was interviewed. This was done to get his thoughts, initial ideas and visions for Lokalii. The interview would also provide background information on Lokalii, from the founders’ perspective. Ruhi has a media related background, and he has previously worked in the hotel industry. Here he saw experienced a desire among the visitors; to discover cities like locals. A friend of his contacted him with the desire to make a guide service, where people could find local guiders. Ruhi stated that

I thought about the word ‘guide’ and I felt that it is not an appealing word. For me, being young at heart, I do not get excited when I hear the word ‘guide’. In my opinion, I do not believe that guiding is a young people thing.

The idea of Lokalii emerged from the knowledge that Ruhi possessed about the hotel industry and from his own personal desire. When he travels, he wants to find the coolest places to experience. With this in mind, he got an engineer, to deal with the technical aspect of the app. They started with a website, and they were to make an app at a later point. Lokalii met with a big investor in Scandinavia, Northzone, and they recommended highly going mobile only. They checked their data, and saw that most of the people visiting Lokalii.com, did this via a mobile browser. They decided to go mobile only, and to launch an app. Ruhi’s dream for Lokalii is for Canadas Prime Minister, Justin Trudeau, to offer an experience in the Lokalii app. In other words, their vision is that everyone in the world either offers an experience, or purchases one. Lokalii decided early on, that they would not go the European way. They wanted to think like Americans, as Ruhi said “we will be ballsy, we will think big and be daring, be kaksige (Swedish) and we will have the attitude ‘this will be big’”.

---

2 This statement, and all forthcoming statements are translated by me.
1.4 Tourism

The digital travel industry facilitates sales for 450 billion dollars worldwide (2014). In 2014, the number of travel apps in the App Store were 61,600. Google Play offered 64,100 travel apps at the same time.

This implies that travel apps represent 5 percent of all apps in the app stores (Sommer, 2015). In 2016, it was estimated that mobile booking would represent 50 percent of all online travel bookings for U.S. travelers. Following this estimation, mobile booking would represent 65 billion dollars, in online booking sales (Peltier, 2015). According to Lucy Fuggle (2015) there were 6 travel trends that would drive the market in 2016: (1) the continued strength of the Chinese market. (2) Travelers wanting to unplug. (3) Discovering untouched and unique places. (4) Fewer barriers to travel. (5) Millennials looking for adventure. (6) Staycation, or travelling closer to home. Several of these trends focus on the importance of experiences and the authentic aspect of travelling (Fuggle, 2015). Experiences and authenticity is something that Lokalii offers to tourists. The experiences range from learning how to brew beer to finding great climbing spots in Oslo. Lokalii offers a new way to travel, where tourists can
meet locals, and experience a city like locals do. How people travel has changed in recent years, and is constantly changing. Travel apps have been on the market for years, and there are still many that are being launched with different concepts. All the apps want to make the experience better for the users. During this introduction, various travel apps will be described to see what the concept consists of, in comparison with Lokalii. The focus will be on Oslo, as a tourism destination. Oslo will also be emphasized city during this thesis. Because the thesis is written in Oslo, and this is also where most of Lokalii's experiences are located. In addition, there are many tourism providers in Oslo, so many international apps contain much content about the city.

1.4.1 Definition of experience

Oxford Dictionaries defines experience as “an event or occurrence which leaves an impression on someone”. They also define it as a feeling, as an emotion or sensation (Experience, n.d.). An experience can also be defined as the content of a person’s subjective experience. It can be connected to perception, feeling, motivation, and more (Teigen, 2016).

1.4.2 Similar apps

In this section, various apps and services that can be compared to Lokalii will be presented. These apps and services are TripAdvisor, VisitOSLO, Stay.com, Nanook and Exploro, and Airbnb experiences. These are chosen because the services give a background for what kind of services are available in the market. Some of them share similarities to Lokalii, others do not. There will be given a brief introduction to each app and service below.

TripAdvisor was founded in February 2000. The website was originally designed as a business-to-business tool. It
became a customer review site when the travel community started using it for this purpose. The most reviewed city is London, and every corner of the world is covered (Telegraph Travel, 2015). According to TripAdvisor’s website, they are the largest traveling site available. They offer the ability to plan and book trips. In addition, advice from millions of travelers is accessible (TripAdvisor, n.d.). The TripAdvisor app is available for both Android and iOS. The app was launched for iOS in 2010 (WebProNews, 2010). TripAdvisor (iOS) was tried on 23rd of April 2017, and I searched for Oslo. TripAdvisor is an app that holds many functions and features. Many people choose to leave a review of a place they have visited, e.g. a restaurant or a sight. When the user searches for Oslo, he or she gets information about the city, and can choose to browse through categories such as; hotels (100 available), restaurants (1427) and things to do (541). One could say that TripAdvisor and Lokalii serve different purposes. Lokalii wants to give tourists and locals an experience that they would not be able to get from using a guidebook. TripAdvisor is an app where tourists can plan their trip. This is done based on user reviews given by other users. These reviews with rating are what the app is based on. Many of the top sights have thousands of reviews, as seen in figure 3. TripAdvisor contains more content, because they focus on offering “the complete package” with hotels, restaurants, activities and so on. Lokalii focuses on personal experiences that are offered by locals in a city. Therefore, the content is narrower. The category “things to do” in TripAdvisor is the one that is most similar to Lokalii’s experiences, it is displayed in figure 3. Here the user can choose to browse through the most popular sights, or to book a trip. These trips appear to be organized by different established providers. This separates TripAdvisor from Lokalii. The concept and functions of the two apps are different. Where Lokalii offers personal experiences, TripAdvisor offers an app that guides their users to choose what they want to see or eat.

VisitOSLO is the official marketing company for Oslo. They cooperate closely with the Oslo municipality (VisitOSLO, n.d.a). Their purpose is to market Oslo as a place to visit. Their goal is for tourists to find all the information they need about Oslo, as well as to plan a trip using their sites (VisitOSLO, n.d.b). VisitOSLO launched a new app in March 2012, but it was completely changed in December 2015 (C. Rafn, personal communication, October 17, 2016). The app was tested on 23rd of April 2017 (iOS). In many ways, VisitOSLO serves some of the same purpose as TripAdvisor. It gives the user the opportunity to explore a city based on recommendations. However, the company, not their users, generates the recommendations given in VisitOSLO. The users can browse through categories, or choose to
VisitOSLO provides the users with relevant information, such as the weather, today’s tips, a calendar with different activities, and guides where the user can choose to browse through different categories, as seen in figure 4. If the user want to look at activities, he or she get many to choose from, this is illustrated in figure 4. Established actors facilitate the activities. As with TripAdvisor, this is different from what Lokalii offers. The two apps (VisitOSLO and Lokalii) have different concepts. VisitOSLO is there to give a tourist an overview of the city, with all the necessary information.

Stay.com is an app for travelers. It also features a website where the user can access the same information as they have in the app. Stay.com wants the users to get the insight of local experts (Stay.com, n.d.). The app allows the user to plan their trip, and to make their own guide with places that they want to visit. It also gives the users the opportunity to share their guide with other people, e.g. via social media (Solheim, 2012).

Stay.com is a Norwegian company, which was founded in 2009 (Stay.com, n.d.). The app was tested on 23rd of April 2017 (iOS). Most of the content
in the app (places to visit, restaurants, etc.) is curated by locals. Stay.com contains different functions than Lokalii. Among others, the users can download a map with their favorite places to see, and by doing so they can plan their trip before arriving at a destination. This map can be helpful, if e.g. the user is not able to use mobile data during the trip. Figure 5 shows how the map looks when it is downloaded, and how the category “attractions” are viewed in the app. The users can browse through it, and see which places he or she has added. Even though the two apps are quite different, the concepts can be compared, if the focus is on local recommendations, and the discovery of new places.

Nanook helps existing providers and private persons who want to offer local experiences. They offer experiences in many places all over the world. Nanook offers 10 experiences in Oslo in the category “Local Hosts Worldwide” (Nanook, n.d.). The service was tested on the 22nd of April 2017. Much of the concept is the same as Lokalii, but Lokalii focuses on people offer something they want to, not on what existing providers can offer. However, private individuals offer many of the experiences from Nanook. Some of Lokalii’s experiences are from existing providers, but then the provider has to make a new experience for Lokalii, one that does not exist from before. The two concepts are quite similar, and they offer much of the same content. One difference is that Nanook only exists in a web browser, which has its pros and cons. This aspect will be discussed later in this section. Exploro also exist in a web

Figure 6: The two figures to the left, shows Exploro’s map. On the right, how an experience is viewed from Nanook’s service. Both figures are accessed through Safari on an iPhone (Exploro, n.d.) (Nanook, n.d.).
browser. They are still in a beta phase, which means that everything is not quite in place. As of 22nd of April 2017, Exploro offers one experience in Oslo (Exploro, n.d.). Both Nanook and Exploro can be defined as competitors of Lokalii. It is difficult to say how big the market share is. The services offer the same concept with the sharing of experiences, but in a slightly different way. The difference lies in the way the experiences are presented. Lokalii offers the experiences through an app, which makes the service more available on a smartphone. Nanook and Exploro offer experiences through a website, which can be accessed through a smartphone. The mobile website offered by Exploro is difficult to use. The experiences are showed on a map, and the user must use two fingers to navigate through it, this can be seen in figure 6. It takes time to use the service, which is not a good thing. Nanook’s mobile website works fine, but all the information about an experience is showed upfront. This implies that the user must do a lot of scrolling, and that can be a bit frustrating. This is illustrated in figure 6. Both the services work better on a computer. This is something that makes the booking process more unavailable. This can lead to people choosing to not purchase an experience from these two providers, because they feel it is too complicated to do on a smartphone. However, all three providers focus on bringing local experiences to tourists. 

Airbnb started experimenting with experiences in May 2014. At first the experiences were offered in San Francisco and Paris, however, the experiences were hidden in the website. The experiences were probably hidden because the function was not launched yet. By offering experiences, Airbnb could be positioned as an end-to-end provider for travel planning and booking (Lawler, 2014). Airbnb launched this feature in November 2016. The experiences range from multi-day activities to a single experience, such as a concert, food, and more. On the day of the launch (17.11.2016) the users could choose from 500
experiences, located in 12 cities (Meltzer, 2016). Airbnb shows many of the experiences on the front page. There are no experiences in Oslo, only in selected cities around the world, such as San Francisco, Paris, Barcelona, and more. It is difficult to determine why Oslo is not one of these selected cities. It might be that Airbnb wants to offer the experiences in some cities first, and offer more at a later point. Or it might be because Oslo is a rather small city.

Airbnb offers a lot of information about the experiences, with a section under “Help” with Q&As (Airbnb, n.d.b). The experiences are located both in the app, and on the website. The users get the opportunity to search for cities, and featured cities are displayed in the app. This is shown in figure 7. The information that is provided about the experience is extensive, and the users get to know both the experience and the host. Lokalii and Airbnb experiences are similar in the content that they offer. The difference lies in which cities the experiences are offered in. Neither of the two services offers experiences in all cities or countries. Because the focus is on Oslo in this thesis, it is an important difference that Airbnb experiences does not offer any experiences there.

To summarize, the concepts of the apps and services can be connected to Lokalii in some way. Some more than others. The providers both show what is already on the market, and who Lokalii’s competitors are. They form a basis for this thesis, and many of the apps and services will be discussed during the analyzes.

The clear competitors for Lokalii are Nanook, Exploro and Airbnb experiences. These services offer the same concept as Lokalii, the sharing of local experiences. Both Nanook and Exploro offers the experiences via a website, which differs from Lokalii. Airbnb offers the experiences via a website and an app. However, Airbnb experiences only offers experiences in some cities, and Oslo is not one of these. The experiences that are offered are also different. Nanook and Exploro do not offer many experiences. The content of the experiences is also different. Lokalii offers experiences such as “Akerselva with an inflatable boat” and “10-minute hand-brewing lesson”. Nanook e.g. offers experiences such as “Buddy drive –

\[^3\) Airbnb experiences is a part of the Airbnb app and website. The experience part of the service will be referred to as Airbnb experiences through this thesis.\]
Electrical limo service” (see figure 6) and “Kayak tour through Oslo city”. The latter can be compared to the experience that James and Nancy participates in. Both the experiences consist of travelling down Akerselva river by boat. Exploro only offers one experience in Oslo, which is “Viewpoints & Plane Wreck Hike outside Oslo”, this can be viewed in figure 8. This experience cannot be found in the Lokalii app. None of the two services (Nanook and Exploro) offer any information about the host. This is something that separates them from Lokalii. Airbnb experiences offers experiences in other cities. They vary in length and content, but they can still be compared to Lokalii. An example of an experience is “Food-and-Farm Activist Dinner Party”, which involves a dinner where the user can get to know their host. This experience is displayed in figure 9. The two services focus on the same thing; information about the host, and local experiences. This description was done to show how the market for travel apps is, and not to determine whether Lokalii has any big competitors. The next chapter will concern the theoretical context, which will form the basis for the forthcoming analyzes.

Figure 9: “Food-and-Farm Activist Dinner Party”, an experience from Airbnb experiences. The figure shows how the experience is displayed, and what information that is provided, in the Airbnb app (Airbnb, Inc., 2017).
2 Theoretical perspectives

The different theoretical approaches presented in this chapter will be a part of forming a background to answer the research question: “How can Lokalii's concept, with the functions and features of the app, be described as a disruptive innovation?”. The different theories are all connected to this question, and will be a part of the forthcoming analyzes. The theories are from different disciplines. This chapter will include theories from tourism, innovation, experience design and human computer interaction with mobile app design. The theories that will be presented in the next sections have been chosen because they highlight different aspects of Lokalii, and they will be used to analyze these aspects. The focus will be on disruptive innovation, therefore the theory will be thoroughly examined. However, other innovation theories will also be explained, and used to examine Lokalii during the analyzes. These theories will be examined to view the innovation field broadly, and to see if it is possible to find the theory that describes Lokalii best. Experience design in tourism will be defined to examine whether the theory can help explore the concept of Lokalii, and to view if the service can be described within the theory, or if it can facilitate the theory. Human computer interaction and mobile app design will be addressed to highlight the different functions and features that Lokalii contains. These are important theories to address, in the light of the research question. But also, to be able to say something about how these functions and features should be, and how they are perceived for the users of the app. This will be elaborated in the analyzes with the findings from the focus groups. The different theories will be described here, starting with information about tourism.

2.1 Tourism

The Oxford Dictionary defines a tourist as “a person who is travelling or visiting a place for pleasure” (Tourist, n.d.). Tourist and tourism are terms that have been debated since the start of the nineteenth century. In the 1950s, it was said that one could give over 550 definitions of travelers. The attempt to define the term has been developed throughout the years. These attempts have contained information that a tourist must travel at least 50 or 100 miles from his or her home, stay overnight, etc. This implies that there are different factors that have to be in the equation to define what a tourist is. The National Tourism Policy Study has recognized that many people usually associate positive meaning to words such as, traveler,
visitor, guest, etc. However, with the word tourist, people often associate negative meaning. They often think of people who are rude, misbehaving, and tangled in the straps of a camera (Hunt & Layne, 1991, pp. 7-9).

2.1.1 Tourism and the Internet

In 2015, a study was conducted on how the Internet is used when people plan their trips. The study was done with American travelers. In general, the Internet can be described as a platform for technological innovation. It can lead to new businesses, and it has changed the landscape of several industries. With the emergence of Web 2.0, the travel industry has changed. One example is that by 2008, TripAdvisor added maps, video uploading and sharing functions to their service. The innovations that have been made in the travel and hospital sector, such as the implementations just mentioned, have been widely adopted by users. Travel planning is a fundamental part of the travel experience. When thorough research is done before a trip, the traveler builds expectations connected to that trip. Smartphones and smartphone apps create a new place for travelers to search for information, especially on the go. The traveler’s need for information is becoming more prominent, and with the smartphone and apps, they have also become more effective when travelling (Xiang, Wang, O’Leary & Fesenmaier, 2015, pp. 512-515). In the study, Xiang et al. (2015) detected that the ownership of personal computers was decreasing, but the ownership of smartphones and tablets was increasing. The primary source of information in travel planning and information about travelling was the Internet. Fewer people used travel guidebooks, and other sources of information increased (TV, travel companies, radio, etc.) (Xiang et al., 2015, pp. 515-516).

Technology and especially mobile phones are constantly changing and becoming more powerful. The tourism industry has adapted themselves to this technology. More and more travel apps are emerging, and there is a lot to choose from when trying to find the perfect app for your needs. A travel app is a mobile app that is targeted toward travelers, in addition to the apps, which are often used in travel context. Many travel operators build relationships with their customers via travel apps. They do this to give the tourist more memorable and interactive experiences. The way customers interact with apps are different from websites. The cost of using apps is higher, because the customers have to search in app stores (such as Google Play and App Store). They must then install the app, wait for it to download, and sometimes even pay for the app. Because of this, customers tend to have a higher
commitment to apps than to websites. Mobile phones are also seen as more innovative, since they possess more features than a PC, such as high-quality camera, sensors, and more (Lu, Mao, Wang & Hu, 2015, pp. 1059-1060). Based on the previous sections it makes sense that Lokalii is only accessible from a smartphone or a tablet, because more people use smartphones, and they have a higher commitment to apps.

2.1.2 Tourism in Norway

During 2015, tourism in Norway increased. This implies that more people were visiting Norway. Numbers from World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) shows that there were 1,2 billion tourists arrivals in 2015 in the world. At Norwegian hotels, there were 3,6 million tourist arrivals. This is an increase of 12 percent from 2014, and 382 000 more tourists visited the country. This increase is bigger than the average of the rest of the world. One reason for this could be the weakened exchange rate of the Norwegian krone. Tourists get better value for their money (Innovasjon Norge, 2016, pp. 9-16). The tourists that visited Norway were satisfied with their stay, and the average satisfaction was at 8,7 (where 10 is the highest satisfaction). The number of first time visitors also increased. Many of the tourists that visited Norway, wanted to relax and not do so much. However, there was an increase in tourists that wanted to experience the northern lights, dogsledding, and participate in concerts and festivals. Several of the tourists also wanted to eat and drink locally, visit historical buildings, and experience the fjords (Innovasjon Norge, 2016, pp. 30-35). Innovasjon Norge has not released the report from 2016 (checked at 17.03.2017). They have however seen that the number of foreigners arriving by the hotels in Norway increased by 12 percent in 2016 (Innovasjon Norge, 2017).

Brenna (2017) writes in Dagbladet that “What is a fjord?” is the third most searched phrase by foreign tourists. Many of the tourists have also searched for “What to do in Oslo?”, and it is Oslo that has been searched for the most (Brenna, 2017). Naturally, tourism in Oslo has also increased during the last couple of years. 2014 generated 1000 new jobs in the tourism industry. The tourists that visit the capital want to experience more than Holmenkollbakken and Vigelandsmuseet. They want to experience the culture, and to feel the international pulse of the city. Oslo is marketed as a city with urban experiences, close to nature (Fonbæk, 2015). 2016 was a good year for the tourism in Oslo, with 13 percent more visitors compared to 2015. In the same year, Americans were most eager to visit Oslo. Many of the tourists
want to see the big attractions, but many also want to experience architecture, design, food, and culture. They want the “complete package”, which does not just involve going to one museum. Rather, it is the environment, good food, good service and exciting cultural experiences that they want to enjoy on their trip (Hansen, Hagen & Mordt, 2016).

2.2 Innovation

2.2.1 Definition of innovation

Innovation has many definitions, and some of them will be presented here. On a general level, innovation can be defined as dealing with the creation of better and more effective products or services (Hjalager, 2014, p. 57). It can also be defined as the successful utilization of new ideas (Francis & Bessant, 2005, p. 171). Another definition says that innovation concerns change, and adds that media products and services are always changing (Storsul & Krumsvik, 2013, p. 13). Innovation can be described as a process. This process is divided into different phases. A simple description of the process will be outlined here. The process starts with a development phase, which constitutes the invention of a product or a service. Then, a production phase is entered, where the new idea is developed further into a product or a service that can be put into a market. This is the innovation phase. Lastly, the phase where the product or service is spread: this is the diffusion (Dogruel, 2014, p. 58).


In the next sections, four types of innovation will be described; radical and incremental innovations, and sustaining and disruptive innovations. These four innovation types are chosen because they give a wide description of the innovation field. They will be implemented in the analyzes that will be conducted later in the thesis. Radical and incremental innovations will draw upon Dewar and Dutton’s article The Adoption of Radical and Incremental Innovations: An Empirical Analysis (1986). Sustaining and disruptive innovation will draw upon Clayton M. Christensen’s book The Innovator’s Dilemma (1997). There will also be given a description of media innovations in this section, because this is a
field that is interesting regarding travel apps. Because the discipline does not necessarily cover the industry of travel apps. However, many of the points from the theory can be transferred to a travel app. This will be showed during the analyzes. Because this thesis focuses on disruptive innovation, the criticism of the theory will be addressed. In addition to how Christensen has evolved and specified the theory since he first published his book on disruptive innovation.

2.2.2 Radical and incremental innovation

Radical and incremental characterize different types of technological process innovations. Radical innovations are changes that are revolutionary in technology. They are clearly different from existing practices. Incremental innovations, on the other hand, are improvements or adjustments in current technology. There is no clear distinction between radical and incremental innovations. The continuum of innovations rather ranges between the two. However, an example of a radical innovation can be a new service that offers something new to the world. One specific example of a radical innovation can be TripAdvisor, because they offer a service that facilitates all aspects of a trip. A user can book flights, hotels, find places to visit, and more, in one service. A typical example of an incremental innovation can e.g. be updates done to an app. Complexity and depth of knowledge are important for adoption of radical innovation. Exposure to external information is important for the adoption of incremental innovation. There can be different attitudes towards innovation within an organization. Some organizations are more conservative, and they might want to use standard methods for solving a problem. In contrast, some organizations encourage change. For many organizations, the easiest innovation is incremental, because they will have a more predictable outcome, and they do no need to overcome potential resistance. This resistance can come from managers, who want to do improvements to an existing product, rather than bet all on a new product, that they do not know if their customers will approve or purchase. To implement a radical innovation can be viewed as a risk based on this (Dewar & Dutton, 1986, pp. 1422-1425).

2.2.3 Sustaining and disruptive innovation

One simple way to understand sustaining innovations is to look at them as improved product performances. Sustaining innovations improve established products for their mainstream customers. Most of the technological advances are sustaining in character. Disruptive innovations, on the other hand, are innovations that result in worse product performance.
What is typical of disruptive innovations are that they are cheaper, simpler, smaller, and more convenient to use, compared to the established actors in the market. One example of a disruptive innovation that does this is Airbnb. This is because they offer the same as hotels, however, they are cheaper. The service is simpler because it does not offer room service, or cleaning every day, such as the hotels do. Why Airbnb is a disruptive innovation will be elaborated on later in this chapter. Disruptive innovations underperform in the mainstream markets. They often offer something to the rest of the customers, which is not necessarily located in the mainstream market (Christensen, 1997, p. xv). “Disruptive innovations tend to emerge from entrant providers, since these companies can, more easily than well-established enterprises, create a new value network and grow even in small market segments, where there are lower profit levels” (Hjalager, 2014, p. 60).

In the analyzes, radical, incremental, and disruptive innovations will be examined in comparison to Lokalii. Sustaining innovation share many similar perspectives to incremental innovation, as shown above. Therefore, it will be unnecessary to include both theories in the analyzes. The difference between radical and disruptive innovations is large, so both innovation theories will be included.

2.2.4 Media innovations

Media innovations are changes that occur in different aspects of the media landscape. In many characteristics, media innovation is referred to in the cases of new media technologies or services (Dogruel, 2014, p. 54). The changes referred to above, can however include the development of new products or services, a change in a business model, or a development of a new media platform (Storsul & Krumsvik, 2013, pp. 16-17). Media organizations have always needed to be innovative. In recent years, this need to innovate has become more urgent and challenging, because the technological advance has increased (Küng, 2013, p. 9). Media innovations separate from producers of other goods, because they can be characterized as having an endless need for newness. Most media content has a short life cycle because of this need. In addition, media innovations are often costly, and therefore there is a high risk when innovating a product. Media innovations are often created during a process that refers to established media. This implies that media innovation processes are shaped by close interaction between established media. They therefore meet existing media when they are entering a market; this market also consists of media that are struggling to
When looking at media innovation, one can start by applying the four Ps of innovation, given by Francis and Bessant⁴, described in *Media Innovations, a Multidisciplinary Study of Change* (Storsul & Krumsvik, 2013, pp. 16-17). The four Ps are: product, process, position and paradigmatic. These four types will be described here. Product innovation is when there is a change in a product or service offered by an organization. This could for example be when there is a new product on the market, such as the smartphone. Or, it could be a new service, such as web-tv, apps or similar. Process innovation involves changes made to how products or services are created and delivered. This occurs when an organization changes how they organize their activities. This can e.g. be when a company changes how they deliver information to their staff, by e.g. create an internal app for information. Position innovation involves how products or services are positioned within a context. This can involve different market strategies, and how a product e.g. is advertised. An example is when a media company repositions their whole identity/brand. Paradigmatic innovation involves changes in how an organization thinks, their values and business models. This happened when the newspaper industry had to shift from printed newspapers to online newspapers. Storsul and Krumsvik (2013) state that the four Ps do not cover all media innovations.

Because of this they added a fifth type of innovation, which is social innovation. The social innovation involves a change that meet a social need. It can also improve people’s lives. One example of a social innovation can be services such as Facebook. This is because Facebook, in the beginning, facilitated communication between people, and gave people the opportunity to get in touch with e.g. old friends (Storsul & Krumsvik, 2013, pp. 16-17).

Most of the innovations in the media landscape are incremental or sustaining. These are small changes made to products or processes. Not all media innovations are like this some have bigger consequences. The Internet, and how the Internet is being used are one example of this. It changed how people e.g. read a newspaper, search for information, etc. The media industry must change to survive, because of the rapid changes that have been done in recent years, such as the emergence of the Internet (Storsul & Krumsvik, 2013, pp. 17-18). To link media innovations to Lokalii, the importance of smartphones and communication must be

---

⁴ Francis and Bessant wrote about the 4Ps in their article *Targeting innovation and implications for capability development* (2005). The 4Ps are used in Storsul and Krumsvik (2013) about media innovations.
addressed. Smartphones are powerful computers of multimodal communication. In addition, they can register where a person is located, where the person touches the phone and which way the phone is held. These features are a part of a change in media history. The smartphone changes how we communicate, learn, research, and so on. This is a change that is not just important in computer science, but also in human science (Liestøl, 2013, p. 61). This aspect shows that it is important for media innovation to address topics that were typically seen as computer science before.

2.3  Disruptive innovation by Clayton M. Christensen

Through time, many leading companies have failed when they were confronted with disruptive innovations. There are several reasons why these companies failed. In some cases, the new technology swept through quickly, in other cases the transition took much longer time (Christensen, 1997, p. xii). In The Innovator’s Dilemma, Christensen writes about different industries, such as the hard disk drive industry. The book focuses on why leading and successful companies fail. In the disk drive industry, the firms became leading and successful because they listened to their customers, but this is also the reason why they failed. The first disk drives were developed between 1952 and 1956. At that time, the disk was the same size of a refrigerator, and it could store 5 megabytes of information. The size of the disk drive has changed with technology, from the size of a refrigerator, to as small as 1.4-inches (in 1993) (Christensen, 1997, pp. 3-7). The changes in the disk drive industry has mostly consisted of sustaining innovations. There have only been a few incidents of disruptive innovation. The innovation that was most important, was when the size of the drives shrunk. These disk drives did not offer what the customers in established markets wanted, so they could not be employed there. The attributes were valued in emerging markets, not in the mainstream markets (Christensen, 1997, pp. 14-15). In the early 1990s, the 1.8-inch disk drive was emerging as the industry’s most recent disruptive innovation. This was the case, even though there were many suppliers of 1.8-inch disk drives. The managers of the firms claimed that there was no market for this small drive. This was apparently not the case. Christensen met with some students, and found that they were eager to buy the 1.8-inch disk drive, and they could get in from a small start-up. They on the other hand claimed that it was not possible to get the disk drive from the big companies (Christensen, 1997, pp. 84-86). This shows that there can be a market for a product or service. The important thing is to find the customers who are looking for it, and not to not only view the mainstream market.
2.3.1 Four principles of disruptive technology

These four principles explain why management practices that are productive in changing and developing existing products are antiproducive, when it comes to developing disruptive technologies.

1. Companies must provide customers and investors with products, services and profits. Companies therefore have a system for killing ideas that their customers do not want. Because of this, the companies have a hard time investing in disruptive technologies. The products or services that are disruptive are often lower-margin opportunities, and their customers do not want it, until they want it. And usually by then, it is too late.

2. Companies need to grow, they must at least maintain their grow rates, or in the best case increase them. Because of this it is difficult for them to enter smaller and newer markets that can become larger in the future. They often choose to focus only on the large markets.

3. Good management often means that there is done extensive research before a product is enter in a market. With disruptive technologies, this is in some cases turned upside down. There is not necessarily a market where the disruptive technology will emerge. There is often no existing data on the market, and the management will not be able to do the research they usually do before launching a product.

4. Disruptive technologies start in the small markets, and this is also where they usually are used. But they can eventually become competitive in the mainstream markets as well. The products that are already in the mainstream markets will then overshoot the demands of the market. While disruptive technologies that underperform regarding customers in the mainstream markets today, may become the competition tomorrow. If there exist two or more products in the mainstream markets, the customers must find some criteria for choosing between the products. Usually, these criteria are reliability, convenience and price, and the newer technologies often have the advantage (Christensen, 1997, pp. 232-233).

2.3.2 Adjustment of the disruptive innovation theory

Christensen, Raynor and McDonald wrote an article in Harvard Business Review (HBR), in 2015, about disruptive innovation. The purpose of this article was to revisit the theory, to explain what works, and what does not work. This article addresses the problem related to the
use of the term *disruption*. The word tends to be used by people who have never read an article or book on the theory. The definition of disruptive innovation is often used about innovations that have shaken the current market. Because of this, the term is used too broadly. In the article from HBR, Christensen, Raynor and McDonald (2015) give a recap of the idea of disruptive innovation; disruption is a process where smaller companies are able to challenge existing companies, or incumbent businesses as Christensen labels them. Entrants (smaller companies) often target segments that are overlooked, whereas incumbents often want to improve products for their most demanding customers. The entrants pricing is often lower. As they move upwards to the mainstream market, this market often adopts their products or services. This is when disruption occurs. In the article, *Uber* is being put to the test, and this will be elaborated on later in this chapter (Christensen, Raynor & McDonald, 2015, p. 4). An interesting point is that Christensen has mainly focused on hardware as disruptive innovations. This is consistent through his book. However, through the article in HBR, services, such as *Uber* are being addressed. This shows how the theory has been evolved through the years. Christensen has added more to the theory, and this will be shown in the next sections. It will also be given a more elaborated section on *Airbnb* and *Uber* regarding the theory.

Four principles for disruptive innovation were described previously in this chapter, regarding established companies. In the article in HBR some of these principles are explained more thoroughly, such as that a disruptive innovation either originate from the low-end or the new-market foothold. This principle implies that an innovation can be described as disruptive if it originates from the low-end of a market, or if it creates a new market. Low-end footholds are where the less demanding customers are. As stated above, incumbents often concern themselves with improving products or services for their demanding customers, which also gives them the highest profit. This results in them paying less attention to their less demanding customers. Disruptors can then provide the less demanding customers with a product or service that suits their needs. New-market footholds concern disruptors that create a market where it has not existed one before; they can turn non-consumers into consumers. They target the consumers who do not have an interest in the market, and turn them into consumers (Christensen et al., 2015, p. 5).

The article highlights four points that often get overlooked or misunderstood. These will be briefly explained here. The first point is that disruption is a process. This implies that the
theory of disruptive innovation is the evolution of a product or service over time, and not at a fixed point. It is also added that many disruptors focus on getting the business model right, rather than focusing on the product. The second point is that the business models of disruptors are often different from the incumbents. Apple and the iPhone are highlighted in the article. The iPhone’s growth can be explained as disruption, not in the mobile phone market, but in the laptop market, because of the iPhone’s ability to connect to the Internet. The third point is that some disruptive innovations make it, and some do not. It is important to point out that if a product or service is defined as a disruptive innovation, it does not necessarily mean that the product or service will be successful. The fourth point is that the saying “disrupt or be disrupted” can be misleading. It is important that the incumbent companies respond to disruption, but they do not need to overreact and demolish a profitable business. They should continue to strengthen their relationship with core customers, and they can for example create a division that focuses on disruptiveness (Christensen et al., 2015, pp. 5-8). These four points help clarify some of the criticism that the theory has received throughout the years. This will be elaborated more in the next section. Usually a product or service is not either a sustaining or disruptive innovation. A disruption theory is not meant to dictate how a company should work; it is to help them choose if they want to take a sustaining path, or a disruptive path. The theory of disruption will never be able to explain everything about an innovation. Christensen et al. (2015) argue that through empirical tests, it shows that the use of disruption theories will give a more predictable outcome of which business that will have success (Christensen et al., 2015, pp. 9-11).

Several scholars have criticized the theory of disruptive innovation. This section will give a presentation of some of the criticism. In 2014, Jill Lepore, wrote an article in the New Yorker criticizing Christensen and his book The Innovator’s Dilemma. Lepore implicates that Christensen selected his case studies to match his assumptions, and that he ignored any data that disproved his theory. She tried to disparage the idea of disruptive innovation. The response was emotional on both sides. Christensen’s response was quite heated, and there have also been others who joined the debate. The term disruption has been characterized as a buzzword, due to the many meanings connected to the word. This is something that both sides of the discussion agree upon. The word has as a result become somewhat meaningless (Gobble, 2015, p. 59).
2.3.3 Digital Disruptive Intermediaries

“Digital Disruption refers to advancements in digital technologies that occur at a pace and magnitude that disrupt established ways of creating value within or across markets, social interactions and, more generally, our understanding and thinking” (Riemer, Gal, Hamann, Gilchriest & Teixeira, 2015, p. 4). For established companies, digital disruption is often seen as a threat. However, it is an opportunity. This opportunity is for entrepreneurs to innovate business models, so that they can compete with established companies. It changes how we understand, makes sense of and gives meaning to business and work-life practices. The iPad and iPhone are examples of this. They have changed how we work, communicate, learn, and consume content, in addition to giving us understanding of what a computer or phone is. It has also created a space for the emergence of new professional identities (Riemer et al., 2015, pp. 4-5). Digital Disruptive Intermediaries (from now called DDI) “occurs when a third party enters an industry and provides a new digital services that challenge established business models and changes the way in which value is created or distributed” (Riemer et al., 2015, p. 10). The intermediaries work as service providers, which function as the middleman between two parties. They channel the service from the supplier to the consumer. In most cases, they also add more value to the transaction. By doing so, the supplier can focus on their core competency, and reach a larger market. DDI’s connect information in new ways. One example is Uber, where supply and demand are matched in new ways. Riemer et al. (2015) give an overview of typical functions of DDI’s, and there will be taken a closer look at “matching actors” (Riemer et al., 2015, pp. 10-12). These providers are called matchers, and they create digital services that organize the allocation of services to customers. The customers get good ways of finding the right providers of a service. The suppliers, on the other hand, get a way of securing that they are being matched with the right customers. The matchers can be constructed in many ways. The features can for example be search/filter features (Airbnb, Momondo), auction mechanisms (eBay), and algorithm solutions (Uber). One important thing is that the providers of the service must be a part of the matching process, they cannot just list the products or services that are offered. The providers of the service have to give the consumers the opportunity to specify what they are looking for. They are disruptive because their market entry upsets the existing market allocation mechanisms. The markets that they upset are usually markets where matching was not organized efficiently previously (Riemer et al., 2015, p. 21).
2.4 Innovation in tourism

This section will start by addressing the importance of tourism innovation. Further it will give a brief introduction to Airbnb and Uber. Which is a part of tourism innovation, where Airbnb gives tourist the opportunity to rent accommodation and live like the locals. Uber gives them the opportunity to travel easily through a city. Both services can be compared to Lokalii. It will be explored whether the services can be understood as disruptive innovations. In addition, it will be given a short introduction to shared economy, because the theory is relevant for how Airbnb, Uber and Lokalii work.

Innovation in tourism is an upcoming interest for tourism practitioners, and a growing theme for scholarly research (Hjalager, 2014, p. 56). Stamboulis and Skayannis (2003) claim that mass tourism is different from most of the other service industries, because it is based on material provisions. Such as, food, shelter, and natural settings. They also say that there is a change in tourism, which occurs at three levels. (1) The first is that the tourist taste changes. This does not concern all tourists, but many. Most tourists are still travelling as they used to, to experience the 4Ss (sea, sun, sand, sex). However, many tourists are looking to experience something different when they travel. Many operators are offering alternative tourism or packages with a theme. (2) There is a change in destinations. Tourists discover new destinations, which become fashionable. Because of this, the destinations have to market themselves, to either meet a demand, or to create one. (3) There is a change in the providers of the products, because they are trying to capture new product markets and customers (Stamboulis & Skayannis, 2003, pp. 36-37). This gives the providers the opportunity to innovate. Christensen emphasizes the importance of interorganizational interdependencies in his theory about disruptive innovation, which is something that makes disruptive innovation interesting for tourism studies. Because the collaboration between actors at destinations is found to establish, to which extent there is any innovative behavior. If the different actors at a destination work together, they can enhance the offering, by e.g. innovate the established services, or by offer new services that give tourist something exiting to experience. An important aspect for tourism innovation is the characteristics of the physical space. The consumption of a tourism product is often carried out on location, and is often outdoors. Rural areas can be interesting for tourists that want to experience trekking and wilderness. Tourism can be an important source of income in many places, and it can connect tradition and the future (Hjalager, 2014, pp. 61-62).
2.4.1 Airbnb and Uber

Airbnb was founded in August 2008 in San Francisco. Airbnb is a marketplace for renting, exploring, and renting out accommodation all over the world. Accommodation can be found online, on a smartphone or a tablet. It is easily accessed, and it gives the traveler a unique experience. It is a way for travelers to rent local accommodation, and meet locals. Airbnb can be found in over 34,000 cities, and in 191 countries (as of 31.10.2016). People can earn some extra money on their extra space, and show it to millions of people (Airbnb, n.d.a). Uber was founded in 2008. Its founders wanted to get transport with just one simple keystroke. It started as an app that gave the users an opportunity to order first class black cars in some big cities. Now the way the logistic systems in cities work have been changed. Uber uses technology to give the users what they want, when they want it. Whether it is lunch, a ride or a package, Uber can fix it. The service offers a new way of earning money for everyone who drives on the Uber platform. They exist in 519 cities around the world (as of 31.10.2016) (Uber, n.d.).

Everyone can list his or her apartment for rent on Airbnb. The guest can search for different parameters, such as date, location and price, and more. Both the host and guest can give each other ratings based on their experience. Airbnb’s main role is to match hosts and guests. According to Riemer et al. (2015), Airbnb is disruptive because their strategy disrupts existing business models in the industry. There have been a lot of regulatory challenges, Airbnb has been accused of breaching laws and there have also been some tax issues. Uber does also match people. It matches passengers and drivers. Passengers can catch an Uber via their smartphone, which also gives them the opportunity to see where the driver is located. They are also able to text or call the driver. The passengers and drivers can rate each other based on the experience. Rimer et al. (2015) claims that Uber’s business model has disrupted the taxi industry. This has however, resulted in resistance from the taxi drivers and in some cases the government (Riemer et al., 2015, p. 21).

2.4.2 Airbnb and Uber as disruptive innovations

Airbnb is often seen as a disruptive innovation. This is because of the company’s internet-based business model, the accessibility, and appeal to tourists. Disruptive innovation theory describes how products transform a market. The disruptive product will usually underperform in comparison to the existing products. But the disruptive product will offer some other
distinct benefits, usually by being cheaper or simpler. The product appeals to the low-end of the market, or it can also create a new market. This is a way of describing Airbnb. The service has changed how tourists and other travelers rent a place to stay when they are visiting another city. Airbnb lacks some features that most tourists search for when they want to rent an accommodation. Some of these features are service quality, brand reputation and security. Such as room service, and cleaning during the stay. As mentioned above, disruptive products usually lack some features, but they make up for it by being cheaper. This is the case of Airbnb, and many tourists are diligent in choosing cheap accommodations. Airbnb hosts can price their accommodation competitively because they have often already covered the fixed costs (like rent, electricity, Wi-Fi, etc.) (Guttentag, 2015, pp. 1193-1196). Airbnb has also developed a service for experiences, which was mentioned in the introduction of the thesis. This service offers experiences in the same way as Lokalii. The experiences are offered in some selected cities, but not in Oslo.

Christensen et al. (2015) claim that Uber is not a disruptive innovation. It is argued that this is because a disruptive innovation either must originate from low-end or from new-market footholds. Uber started by building a position in the mainstream market, and then at a later point targeted more overlooked segments. Uber did not target nonconsumers, or the customers from the low-end market. This would have meant that normal taxis had become too clean and too easy to use, which is not the case according to Christensen. He argues that Uber has increased in demand, because they are cheaper and easier to use. However, to be defined as a disruptive, the innovation must originate from one of the footholds stated above. Disruptive innovations have to catch up to standards of mainstream customers, before they can become interesting for these customers. The mainstream customers do not switch brand just because it is cheaper. The quality must be equal to the brand that they are using. Uber’s strategy seems to be sustaining innovation. The service is easier than normal taxis, and the users can rate their drivers. Christensen et al. (2015) says that if one applies the theory correctly, Uber is not a disruptive innovation in the taxi industry. He highlights UberSELECT, which gives the user the option to choose a more luxurious car. This feature can point to that Uber is on a disruptive path, since the service is cheaper than e.g. hiring a limousine. This feature appeal to the low-end of the limousine market (Christensen et al., 2015, pp. 5-9). Riemer et al. (2015) on the other side claim that Uber is a disruptive innovation, because of the business model, as mentioned in the previous section. Here Uber is characterized as a matcher, and because of this Uber disrupts the existing market; the taxi
industry. The service gives both the passengers and the drivers the opportunity to rate each other, and this is something that has not been done before. The ability to rate each other is a function that Lokalii has not implemented in the service. The participants in an experience can however rate the host. This function can make the participation in an experience more protected for both parties. It is also something that make can make the purchase of an experience more personal, for the seller and the buyer (Riemer et al., 2015, p. 21). Lokalii can also be viewed as a matcher, considering how Rimer et al. (2015) describe it. Simply put, Lokalii is a facilitator of experiences that put people in contact with each other. This has not been done before, at least not with private individuals as the providers.

2.4.3 Shared economy

Shared economy is defined as “an economic system in which assets or services are shared between private individuals, either for free or for a fee, typically by means of the Internet” (Heo, 2016, p. 166). This concept has created markets out of things that were not seen as an opportunity for income before. Sharing economy is a way for people to make a profit on their possessions. Both Airbnb and Uber are online platforms that are based on shared economy. Both services have (in addition to many other companies) changed how people travel. Sharing economy has become quite popular, and this says something about tourists’ desire to connect with the local community that they are visiting. When tourists use Airbnb for accommodation, they can get a personal relationship with their host. This can be important to them because they get a greater value and satisfaction from the service (Heo, 2016, pp. 166-168). One other term that is worth mentioning regarding shared economy is service dominant logic. Service dominant logic implies that value is defined by the consumer, as well as it is co-created with the consumer. This means that companies must collaborate with consumers, and in this way, they will learn from them. They also must adapt to the consumers individual and dynamic needs (Vargo & Lusch, 2004, p. 6). Tourism research shows that with co-creation the travelers have a more positive experience and they are more loyal to the service provider. People, in general, like to take part in the creation of values (Heo, 2016, p. 167).

2.4.4 Lokalii compared to Airbnb and Uber

In many ways Lokalii can be compared to both Airbnb and Uber. This is especially in terms of shared economy. Airbnb and Uber are based on people selling their services, in terms of accommodation or driving people from a to b. It is the same with Lokalii, which is based on
people selling their experiences, to give tourists or locals an experience of a city. The three services are reliant on people wanting to offer their services, as well as people wanting to buy the services that are offered. People who wants to experience a city like a local often use Airbnb. It is the same for Lokalii, and many tourists do not only want to live like locals in a new city, they also want experience what the locals do. Uber separates from the two other services, because they offer a service that can be compared with the taxi industry. Tourists can meet locals in this way, but the personal aspect is less significant, than with Airbnb and Lokalii. This depends on the driver, how inviting he or she wants to be. With Airbnb, the users rent a private accommodation. Which is personal in itself, but now they also offer Airbnb experiences which gives the user a bigger opportunity to live and experience the city as a resident do. This service has not been addressed by Christensen, regarding disruptive innovation. This is probably because the service is still new (it was released late in 2016).

Airbnb experiences and Lokalii are similar. Both give information to their users, show pictures, and offer local experiences, offered by locals. The same experience is not found in the two services. “Slip ‘N Slide!” is an experience offered by Lokalii. Even though this experience is not offered in Airbnb experiences, the service offers some that are similar. Such as “The Hunt: North Beach”, which involves an interactive scavenger hunt. It is offered by Airbnb experiences. The two experiences are different, but they contain some of the same features. They are personal, fun, exiting, and different. They give the user the opportunity to experience something new, that they probably would not experience without the services that offer them. These two experiences are illustrated in figure 10.

2.5 Experience design

This section will concentrate on experience design in tourism. The theory will be defined, and explored. Experience design is a broad field of study, and the focus in this thesis will be on what the field consists of within tourism. This will be done because the essence of Lokalii is to provide experiences for tourists and locals. Some of the terms can be connected to human computer interaction, which will be explored in the next section. Early tourism literature shows that design and designing were connected to the planning and development of facilities and infrastructures to accommodate tourist activities. This could e.g. be how buildings looked, and how they were arranged. This was done to give the place an aesthetic appeal. Which has led to design hotels, brochure- and website design (Tussyadiah, 2014, p. 545). The definition of experiences has been debated for many years. It can be defined in many ways. One of these is that an experience can be described as an immediate response to some event that just happened. Another example is that within a trip there can be many micro-experiences, which can be connected by using cognitive and emotion-based processes to create meaning. An experience can also reflect on a single event within a trip, e.g. a concert or a visit to a museum (Kim & Fesenmaier, 2017, pp. 19-20). “Akerselva with an inflatable boat” was mentioned in the introduction of the thesis. This experience can be seen in comparison to e.g. various amusement parks, such as TusenFryd. These kinds of experiences can be linked to the definition given above. TusenFryd is a big amusement park, offered by an established company. It is located outside Oslo (TusenFryd, 2012). The experience that James and Nancy participated in can be viewed as a ride. The same as one can experience in an amusement park. These two experiences are quite different, “Akerselva with an inflatable boat” involves meeting new people, and sharing an experience. A ride in an amusement park can also involve this, but the mission is often not to get to know new people. In my experience, people tend to travel with a group of friends or family to these parks. This is something that separates Lokalii from other established actors.

A broad definition of experience design is “a practice of designing products, services, processes, events, and environments with a focus on the quality of the user experience; a deliberate, careful creation of a total experience for customers” (Tussyadiah, 2014, p. 546). Experiences are the essence in tourism. The tourism industry is continually becoming more and more competitive, therefore, unique and different products are offered. Products that give the users value. The tourism business must offer products and services that connects to the
tourists in a personal way. This leads to a deeper emotional attachment, which in most cases results in customer loyalty (Tussyadiah, 2014, pp. 543-544). Stamboulis and Skayannis (2003) state that everything can be perceived as an experience, even the 4Ss (sea, sun, sand, sex), which were introduced in the previous section. Experiences have always existed in destinations. What is new is that the experience is designed, produced with intention, organized, prized and often charged for. It is a new value attribute. Experiences can be divided into four different types; entertainment (passive participation e.g. music concerts), education (active participation, e.g. seminars), escapist (active participation, e.g. mass tourism in exotic destinations), and aesthetic (passive participation, e.g. sightseeing). Destinations should offer experiences within the four different types, as this gives the participant a broader experience. For the experiences to be consumed, they must be produced. The destination works as the theater, where the tourists are the actors and they must play an active role to experience something (Stamboulis & Skayannis, 2003, pp. 38-41). Kim and Fesenmaier (2017) propose a framework for tourism experience creation process, which can be seen in four levels;

1. A sensory level which is below the conscious level;
2. A perspective level which travelers are fully aware of those aspects effecting how they see and experience a place;
3. A cognitive and emotional level where travelers’ brains, minds, and bodies actively respond to the world around them; and,
4. An action level where information transforms, learning, and memory occurs” (Kim & Fesenmaier, 2017, p. 22).

The tourism experience is a result of both unconscious emotions and conscious perceptions during a trip. The outcome of a tourist experience can vary based on individual and situational filters. There are many factors to consider when looking at tourism experiences. How a person interprets an experience varies from individual to individual, because we all have different backgrounds (culture, prior experiences, etc.). Experiences are a continuous process, which change through interactions in time and space (Kim & Fesenmaier, 2017, pp. 23-26).

The term design has been approached in different ways, and it is almost impossible to give a precise definition of the term. One of the ways the term design has been defined in tourism is as the process that regulates the creation of new products and services (Tussyadiah, 2014, pp. 543-544). By drawing upon this, business literature has tried to define experience design more specifically, as “the development of experience-centric services, where services are...
designed in such ways that service providers can connect to customers in a personal and memorable way through the creation and management of moments of engagements (i.e., service touch points)” (Tussyadiah, 2014, p. 544). Many studies have been done on the topic, which have generated various outcomes. Some scholars have integrated experience design in their technology-assisted services, when focusing on user experience. This will be elaborated on in the next section about human computer interaction. The focus of experience design is to create experiences for consumers that have a high quality and value. To do this, the providers must work with the consumers, to understand their how they should offer various experiences. The type of experiences that are addressed here, are tourism experiences. It is therefore important that consumers participate in the designing of experiences (Tussyadiah, 2014, p. 544).

Destinations can offer personalized services to different types of tourists, because of the available data they have on tourists. This data can e.g. be retrieved from feedback systems, such as surveys. These experiences could enrich how tourists value their trips. Customers can be a great knowledge source for innovation. Because of the available data, customers can expect more from the providers, and that the offers are molded to their needs. Every traveler is different, they want to eat different food, they prefer different hotels, and they want to explore different aspects of a destination. Therefore, it is important for the tourism industry to have information about their customers. By exploring local culture, tourists can enhance their experience. If the activities are at the destination they are visiting, their experience will become more memorable (Buhalis & Amaranggana, 2015, pp. 378-381). Buhalis and Amaranggana (2015) did a study on what personalized services tourists expected from Smart Tourism Destinations, and the findings were divided into three categories; before trip (planning phase, to make an informed decision), during trip (information to assist tourists at the destination, direct personalized service), and after trip (feedback system, the tourist could give feedback on their tourism experience). They argued that smartness within destinations is important to enhance experiences through feedback, access to real-time information and customer service. Data about the users are collected and can be used to give the tourists more personalized information. They can predict what the tourist wants, and base their services and recommendations on this (Buhalis & Amaranggana, 2015, p. 387). The next section will concentrate on human computer interaction and mobile usability. It will also look at apps and how they should be developed.
2.6 Human computer interaction and mobile usability

2.6.1 Human Computer Interaction

Computers and mobile phones are a part of our everyday life. People can communicate with each other 24 hours a day (Oh & Moon, 2013, p. 195). Computers were introduced in the 1940s, but they were not for everyone. The computers were guarded, and located at universities research labs. It was not until the 1980s, that interaction became an emerging term. The computers had become useful for more people, and moved from guarded rooms to everyone’s desk (MacKenzie, 2013, p. 1). MacKenzie (2013) pegs the birth of human computer interaction (HCI) to 1983. This was the year when the article The Psychology of Human-Computer Interaction was published. It was also the year that Apple announced the Apple Macintosh, which was launched in 1984 (MacKenzie, 2013, p. 15).

HCI concerns the activity between humans and computers, and the knowledge about the interaction. The scope of HCI is broad, and it draws upon interests from sociology, psychology, linguistics, computer science and more (MacKenzie, 2013, p. 2). The goal for HCI is “to ensure that the systems produced by designers for people to use are comprehensible, consistent and usable. Its central concern is the good design of sociotechnical systems” (Maddix, 1990, p. 9). The challenges for HCI lie in the human factors. Computers are simple, but humans are intricate. Computers are designed to function per their programming capabilities. Humans differ; they are old, young, female, male, Norwegian-speaking, English-speaking, tall, short, creative, slow, etc. This means that HCI is never precise, but it is approximate (MacKenzie, 2013, p. 27).

2.6.2 Mobile usability

Nielsen and Budiu (2013) argue in their book Mobile Usability, that companies should create apps if they can afford it. They have conducted several tests on mobile usability, and the recent test showed a success rate of 74 percent when the users used apps. Apps are often simpler than websites. An app can target the abilities that a device holds, such as GPS, camera, and more (Nielsen & Budiu, 2013, p. 34). However, apps have some disadvantages. They are more difficult to discover, in comparison to websites. The user must download an app to see if it gives the desired information. The users must do more work to install an app, and to see the content. There are three categories that apps can be divided into; native apps, web apps and hybrid apps. Native apps are installed through an application store (e.g. Google
These apps are accessed through an icon on the device’s home screen. With these apps, the operating system of the smartphone can have an impact on how the app is displayed, and how it is used. Web apps are accessed through a browser. The users get the opportunity to install the app on their home screen, this works as a bookmark. They look like native apps, but they are more limited, regarding which of the devices features they can access. E.g. often they cannot access the hardware of the smartphone, such as the camera, or the hardware for processing of graphics. This can cause a problem with web apps that are graphic demanding, such as e.g. 3D games. In these cases, the app should be native, so that it can access the various hardware of the smartphone. Hybrid apps are installed in the same way as a native app, but some parts of the app are distributed through published Web apps. They use a browser within an app. Because the apps icon is present on the home screen of the device, there is a continual presence that reminds the user to use the app. However, apps are often put in folders, and they are therefore not as visible (Nielsen & Budiu, 2013, pp. 38-43).

2.6.3 Principles for mobile app design

Google have compiled 25 principles for app design, and they are presented by Jenny Gove, Google’s UX Research Lead. The 25 principles will not be listed here, but I have compiled them into a shorter list, which can be related to Lokalii. These will be used to perform an analysis of the Lokalii app later in the thesis. To develop the principles, Google partnered with AnswerLab to do a user study. This was conducted with more than 100 participants, on 100 different apps. The apps were from different segments, ranging from insurance to travel. It is estimated that users will download 200 billion apps in 2017. Apps can create profitable relationships for companies. Even though apps are in the wind and users cannot get enough of them, 25 percent of app users open an app once and never again. People are active on their phones, and it is therefore important that apps are efficient and enticing. All the 25 principles presented by Gove can be related to most applications (Gove, 2016, pp. 2-3). The list has been shortened down to 10 principles, and some of them have been merged. These will be presented here. The name of the principles is the same as Gove’s.

1. Show the value of your app upfront:

The apps key- and new features should be located upfront and in center. This is to give the user the option to try a new feature, and to be a source of delight and interest. Do not label a feature as “new” without telling the user what the feature consists of. This will only create confusion and frustration (Gove, 2016, p. 4).
2. Organize and label menu categories to be user-friendly:
If categories do not align with the user’s mental modes, this can create confusion. Categories should be presented with no overlap, and it should be easy to navigate through them. This is especially important when a user e.g. has tried to search for something, and then turns to the categories (Gove, 2016, p. 5).

3. Prominently display the search field:
The search field must be easily accessed so that the user does not have to browse through the app to locate it. Some users want to do a quick search, instead of browsing in the app. If the search function is prominently placed, then the user would not be frustrated (Gove, 2016, p. 9).

4. Use effective search indexing/provide filter and sort options:
When a user uses the search function in an app, it is important that the search results are useful. Recognition of root words is one feature that can make the search process more useful. It can also reduce probability of user errors. The search process will also go faster for the user. Filter and sort options can also help the user to narrow down their search. It can be confusing for the users to scroll down on a small screen, in the attempt of trying to find what they are looking for (Gove, 2016, pp. 10-11).

5. Allow user reviews to be viewed and filtered:
It is important for the users to see reviews, because this can affect the decision-making whether to purchase an item or a service. When the number of reviews is high, the users often trust the seller. Show the users the reviews, so that they can get the real story about the item or service. It is also important to show the negative reviews, not only the positive (Gove, 2016, p. 13).

6. Make it easy to add and manage payment methods:
The payment solution should be as easy as possible. There should be a simple page for adding credit cards, with a number pad and the ability to scan the card. The users should be able to add multiple credit cards, and to easily switch between them (Gove, 2016, p. 16).

7. Provide a clear utility before asking users to register:
Do not ask the users to register with personal information upfront, unless there is a good reason for it (which you must tell them about). It is important not to force the users to register before they e.g. commit to buying something. This is especially important when the app is unknown to some users, before the providers have built themselves a brand name (Gove, 2016, p. 17).
8. Communicate form errors in real time:
When the users are e.g. filling out a form, and there is an error, this error should be
communicated right away. The users will be agitated if they get this information at the
submission. It is also important that if there is an error, in general, that the users get
information about this, as well as information about what the error consists of (Gove, 2016, p. 21).

9. Speak the same language as your users:
The terms and phrases that are being used in the app, should be known to the users. Brand-
specific terms can confuse them, and ultimately prevent them from buying something. If the
app is in one language, all the information should be in that language, e.g. if some
information is in English and some in Norwegian, then the users can be confused (Gove,

10. Be responsive with visual feedback after significant actions:
If the user does a significant action, it is necessary to give him or her some feedback, so that
he or she knows that action has been processed. Giving a visual feedback can do this; such as
a message appearing on the screen or that the view in the app changes. If this is not done, the
user may question if they managed to do the action, and they can get frustrated (Gove, 2016, p. 26).

2.7 Summary
This chapter has addressed various theoretical perspectives, from different disciplines. They
can be transferred to different aspects of Lokalii. The theories concerning tourism can be
connected to Lokalii being an app that gives travelers the opportunity to discover a city like
locals. Innovation theories are connected to the concept of Lokalii, and the different aspects
and features that the service facilitates. Such as the personal, the local, and the eventful.
Experience design connects to what the app can offer travelers at destinations; the
experiences that the travelers are left with after a trip. Human computer interaction and
mobile app design are connected to the functions in the app, and how the users perceive the
app. These theories combined give a total and complex image of Lokalii. They are a part of
forming a base to analyze Lokalii.
3 Methods

This section of the thesis concerns the methods that have been used to gather data regarding Lokalii, innovation and tourism. Which methods, why, and how they have been used will be addressed here. In the introduction, various apps and services that can be described as similar to Lokalii has been outlined. These apps and services will be a part of the analyzes as well, because the informants drew upon them during the focus groups. Two focus groups are the main source of data collection in this thesis. The focus groups have been executed with the same group of informants. Pouria Ruhi, the founder of Lokalii has been interviewed, to get his thoughts regarding the service and innovation, as well as getting his knowledge on how the service emerged and what has happened since they came up with the idea. This interview was mentioned in the introduction. Firstly, I will give a short background of the focus groups, how the method emerged and how it was used. Then, I will address the criticism of using focus groups as a method. Furthermore, information about why this method was selected, how the informants were selected, and the execution of the focus groups will be presented. The interview with Ruhi will also be presented, giving reasons for interviewing him.

3.1 Focus groups

Participating in a group is a common experience for most people. This is something that we do all the time; for planning, advising, learning, sharing, and so on. The purpose of a focus group is not just to get some people together to talk. It is a special group, and it purpose will differs in terms of size, composition, and procedures. The different participants are selected because they offer something to the discussion, which is planned in the focus group. Their characteristics relate to the topic that is being discussed. The researcher creates an environment where the participants feel safe to share their points of view. It is important that the researcher does not pressure the participants to e.g. reach consensus. By analyzing the findings from the discussion, the researcher can see how the participants perceive a product or service. A focus group needs to be planned, and designed to get the participants opinions and thoughts about a specific topic. The participants often enjoy sharing their ideas in this type of study, and the discussions are relaxed (Krueger & Casey, 2009, pp. 1-2).
3.1.1 History of the focus group

Focus groups originated during the 1940s, in the work of the Bureau of Applied Social Science at Colombia University. In the beginning, focus groups were used in collaboration between Paul Lazarsfeld and Robert Merton. Merton wanted to develop an interviewing procedure for groups, which would help researchers find out something about the group members subjective reactions. He did a series of audience studies, involving different types of content and audiences, such as print-, radio- and film audiences. In collaboration with different researchers at the bureau they developed a standardized set of procedures for these interviews. In the late 1960s and early 1970s the use of focus group became a regular research method (Bloor, Frankland, Thomas & Robson, 2001, pp. 1-3). Many advertisers started using this approach. A focus group is an interview form, which assembles from six to twelve people in a discussion. The number of recommended participants does however vary. The form is an unstructured, but focused interview. The man or woman who arranges the focus group works as the interrogator and makes sure that the informants do not go off topic. Many focus groups have been arranged so that the clients (who wanted the focus group to be held) can sit behind a one-way glass and observe the focus groups. This way they get information about for example their product right away, from their potential customers. There is one problem with this approach. The informants might hold back on the information they give, when they know that someone is watching them, and evaluating everything they say (Merton & Kendall, 1946, pp. 560-561).

3.1.2 Criticism of focus groups

There are several different criticisms that have been targeted at focus groups, since they were introduced as a method. These criticisms differ in importance, and they vary in terms of how the focus group is constructed. It is important to note that no method is perfect, and that methods are highly situational. Krueger and Casey (2009, pp. 13-15) have compiled some of the criticism on focus groups, and this will be presented here. Some focus group participants tend to see themselves as rational, thoughtful and reflective. As much as 95 percent of decision-making is unconscious, because of this, focus groups can give erroneous results. This criticism applies to all research that concern questions and answers. Another criticism against focus groups is that they do not tap into emotions. When e.g. behavior is discussed, some participants may try to intellectualize their answers, so that the answer is well meant. It is often hard for participants to give an accurate answer regarding behavior. This is
something that, for most people, is non-rational. Some participants may see emotions as more private than ideas. It can be wise to conduct individual interviews in addition to focus groups, when addressing topics concerning emotions. In some cases, a participant can be asked a question that he or she does not have information about. Many people choose to invent an answer so that they do not have to answer “I don’t know!” It is important to make sure that the questions asked are easy to understand, so that the participants do not feel that they should make up an answer. If the focus group is too large, the results can in some cases be trivial. As well as if the topic is complicated. If the duration of the focus group is too short, this can also happen. Some participants may be dominant during the discussion. This is something that can influence the results. This can prevent some of the other participants from speaking their mind. The researcher should try to prevent this from happening during the focus group. The last critique mentioned by Krueger and Casey (2009) is that you cannot depend on the results given by a focus group. This is the case with many different methods. If the researcher is skeptical about the results, he or she should use various methods, to confirm the results. It is also important to note that the researcher should generally be skeptical about the results (Krueger & Casey, 2009, pp. 13-15).

3.2 Focus group as the selected method

The reason why focus groups were selected as a method for this thesis will be presented here. Some of the reasons deal with the decision before the focus groups were conducted, and some point out why the focus groups were successful. Focus groups as a method were selected in this thesis because they create a place where the informants can discuss their opinions on a specific topic. A place where the participants can discuss Lokalii’s concept, and the functions and features that the app contains. As presented in the previous section, focus groups as a method have been discussed and criticized. It is like this with all type of methods. Despite this criticism, I believe that focus groups are a good way of gathering knowledge on a specific subject. The information that is desired does not involve how the informants use the app, rather what their thoughts are, regarding the concept of Lokalii. A focus group gathers different people, which together can give different opinions on a specific topic. They are able to talk with each other, and they are given the opportunity to speak their mind. In a focus group setting, they can build on each other statements, to give a more explanatory view of Lokalii. It is also possible to do several interviews with this topic. But in an interview, it is only possible to talk to one person at the time. This could be restrictive and prevent some
information that is easier to get in a group situation, e.g. when informants build on each other’s statements. The questions that were asked during the two focus groups were easily understood. It appeared that the informants did not have any problems with answering the questions that were asked. In addition, their answers seemed to be honest, because they did not dwell before giving them. When I took the role as the researcher, I did not experience that any of the informants were dominant in the discussion. Some of the informants were quieter than others, as is often experienced in these kinds of situations. I noticed this, and directed some of the questions towards these informants. One important point, regarding the criticism, is that the point of conducting the focus groups was not to get the informant’s emotional reaction to Lokalii. It was rather to discover if the concept is something that can give a tourist, or local, a better experience of a city. In addition to checking if the service is offering something new. For this thesis, I believe that focus groups are the method that will generate most information, in addition to relevant findings to the research question.

3.2.1 Methods of selection

In academic research, it is recommended to have 5 to 8 participants in a focus group (Krueger & Casey, 2009, pp. 151-152). It is ideal for getting enough information, and it is not too many, for the discussion to get out of hand. The informants were selected based on a survey distributed by Lokalii. This survey was distributed via Lokalii’s Facebook page on the 18th of July 2016 (Lokalii, 2016). The survey asked users about their first thought about the app, and if the participants wanted to be a part of Lokalii’s “very special super duper feedback group with tons of influence”. The survey has only been used to get participants to the focus groups. No other data from the survey has been used. The survey was made and published by the people behind the service, and I was not part of this process. This was done because I wanted to get more in depth information about Lokalii, and about the concept. 30 people answered the survey. The participants who answered “yes” to the latter, are the ones that I contacted for participation in the focus group. There were a total of 16 people who answered “yes” to the question. Some of the people that answered the survey are my acquaintances. Thus, I contacted the participants that were unknown to me first. They were emailed in November 2016. In the email, I asked them if they wanted to participate in the focus group, and I gave them more detailed information on how the implementation of the focus group would be. Some answered, but most of them could not participate or did not answer. Therefore, I contacted all the participants from the survey (who had answered yes), and 7 informants
agreed to participate in the first focus group. These informants varied in age, sex, and where they are from. This helped to give a wide specter of answers in the focus group. Their background will influence how they experience the app, and how the perceive it. The informants also wanted to participate in the focus group, and based on this I assumed they had a lot of feedback to give.

The second focus group consisted of the same informants. However, some of them could not attend, so the total number of informants was 4. The second focus group had a different theme, because the informants engaged in an experience. The experience was “10-minute hand-brewing lesson”. Because they participated in this experience, there was no problem related to having fewer informants. With more informants, it may have occurred that everyone could not get the opportunity to try the experience. All the informants got to try the experience, which consisted of learning how to hand-brew coffee. The informants answered the questions well, and elaborated on each other statements. The content of the experience will be elaborated on in the next section. Ideally, it would be preferable to have the same number of informants in each focus group. This is because then all the informants would have tried an experience, and they might have more to say about it. However, the information from this focus group did not lack opinions. Considering the topics of the thesis, the information that the informants gave was enough to provide extensive analyzes and discussions.

Regarding the way the participants for the focus groups were selected, the ideal scenario would have been that they were unknown to me. By which it meant that the participants should not have been my acquaintances. However, I did not know all the participants. It can be argued that their opinions could be colored by their relationship to me. And that they could hold back some opinions, because they were afraid to e.g. criticize the app. It can be a disadvantage with acquaintances in a focus group. This depends on what kind of topic the focus group holds. If one is researching a topic that is emotional and difficult to talk about, it is of course not an advantage to know the participants. In this case, however, the topic might be easier to talk about, and the informants should not have any problems with giving their opinions. I believe that it also can be an advantage, because the participants might not be afraid to say their opinions, simply because they know the researcher and they want to give as much information as possible. An important aspect to this is that I did not create the Lokalii app. Therefore, if the participants criticized aspects of the service, they were not criticizing
my work. If I had developed the service, there could have been some problems regarding the selection of participants. This is however not the case in this thesis. During both the focus groups, the participants gave their honest opinions, and there was no lack of criticism. This shows that there was no problem with using acquaintances as participants in this study. But as said in the introduction, the ideal setting is to use unknown participants. The next sections will concern the designing of the interview guides, and how the different focus groups were implemented.

3.2.2 Designing the interview guide

Before the two focus groups, I developed an interview guide, to make sure that the right questions were asked, in addition to making sure that the important topics was covered. Krueger and Casey (2009) emphasize the importance of asking questions that the informants understand, and that they can answer. Another aspect is that the questions should encourage a conversation, so that the informants can build on each other’s statements. The advantage with getting the informants to converse is that the moderator becomes less dominating, and the informants share more personal experiences (Krueger & Casey, 2009, p. 36). I developed two interview guides, one for the first focus group, and one for the second focus group. The second interview guide was assembled after the first focus group. This was done to make the questions fit better with the theme for the second focus group; the participation in a Lokalii experience. The questions that were asked, in the first focus group, were divided into different topics: general, concept, innovation, functions and features. The different topics concern the various aspects of Lokalii. They are also consistent with the topics of the thesis. The questions were open, and invited the informants to discuss with each other. I developed an interview guide, so that I could be certain that the important questions were asked (see appendix 1). Some questions were a bit altered, and some were not asked because the participants had already answered them during another question. By asking these questions, the participants gave answers to different aspects connected to Lokalii. This is a part of giving a comprehensive image of the service. The interview guide for the second focus group was divided into the same categories as the first focus group. The booking process and the Lokalii experience were implemented under the general category. As with the first focus group, the questions were open, so that the participants could discuss among themselves (see

---

5 The questions during both focus groups were asked in Norwegian, but the interview guides have been translated to English.
appendix 2). Some of the questions were similar to the ones in the first focus group. This was done to get their opinions on the same topics, after they had participated in an experience, to see if their opinions changed, or if they had something to add. In addition to these two interview guides, I assembled one for the interview with Pouria Ruhi, the founder of Lokalii (see appendix 3). This interview guide, included some of the same topics as the focus groups: the concept of Lokalii and innovation. The questions focused mostly on the emerging of Lokalii, the idea, innovation, and the future. Not all questions were asked, since Ruhi answered them during some of the other questions. The questions were designed to make sure that Ruhi gave profound answers, so that I could give a correct image of Lokalii.

3.3 The implementation of the focus groups

It is important that the atmosphere in the focus group is permissive, and that the researcher gives enough information about the situation. The researcher should also provide ground rules for the focus group. Krueger and Casey (2009) recommend that the introduction includes; the welcome, the overview of the topic, the ground rules, and the opening question (Krueger & Casey, 2009, pp. 96-97). During the introduction to the two focus groups, I followed these recommendations. The first focus group started with welcoming the participants, and thanking them for taking time to participate. This was followed by a short overview of the thesis, and the topic for the thesis. I emphasized that the participants had to speak their mind, and that there is no correct or wrong answer to a question. This was to make sure that they felt comfortable, and to not be afraid to give their honest opinions. After this, I asked them the opening question. The introduction to the second focus group was a bit different. The participants were welcomed, but the overview of the thesis was not included, since they had already gotten this information. The ground rules for the focus group were repeated, so the participants would not forget it. Lastly, they were given information about the experience, and told that the focus group would be conducted afterwards.

The first focus group was held on the 28th of November 2016. The location of the focus group was at Forskningsparken, and there were 7 informants present. The version of the app that was tested was 0.9.3. This version was released on October 1st, 2016 (Lokalii AS, 2016a). I had booked a study room at Forskningsparken, where coffee, soda, and cookies were served. All the informants signed a declaration of consent, which said that they would be anonymized in this thesis, and that they could withdraw their consent at any time (no one did this) (see
They also gave me permission to audio record the session. The focus group lasted for approximately one hour, in addition to some introductory information about my thesis and how the focus group would be conducted.

The second focus group consisted of the participation in an experience, and a focus group gathering afterwards. The focus group was conducted on the 5th of January 2017. The informants, and I participated in the Lokalii experience “10-minute hand-brewing lesson”. The informants discussed the 0.9.41 version of the Lokalii app, which was released on 19th of December 2016 (Lokalii AS, 2016b). The session (experience and focus group) lasted for approximately one and a half hours. This session was videotaped, in case some relevant information during the participation in the experience arose. The focus group, that was held afterwards, was audio recorded. All the informants signed a declaration of consent, concerning both the videotaping (see appendix 5) and the audio recording, and their anonymity (same as in the previous focus group). The videotape has not been used during this thesis. The informants gave enough information during the focus group, also when concerning the participation in the Lokalii experience. The experience and focus group were conducted with four informants. Because of this, the data material could be smaller. However, the informants answered all the questions presented, and they discussed the topics among themselves. The information from this focus group has generated relevant findings for the thesis. I will now go through how the Lokalii experience was conducted. The participants had beforehand located and booked the experience through the app, so that they got to go through all the aspects of the app. The participants arrived at Paul’s Boutique, where the experience was held. This experience was held at an established company, a café. The person who is running the establishment offered the experience. So, the location of the experience is at an established company, but an employee hosted the actual experience. The experience consisted of learning to hand-brew coffee. The person hosting the experience showed us how much coffee one should use, and the same with water. The participants had a go at pouring the water into the ground coffee, using circular movements. It was important to do this slowly, but at the same time not too slow. To make the hand-brew, a glass container was used, and the finished coffee dripped into this container. The container stood on top of a weight, which showed how much water one should use, and then let it soak into the ground coffee. Figure 11, shows pictures from the experience, with a screenshot of how the experience is displayed in the Lokalii app. The process was done several times, so that
everyone had the opportunity to try. Everyone also got one to two cups of hand-brewed coffee. The focus groups were held right afterwards, at the same location.

Figure 11: On the left, “10-minute hand-brewing lesson” in Lokalii. On the right, pictures from the experience taken by me (Lokalii AS, 2016b).

3.3.1 Interview with Pouria Ruhi
The interview with Pouria Ruhi was conducted on the 10th of February 2017. The interview was semi-structured, and it was held to get information on how the idea of Lokalii emerged. Ruhi also signed a declaration of consent, stating that he could withdraw his participation at any time (see appendix 6). The interview was conducted at a café, so that the situation would be comfortable for Ruhi. This was done to make the interview situation more of a conversation. In this way, I could get more information, and the situation was more relaxed for the both of us. This is because a café creates an environment that is calm and open, in comparison to what a closed room can create. Ruhi’s statements have been used in the introduction, to give a background for Lokalii. They will also be addressed in the forthcoming analyzes.

3.3.2 Analysis and findings
The focus groups have been used to give information about the research question and the different topics of this thesis. The two focus groups have combined given a prolific
discussion, that sheds light on the different topics in the research question: Lokalii’s concept, functions, features, and innovation. The questions that have been asked are not directly connected to the theories in the thesis. This is because one cannot anticipate that the informants are familiar with the theories. The questions have rather been asked in a way that is understandable, but that easily can be connected to the theories. This concerns in particular the innovation theories. The findings from the focus groups will be presented in the forthcoming analyzes. These analyzes will address the different topics discussed in the focus groups, and combine them with the theoretical approaches. By conducting the analyzes in this way, the important findings will be emphasized, and put into the context of the theory that has been presented. The informant’s opinions will be highlighted when it is appropriate, either by a direct quote, or by compiling their opinions and implementing them in the text.

3.4 Quality of the thesis

3.4.1 Reliability, validity and generalizability

Reliability concerns the trustworthiness of the findings during a research. Often it concerns whether the findings are reproducible, both by other researchers and at a different time (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015, p. 281). The findings in this thesis are probably not reproducible. This is because both the travel app market changes fast, and the Lokalii app have changed several times during the period of this thesis. There have been done several updates to the app, but the main characteristics have not been changed. When I started the cooperation with Lokalii, the users could not book experiences through the app. So, the changes have been quite big. If a researcher would ask the same questions to a different group of informants, many of the answers would probably be the same, but some would differ. This is because in a focus group setting, many of the answers can depend on how the group dynamic is, and how their relationship is to the topic that are being discussed. The overall themes of the findings might be the same, because of the changing trends in the travel industry. Validity concerns if the “method investigates what it is intended to investigate” (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015, p. 282). The moral integrity of the researcher is also included here, and that he or she is critical to the quality to the findings. Focus group has been the selected method in this thesis, and the information that has been researched is the thoughts regarding the concept of Lokalii. In addition to the functions and features that the app contains. This is also what the findings consist of. By researching these specific topics, the method gives insight to how potential users think about the service, and the app. Through the analyzes, the findings are presented
and discussed. The informants’ statements are also being questioned where it is appropriate to do so (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015, pp. 282-283). Generalizability refers to which extent the findings can be transferrable to other situations, or contexts. There are different forms of generalizing. This thesis has not been aimed at generalizing, or that the findings can be transferred to other situations. The goal has rather been to examine the travel app market, by focusing on one case. The findings are connected to Lokalii, and they are therefore probably not transferrable to other services. If they could be transferred to any services, it must be services such as Nanook, Exploro and Airbnb experiences. However, the services do not contain all the same functions and features as Lokalii (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015, p. 295).

3.4.2 Captivation and disengagement
This thesis is written in cooperation with Lokalii. This means that I have gotten access to how the people behind the service works, some numbers regarding downloads, and the survey. There has been a constant sharing of feedback between them and me. I have given them feedback in terms of what they should update in the app, based on the focus groups, and they have given me information about new updates. Some days I worked with them, by writing my thesis in their offices. This I did this to get access to information right away, and to fill them in on what I had been working with. Peter Schlesinger (1981) has written an article on his involvement with the BBC, during his PhD. Schlesinger states that in many cases it is desirable to have a personal involvement in the field that is being studied. By doing so, one can go through a given culture more thoroughly. This is what he defines as captivation (Schlesinger, 1981, p. 353). This is something I have done during this thesis. In general, the tourism industry and apps are something that I find interesting. I have worked closely with them, not only for the sake of the thesis, but also because I genuinely want to know how they are doing in the market. The company is a start-up, and it is never easy to predict how the future will be. Schlesinger (1981) states in the article, that it is also wise to disengage yourself from the situation that you are in, as a researcher. Because if you do not, you can end up with having difficulties with the investigation. Captivation can end up causing a suppression effect, a self-censorship (Schlesinger, 1981, p. 354). Because of this, it is important to be able to pull yourself out from the situation, to be able to view the situation more critically. As I have worked closely with Lokalii, it has been important that I have done this, to be able to view the service critically. In the worst case, I could have ended up not being able to do a thorough investigation, because of my position in the situation. This is
something that I have been cautious about, and it has been important for me to keep an objective view on Lokalii throughout the thesis. This has made it possible for me to criticize Lokalii’s concept, functions, and features, as well as viewing the informant’s statements objectively. For me, the collaboration with Lokalii was a source of information that would help me during the thesis. My goal was not to please them, or to give them a colored view of their company. Both Lokalii and I wanted to figure out how the concept, functions, and features fit with Oslo, and innovation theories.

### 3.4.3 Research ethics

Many of the screenshots from different apps and services show the sellers first name and a picture. This is information that are open to everyone that either download the apps, or visits the company’s website. I could have censured these names and images, but then this would harm many of the points that will be discussed during the next chapters. The personal aspect of the different apps is important to this thesis, and because of this I have chosen to include these names and pictures. It is only the first name that is shown, and the pictures are small, and almost not recognizable in most cases.

The Personal Data Act states that people who process personal data must protect personal integrity and privacy. Personal data is information that is related to a person, such as names, e-mail addresses, or a compilation of background data (The Norwegian National Research Ethics Committees, 2016, pp. 8-9). The informants in this thesis are anonymous, and no data that can be used to identify them has been collected. Their e-mail addresses were provided in the survey presented by Lokalii. These have only been used to get in contact with them. During the focus groups, I got information about their birthplace, age, and current living place. This information has not been used in this thesis. Pouria Ruhi has not been anonymized. This is because he is a public person. This thesis has been approved by the Norwegian Center for Research Data on the 24th of October 2016 (see appendix 7).
4 Mobile app design

This chapter concerns the 10 principles from Jenny Gove’s principles of mobile app design. The principles are based on giving the users the best experience of an app (Gove, 2016, pp. 4-26). The principles will be described one by one, and connected to Lokalii. The informants had different opinions regarding the functions and features in the app, these opinions will be presented here. First, the two focus groups will be described, with general background information about the informants. Further, the principles of mobile app design will be applied to Lokalii. This analysis is connected to the second part of the research question, regarding the functions and features of the app. The concept will also be mentioned during the analysis. “How can Lokalii’s concept, with the functions and features of the app, be described as a disruptive innovation?” The two forthcoming chapters will focus on the other parts of the research question.

4.1 The focus groups

4.1.1 The first focus group

The questions asked in the first focus group mainly concerned the concept of Lokalii. The informants were asked about their history of travelling, and the use of travel apps. They were also asked about different functions and features of travel apps, and in the app. Regarding the concept, the questions were specified to Oslo. The users tested the 0.9.3 version of the app. This updated included bug fixes and improvements, rating and reviews (Lokalii AS, 2016a).

4.1.2 The second focus group

The app had been updated since the previous focus group session, and the updates included: in app contact seller option, extended seller profile page, and bug fixes and improvements. The version of the app that the informants tested was 0.9.41 (Lokalii AS, 2016b). This focus group consisted of participation in a Lokalii experience, and a focus group session afterwards. The informants and I participated in the Lokalii experience “10-minute hand-brewing lesson”. During the experience, we learned how to hand-brew coffee. The price for the experience was 97,75 NOK.
4.1.3 General background
All the informants currently live in Oslo, however, most of them were born in a different place or city. The first focus group consisted of five women and two men. The second consisted of three women and one man. During the first focus group, they were asked to give information about whether they use apps when they are travelling, if so, which apps and why. Most of them use apps when they travel. The apps that were mentioned were; Stay.com, Google maps, Instagram, TripAdvisor, Airbnb, Facebook and museum/boarding pass/payment through a smartphone. Stay.com was used by several of the informants, and they were especially fond of the ability to have some parts of the app offline (this was shown in figure 5). Google maps was used by most of the informants, and they also used it in Oslo. It was described as classic and essential. Apps like Instagram and Facebook were mainly used to do research before a trip. This was also the case of TripAdvisor, but some of the informants used it to locate places near them, when they were in a new city. TripAdvisor was described as encompassing. Some of the informants used Airbnb for booking accommodation. The museum/boarding pass/payment through a smartphone were mostly used because the informants meant that the world has become more electronic. These apps were usually downloaded before a trip. Several of the informants said that they did not use apps for travelling purposes five years ago. This is something that has evolved quickly, and it has become a necessity when traveling, in the planning phase, as well as when they were in a new city.

4.2 10 principles
4.2.1 1: Show the value of the app upfront
This principle focuses on the importance of showing both key- and new functions and features, upfront in the app. When the user opens the Lokalii app, they get to see the different categories and “top experiences”. Lokalii had launched new updates; review and rating, in app contact seller option, and extended seller profile page. These functions and features are not located on the first page of the app, but the users find them by clicking on an experience, and scrolling down. The in app contact seller option consisted of a “contact me” button. A user has to click on an experience to see the button. It is not shown upfront, but it is placed in an appropriate place, within the information about an experience. The users can read about the experience, and if they have some questions, they can contact the host on the same page. The button is located right above the information about an experience, as shown in figure 12.
A new feature is that the host can add more information about themselves. This is also placed in a place that are easy to find. The users must click on the image or name of the host, and the information is displayed in a new window. Both features are easy for the users to find, and it would not be convenient to have them upfront in the app. One improvement Lokalii could do, is to have information about the new functions and features when the app is opened, after an updated. Such as a page that pops up one time and says: “Here are the new updates, check them out!”

This principle also mentions that the apps key features should be easily shown in the app. Lokalii is an app for booking and selling experiences. This is quite clear from the first page. The users can choose to browse through experiences, or browse through categories. This makes the users active in the app. By browsing through the different experiences, which contain interesting and descriptive photographs, they get inspiration to book an experience. An example of such photographs is shown in figure 12. One of the key features in the app is the personal aspect. By booking an experience, the users meet another person, and by participation in an experience they can get to know the person who offers the experience. This is something that the informants commented on in the two focus groups. They had some concerns regarding the personal aspect. Person 6 stated during the first focus group, that

Personally, I feel the threshold to book is pretty high, because I do not get to see any more information about the person who offers the experience. If a person has posted
an experience, I want to read more about this person and get to know him or her and maybe ask about which day or time is suitable for both of us.

This statement shows that the informant experienced some confusion or frustration during the process of browsing through the app. The threshold mentioned from person 6, is something that the informants discussed during the first focus group. However, some of the threshold was removed after Lokalii implemented new functions, in the 0.9.41 version of the app (Gove, 2016, p. 4).

4.2.2 2: Organize and label menu categories to be user-friendly

This principle focuses on categorization, which means that the categories should match the user’s mental modes. If the users of Lokalii want to find an experience with a specific topic, they can browse through “top experiences”, browse through the categories, or make a search. Lokalii offers different categories: off the grid, outdoor, food, urban, culture and nightlife. These categories are located at the top of the page as soon as the user opens the app, and the user can swipe through them.

![Figure 13: How the categories in the Lokalii app are displayed (Lokalii AS, 2016b).](image)

The names of the categories are a bit different from traditional travel apps, but they reflect upon the concept of Lokalii. The informants said, during the first focus group, that they felt inspired by the app, and they liked how the experiences were sorted into categories. They are easy to locate in the app, and they do not overlap. The informants also suggested that Lokalii should offer more categories (e.g. season), or that the users could check off different features that they are looking for (timeframe of experience, number of participants, etc.). They pointed out that it is important that this feature does not become too complicated. During the second focus group, the informants were to book the “10-minute hand-brewing lesson” experience. One of the informants tried to browse through the category “under the radar”
(which is now called “off the grid”), but was not able to locate the experience. The experience was located within the two categories “food” and “urban”. The informant found the experience by scrolling on the first page of the app. This might indicate that some of the categories are a bit difficult to understand. They have cool titles, but it can be difficult for the user to understand what kind of experiences that belongs in which category. The title of the categories reflects the concept of Lokalii. It is important that the users get to know these categories, so that they can easily navigate through them (Gove, 2016, p. 5).

4.2.3 3: Prominently display the search field

The search field in the Lokalii app is located at the top right corner, and it is displayed as an icon of a magnifier. When the user touches the magnifier, they get sent to a new page where they can make a search. How this works will be examined in the next principle. When the search field is not prominently placed, the users can become frustrated because they have to look for it. Many apps use an icon of a magnifier to imply that this is where the users can search for something. Figure 14, shows how the search field is displayed in Lokalii, TripAdvisor, VisitOSLO and Stay.com. This can therefore imply that users are familiar with this icon, and they look for it when they want to make a search. On the other hand, apps should be as easy as possible for the users to understand. The search field should be easily accessed, so that the users do not experience any slowness. In many cases the users first try to search for what they are looking for, and if they do not find it they browse for it. Because of this, it is important that the users can locate the search field without any problems. During the second focus group, the informants stated on several occasions that they had used the search functionality, this feedback will be elaborated on in the next section. It did not seem like they had any problems with locating it (Gove, 2016, p. 9).

4.2.4 4: Use effective search indexing/provide filters and sort options

This principle is merged from two principles, introduced by Gove (2016), and they build on the previous principle. When a user wants to search for something, they often expect the in-app search to work as well as Google. Sometimes this is not the case. In Lokalii, the users can search for a city, a neighborhood or an address. They cannot search for a specific experience, or the content of an experience. However, if they start typing “Os” the app predicts the rest of the text, and suggests “Oslo” as a search word. In addition, it gives different suggestions, such as different neighborhoods. This function makes it easier for the users to search for a specific experience. It is important that the search function works, because this can in many cases result in the purchase of experiences. It is good that Lokalii offers suggestions when the users try to search for a city. However, there is a problem that the users cannot search for types of experiences, or specific words. Several of the informants from the second focus group tried the search function when they wanted to book the “10-minute hand-brewing lesson” experience. They understood quickly that they could not search for “coffee” or “hand-brewing”. This is something that they discussed. They thought it was a bit difficult, and person 2 stated that “oh okay, city, neighborhood, or address, that’s a bit stupid”. One of the other informants tried to find the experience in order to locate the address for the experience. This person did not find the experience by searching, rather by browsing through the first page of the app. All the informants discussed different functions during the focus group, and they pointed to the search function several times. Person 4 stated, during the second focus group, “maybe you could search not only for cities, but also for the title of the experience in addition”. The other informants agreed to this statement. By implementing a better search function, Lokalii can potentially reach out to more users. As soon as something becomes complicated or frustrating for the users, they tend to put it away, and they usually do not complete the purchase. If the users cannot find what they are looking for by searching, filter and sort options could help them. This is something that the informants pointed out during both focus groups, and said they would appreciate. Lokalii does not offer this function, and on the one hand they do not need to. This is because the search function does not generate too many results, unless the user is searching for one city with a lot of experiences. This only occurs when it is Oslo that is being search for. During the second focus group, person 2 suggested one improvement Lokalii can do to make the app user-friendlier:

I think it would have been cool if the first time I tried the app, there was a list of different things. And that I could check the things that I am interested in. Such as oh I
love coffee and to ride a bicycle, and then I could get recommendations based on this. Because it is still a bit difficult to navigate through the app.

Another informant added that this is especially important because of how the search functionality works. This could make the app even more personalized. By giving the users the opportunity to filter their search right away, the recommendations will be custom to that user. Filtering is important anyway, to supplement the search function. One of the informants from the first focus group highlighted a function from *TripAdvisor*, where the user can set their search to a specific distance. The other informants agreed to the importance of a filter option like this. A nearby function would also make this easier. Both the ability to set a specific radius, and a nearby function will make it easier for the user to see experiences that are located near them, and exclude experiences that are located far away. During the first focus group, the informants discussed how they got a bit confused when opening the app because the experiences shown on the first page was from all over the world. They wanted an option for choosing which city they want to see experiences from. Person 2 suggested that the users could get some options; “you can choose one of these top ten cities, and then you get top experiences from that city”. This is a feature that could make the process of booking an experience more effective, and it could be implemented in the suggestions above (Gove, 2016, pp. 10-11).

4.2.5 5: Allow user reviews to be viewed and filtered

The ability to give a review and rate an experience, in addition to see other user reviews, was one of the functions that were launched in the 0.9.3 version of the app. If the user looks at an experience, he or she can see what other people thought about the experience. During the first focus group, person 6 said that “here [in the app] I need a confirmation that other people think the service is cool, and that they had a positive experience. They do have some rating, but I need the confirmation”. Some of the other informants said that they are more skeptical to reviews. Because they do not know these people, or whether they can identify with their opinions. They drew parallels between the option to write and read reviews, and *TripAdvisor*. It was said to be a good function, but it could give a skewed image of an experience. One of the informants said that they like to read reviews, but had experienced with *TripAdvisor* that the top restaurants can be very crowded. This could be because everyone goes there, based on the good reviews. During the first focus group, it seemed like the informants both wanted reviews as a function, and that they did not trust the people writing reviews. They all wanted
a confirmation that an experience was good and safe, but at the same time they did not feel that they could trust the person reviewing the experience. One thing worth mentioning is that it is not easy to locate where the users can write a review, in the Lokalii app. The informants noticed this, and questioned where they could review an experience. They could not find it in the app. During the second focus group, the informants tried to figure out how this worked, but they did not manage to do so. They highlighted the importance of someone recommending the app or an experience to them. This would make them trust the provider and seller more. This shows that some of the informants had changed their thought regarding reviews from the first focus group. There is a connection between the fact that Lokalii is a new provider, and that the type of service is new. Because of this, it is important that Lokalii offers reviews, to make the users assured before purchasing an experience. Lokalii does offer reviews, and that is good. However, it needs to be easy for the users to understand how to write a review. At times user will want to leave reviews, whether the experience was good, or not so good (Gove, 2016, p. 13).

4.2.6 6: Make it easy to add and manage payment methods

This principle concerns how easy the payment methods are in the app. According to Gove (2016) it is important to give the users options when adding credit cards. They should get the ability to add multiple cards, and toggle between them. The first focus group did not focus on how the payment methods were in the app. When a user wants to purchase an experience, they must press the button “request a booking”. They can choose a date and time, and how many participants they want to purchase the experience for. The total amount is shown on the page. Then they can press the button “review request”, which gives them a session summary, and they can add a credit card to pay with. After this procedure, the user needs to press “place booking”, and the experience is booked. The order can be located afterwards in the app; it shows a summary of the order. How this looks in Lokalii is shown in figure 15. This is the procedure if the user is logged in. Before the second focus group the informants had to purchase an experience. This implies that they created a user profile, with their credit card information. All the informants stated that they thought this process was very easy. Person 4 stated “I remember that it went faster than I anticipated. It went smoothly, and suddenly it [the experience] was ordered”. None of the informants experienced any problems with the payment function, and they concluded among themselves that this was an advantage.
This function has not changed in the recent updates of the app. This can indicate that the developers of Lokalii experiences that the function works. Or, it can be that they rather want to edit it in the future. Even though this principle from Gove indicates that Lokalii should do some changes to make the payment function even better, the informants seemed satisfied with the function as it is (Gove, 2016, p. 16).

4.2.7 7: Provide a clear utility before asking users to register

This principle focus on the importance of giving the users information about why they have to register in order to use an app. Some people will stop using, or simply delete an app that asks them to provide personal information upfront. It is important that the users only get asked to provide personal information if it is necessary. When a user first tries Lokalii, they do not have to sign up to browse through the experiences. Some of the informants pointed out that they liked this, in the first focus group. They liked that they could view the experiences, and then later choose to create an account. It is first when the users want to request a booking that they must register, and create an account. Lokalii does not give the users information about why they must register. The only information the users get is: “Join us… It’s pretty cool over here!”.

The users can choose to connect with Facebook, sign up with e-mail, or sign in if they already have an account. If the user chooses to sign up, he or she must provide an e-mail address, a password, in addition to first and last name. Before the second focus
group, the informants registered, and booked the “10-minute hand-brewing lesson” experience. They did not give any information about this being a problem. On the one side, Lokalii does not give the users explicit information about why they must provide personal information. However, many users probably understand this when they press the “request booking” button. By registering and creating a profile, it makes it easier for the user to keep track of their bookings, and their offered experiences (if they have any). It would be preferred if Lokalii provided a sentence about this, so that the users feel safer to register (Gove, 2016, p. 17).

4.2.8 8: Communicate form errors in real time
This principle is important, because if the users are to fill out a form (registration, credit card registration, etc.) they should get information about eventual errors right away, instead of at the end of a form. Lokalii has two forms that the users have to fill out. Because the forms are quite simple, general errors in the app will be included in this principle. The first form is to sign up for an account. The form has a simple layout, and there should not be any problems filling it out. However, one small problem is that the form does not change automatically to capital letters, when the users fill in their name. They must do this themselves. Another problem occurred when I tried to make an account with a misspelled e-mail address, I did not get any error. This implies that if I want to book an experience, I can do that, but I will not receive any confirmation or additional information about the experience by e-mail. This can end up confusing the users, and they can get uncertain on whether they have been able to successfully purchase an experience. If an experience gets cancelled, this can become a problem. This can also occur if the user wants to contact a host, and they end up getting no feedback, because the communication is by e-mail. This is, of course not a big problem, but it can become a problem. Lokalii should add a feature that requires the users to confirm their e-mail address, from a link sent to their e-mail. This would fix this problem easily. The other form that the users have to fill out is a credit card registration for purchasing experiences. This form is designed simply, and the number pad appears on the screen. One of the informants experienced a problem, before the first focus group. This person had forgotten the password to the Lokalii account. There is no place in the app that says “forgotten your password”. This makes it difficult for the users if they forget their password. During the second focus group, the informants did not pay any particular attention to any errors. They did not experience any problems with the registrations. One of the informants noticed that
they did not receive any confirmation e-mail, after booking the “10-minute hand-brewing lesson” experience. The other informants did however receive it. This is not a form error, but rather a feedback error. This point will be elaborated on in principle ten (Gove, 2016, p. 21).

4.2.9 9: Speak the same language as your users
This principle focuses on the importance of giving the users understandable information. The information should be given in a language that the users understand. Technical terms should not be used, or other words that the users do not understand. This is not only important regarding the information given by Lokalii, but also regarding the information from the sellers of the experiences. The information from Lokalii, in the app, is given in an informal language, and it is the same with most experiences. Looking at the description of “Akerselva with an inflatable boat” can show this, it is shown in figure 1. This description is good because it makes the users engage in the content, which can lead to them purchasing the experience. It is important that the language in this type of app is inviting, and that it makes the users engaged. One can view the information about the experience as a form of sales call. This is the space that the host gets to generate a sale. Because of this, it is important how the language is used. Most of the hosts use this space well, but some of the experiences e.g. do not give significant information about the experience. This is something that can confuse the users, especially if the user is a bit uncertain about the service, and whether it is trustworthy or not. The information in the app is given in English, and most of the information about the experiences is also written in English. Person 5 stated during the first focus group, “I think that it was smart of the developers to make the app in English. It shows that they are thinking broader, that they are not just interested in Norwegian users, but tourists and to spread internationally”. This statement is more specific on the actual language used, but it shows how Lokalii cares about their customers. They want to reach many customers, and by having the app in English, this makes them do so. There is very little use of unknown terms and phrases in the app. Some of the experiences contain words that one cannot assume everyone understands. But, people who are looking for these experiences will most likely understand the phrases (Gove, 2016, p. 24).

4.2.10 10: Be responsive with visual feedback after significant actions
This principle concerns the importance of making sure that the users get feedback when they do a significant action. The users need to get feedback when he or she e.g. purchases
something, or puts something in the shopping bag. By this time, the user has spent money on something, and they want some kind of feedback. This feedback should be given in the app, right after the user have finished the purchase, and an e-mail should be sent with information about the purchase. Person 3 did not receive an e-mail confirmation after the experience was booked, and said, “I think it was annoying that you do not get a confirmation, or I did at least not get a confirmation. There should be given a reminder of the experience as well”. This was during the second focus group. The users can however see in the app if the booking is complete. They can view their orders, and the information about the location and the experience is found here. Regarding the “contact me” button, the informants had not tried the new function, and I told them in short about it. Because it was used to contact the host of the “10-minute hand-brewing lesson” experience. This was during the second focus group. The informants liked that they got the option to contact the seller. They felt that this function made it safer to purchase an experience. However, the function does not give a notice if the message has been sent, and it does not say where you get the answer. This is by e-mail, which has been mentioned previously. Lokalii should give the users information about this, so that they do not get confused. All the informants requested a feature that gives them notifications to remind them of the experience as well. This would make it easier for them to remember when the experience would take place, and whether they need to bring something to the experience. The important thing about this principle is to give the users information when it is necessary (Gove, 2016, p. 26).

4.3 Summary

This chapter has addressed principles for mobile app design. These principles have been applied to Lokalii, and examined with the statements from the two focus groups. They show how the Lokalii app works, and how it can become better. The next chapter will concern various innovation theories, and how they can be applied to Lokalii.
5 Innovation

This chapter will address the findings from the two focus groups, and connect them to the innovation theories that were presented in the theoretical chapter. The theories create the base for this analysis. Findings from the two focus groups will be compiled through the chapter. Both focus groups consisted of questions regarding innovation, in addition to the concept, functions and features of Lokalii. Information given by Pouria Ruhi in the interview will be summarized, to get his points on Lokalii and innovation. After this, Lokalii will be put in context of different innovation theories, first by looking at the four Ps and one S from media innovation. The theories of radical and incremental innovation, and disruptive innovation will be addressed. There will be given a brief recap of the theory, then the theory will be applied to Lokalii combined with the statements from the informants. There will be given information about which focus group the statements are from.

5.1 Innovation theories

5.1.1 Pouria Ruhi on Lokalii and innovation

The founder of Lokalii, Pouria Ruhi, believed that the service was an innovation. When the team started developing the service, they did not find anything similar and therefore they thought Lokalii was a game changer. In retrospect, Ruhi believes that the innovation of Lokalii lies in the processes behind the service. What he means by this is that it is the processes that have led to Lokalii, that are the innovation. He said that

It is not rocket science, we have created a marketplace, but we have created a marketplace for experiences, which is an innovation. We have been granted funds from Innovasjon Norge, so it is innovative to some extent. But if I am to be completely honest, it is not the world’s most innovative idea. However, it is innovative in the way that we have been thinking. I think there are two sides to the startup world today, some startups have good and innovative ideas, and some just want to be a part of a startup because it is cool to be an entrepreneur. We have not done it like this, we really wanted to make a service that works and that people want to use, because we think it is fun. We do not have financial gain as a ‘carrot’. We have rather tried to see who we are and what values we want the company to have, and tried to implement as much as possible into that.

It is here innovation has been taking place. Ruhi added, in an e-mail, “the innovation lies in that there is a person-to-person market place. It is something new, and people are not familiar with it. The app holds features that are innovative, which for example makes it possible to
book instant experiences” (P. Ruhi, personal communication, May 3, 2017). He followed up in the interview, by giving some information on how they did their research, and why they wanted a service like Lokalii. The service was created because Ruhi experienced a desire in himself, and saw a need in the travel industry, to experience more when travelling. They did different research to see if there was anyone who offered a service like Lokalii. Ruhi could not find any similar service, and he thought “oh, this is disruptive”. This statement implies that Ruhi believed, at a point, that Lokalii could be disruptive. Whether he meant it in the way that Christensen describes disruptive innovations, it is hard to say. I asked Ruhi in an e-mail, if he could elaborate on the statement, and he answered that

We created a new market, through getting people to sell experiences. You do not need a car or an apartment to earn money. You can come a long way with creativity. Through a service like this, we can create new economic opportunities for several people. This also contributes to bringing people closer together. It is more personal and unique (P. Ruhi, personal communication, May 3, 2017).

The additional information does not say anything about Lokalii being disruptive, but it does say something about why the service is unique. Disruptive is a term that in many cases is misused, as described in the theoretical chapter. This is also why many scholars criticize the theory of disruptive innovation. This does not necessarily mean that Ruhi have misused the term, because it can be argued that he believes that Lokalii is disruptive.

5.1.2 Media innovation – the four Ps and one S

This section will concern the four Ps and one S, from the theory of media innovation, and apply them to Lokalii. The first P is product innovation. This can be applied to Lokalii, because it involves new services, such as an app. Product innovation usually involves changes in products or services from an organization. Lokalii is a new company, but it offers a service that is new to the market. The actual development of Lokalii can also be described as a product innovation. This is in line with what Ruhi described as the innovation in Lokalii. The app can be viewed as an improvement from other traditional travel apps, such as TripAdvisor and VisitOSLO. In this way, Lokalii has not changed a product, it has rather changed someone else’s product, based on a need that was experienced when travelling, and this is the product innovation.

The second P is process innovation. It concerns changes to how a product or service are created and delivered. This can be applied to Lokalii, since private individuals curate the
offers in the app. Many existing travel apps use this method of curating content in the app, such as TripAdvisor and Stay.com. Locals curate the information in Stay.com, and it is not based on reviews, rather on recommendations. Stay.com facilitates recommendations that show a user where they should go for a cup of coffee, or which bar is the coolest in a city. However, the difference lies in the fact that Lokalii offers experiences created by private individuals. These people give the information in the app. This means that Lokalii can be viewed as a change from other travel apps, because the information in the app is presented in a different way; as experiences, rather than recommendations or reviews. The change is most prominent if the personal aspect of Lokalii is drawn upon. This has been addressed through the thesis, and it is a big part of how the information in the app is presented.

The third P is position innovation. It is a bit harder to apply to Lokalii, because they are still a new company. This type of innovation involves changes that are done in the company’s brand or identity. Lokalii’s marketing has not changed much since they released the app. This will be more interesting to examine when they are more established in the industry. However, the service has been marketed a bit more, with more posts in social media. This is not a change in the brand, because the posts in social media have the same content, the change lies in the frequency of the posts. Figure 16 shows two typical posts from Lokalii, on Facebook. The frequency of posts has curated more followers, and therefore more people are reached. This is something that I have observed in recent months. Based on this it is not possible to say that the changes Lokalii has done is position innovation, but it might be in the future.

Figure 16: Two Facebook posts from Lokalii (Lokalii, 2017a) (Lokalii, 2017b).
The fourth P is paradigmatic innovation, and it involves changes in how a business thinks. It can to some extent be applied to Lokalii. The founders of Lokalii chose early to go from a website and an app, to be mobile only. This means that Lokalii is only accessible on a smartphone. A website is offered, but this is only to give information about the app. This change might have led them to alter how they communicate to customers, and potential customers. It is a big step to take, but Ruhi and the others on the team were advised to do it. They experienced that most users accessed their website via a smartphone, so it was logical for them to go mobile only. As mentioned in the description of the previous P, Lokalii is more active on social media. This can be a way of reaching more potential customers. Paradigmatic innovation will probably be more describing for Lokalii in the future, depending on which way the service develops.

The one S is social innovation, and it implies innovations that meet a social need and improve people’s lives. Lokalii can be described as a social innovation, because it meets a social need. This need can be described in two different ways. Firstly, Lokalii meets the need that Ruhi experienced when travelling, and during his work in the hotel industry. This need was to meet locals, and experience a city the way locals do. Secondly, the social need that Lokalii meets is what happens when tourists and locals physically meet, to discover a city. Lokalii can facilitate new relations. The service improves people’s lives by doing this, and the tourist’s experience of a city. The social innovation lies in the different features that the app offers the users, especially in the personal and local aspect. This was illustrated by how James and Nancy experienced Oslo through their participation in “Akerselva with an inflatable boat”. They got to experience Oslo in a cool way, with locals. But, the most important part was that they got to meet the host’s friends, and got to know them. This is where the personal and local aspect of Lokalii is prominent. This is also here that the social need is met, because the couple developed new relations, which led to friendship. Because of this, their lives were improved (Storsul & Krumsvik, 2013, pp. 16-17).

5.1.3 Lokalii as a media innovation

Media innovations are usually improvements or changes done to an existing product or service. Sometimes the change is big, and it can result in a new product or service. The media industry is in a constant change, and they need to change in order to survive (Storsul & Krumsvik, 2013, pp. 17-18). This is mainly because of the technological changes that have
emerged during the last years (Küng, 2013, p. 9). Lokalii is not what media innovations usually concern. Often, the products and services that are addressed are typical media products, such as newspapers, television, radio, etc. What is a common denominator within the products just mentioned, is that they facilitate communication in one form, or another. They reach out to people to inform them about something. To some extent, this is also what Lokalii does. It facilitates communication between people, which can result in the sharing of experiences. The information given in the app works as one-way communication, where the hosts give information about what they offer. When the users either contacts a host, or participate in an experience, the communication is two-ways. The Internet and smartphones are also a part of media innovations. They change how people learn and communicate, and how products and services are offered (Liestøl, 2013, p. 61). It is this communication in conjunction with the Internet and smartphones that can describe Lokalii as a media innovation. This was a short description of why Lokalii can be described as a media innovation. This is not the main focus of this thesis, but it is interesting to transfer the theory to a new company, that might not be exactly what the theory normally concerns.

5.1.4 Radical and incremental innovation

This section will address the theories of radical and incremental innovation. The theories will be compared to Lokalii, to see how they are applicable. In addition to point to different aspects of Lokalii, which can be explained by using the theories. Radical innovation involves revolutionary changes in e.g. technology, where the change is big, and it changes the company’s original practice. Incremental innovation occurs when there are done improvements in existing technology. These innovations are not as distinctive as radical innovations. There is no definite separation between radical and incremental innovation, they can overlap, even though they are quite different (Dewar & Dutton, 1986, pp. 1422-1425).

In terms of radical innovation, the concept of Lokalii must be viewed. The concept is the sharing of experiences, and it has been created a marketplace for these experiences. The biggest innovation for Lokalii lies in this service, the marketplace. This type of service has been offered before, but in a different way. One example that the informants gave during the first focus group is Jii, which offered an online store where experiences could be bought. There exist several services like this, where different experiences can be bought online. The experiences are often offered from an existing business, such as a company focusing on
diving licenses, etc. When the founders of Lokalii first thought of the idea, they could not
find any similar services. When the service was developed, and there were no clear
competitors, Lokalii could clearly be defined as a radical innovation. This is because the idea
was unique, and it offered something revolutionary. As Ruhi describes the idea, it is not
rocket science, but the team experienced a need among themselves and tourists. This was the
base for Lokalii. Now there are several other providers who offer something that is similar
Lokalii. These have been mentioned in the introduction of the thesis. Most of these services
appeared in the market after the Lokalii app was launched. Person 2 in the first focus group
said that

A big advantage with Lokalii for me is that I do not have to stand in line behind a lot
of people from Germany and China to experience something. I believe that this is
unique. I have not found any other apps that offer this, so it is cool.

Some of the informants argued that they had not seen any similar services, at least not
experiences that are curated by private individuals. Radical innovations are big changes, and
can often be defined as revolutionary. To summarize, Lokalii can be described as a radical
innovation based on the concept that is offered. By following the statements of the
informants, Lokalii has created something that is, in many ways, a new service. Many of the
features can be transferred to other similar apps, but the concept with the personal aspect in
mind, makes Lokalii unique.

Lokalii can also be described as an incremental innovation. If the typical travel apps and
services are viewed as the base from where the idea of Lokalii emerged. Then Lokalii can be
described as incremental, as an improvement from existing services. The informants
described Lokalii as cool, inspiring, a new way to see a city, local and authentic. During the
first focus group, the informants gave information about some similar services that they had
seen. The services that were mentioned was: Underskog, Jii and Remember. Stay.com was
also mentioned, because the informants compared it to Lokalii. The updates done to the app
(rating and reviews, in app contact seller option and extended seller profile) are consistent
with incremental innovation. They are upgrades, which make the app better and user-
friendlier. The specific updates are not revolutionary, but they make the app more convenient
for their users. Both the option to contact a seller, and the seller profile page, makes the
experience of the app more secure for the users. Based on this, Lokalii can be described as an
incremental innovation. The innovation lies in the essence of taking an existing service, and
developing it further. One could say that Lokalii builds on features from the existing services, and makes the experience more personal. Stay.com e.g. gives the user information that is curated by locals. Lokalii has in some sense taken this a step further, by putting tourists in contact with locals, so they can experience something together.

5.2 Disruptive innovation

Looking at the previous section, Lokalii can be described as both an incremental and a radical innovation. This section will apply the theory of disruptive innovation to Lokalii. The theory of disruptive innovation is defined by Christensen (2015), as a product that is cheaper, simpler, smaller, and more convenient to use, than the products or services offered by established companies. Disruptive innovations often target the consumers that do not have the same need as the mainstream consumers. This implies that the disruptive innovation can either emerge from an existing market, where they target other consumers than the dominant consumers (low-end foothold). Or it can emerge from a non-existing market, which implies that a new market is created. Here non-consumers are turned into consumers (new-market foothold) (Christensen, Raynor & McDonald, 2015, pp. 5-10). Christensen has four principles for why and how companies should focus on developing products that are disruptive, and how to deal with disruption. The theory has also been developed further, some of these principles and developments will be highlighted here. Christensen’s theory involves that several aspects are fulfilled to define an innovation as disruptive. His four principles are in close contact with how established companies should think, regarding disruptive technologies. Lokalii is a new company, and can be defined as an entrant, as Christensen refers to newly established companies. Because of this, some of the principles are not applicable to Lokalii directly, but they can be transferred to the service. During the analysis, the principles and points that are relevant to Lokalii will be addressed (Chrisensen, 1997, pp. 232-233).

5.2.1 Market

According to the theory of disruptive innovation, an innovation must emerge from either a low-end foothold or a new-market foothold of the market. Lokalii can be placed in both the categories. This is because Lokalii can be viewed as a service that targets the consumers who do not use typical travel apps. During the second focus group, the informants discussed if Lokalii potentially can change the tourism market in Oslo. Several of the informants stated
that they believe that Lokalii can do this, eventually. Person 6 stated that “yes, I think so because people are more concerned with local and genuine things […]”. Lokalii can be described as a different type of travel app, which is consistent with it emerging from the low-end footholds of the market. The app is also different from a guided tour, sightseeing bus, guidebook, etc. It is different, because the concept involves a personal aspect, and the involvement of private individuals. The service is also interactive; it requires that the users do something in order to get an outcome. Because of this, Lokalii can be viewed as an improvement from the more traditional ways of travelling. It targets the consumers who do not want a guided tour, but rather want to travel like locals, and experience what the locals do in a city. Many travelers use apps such as TripAdvisor and VisitOSLO. Lokalii can therefore target the customers who are not TripAdvisor’s and VisitOSLO’s most demanding customers. This implies that Lokalii has created a service that do not interest the mainstream users, but rather the users that are interested in something other than what established companies offer. This can be the users who want a more local experience of a city, or just want to experience something that is different from the typical tourist places and sights. The reason for this can be because they want to experience something more personal and local. Here Lokalii can give them what they want. James and Nancy got to experience this, when they participated in “Akerselva with an inflatable boat”. They wanted to experience something new, and explore the city like locals. It can be argued that not all residents of Oslo are familiar with traveling down Akerselva river with an inflatable boat, but it gave James and Nancy a memorable experience.

However, many of the experiences that are offered cannot be compared to the typical guides, sightseeing or other travel apps. Therefore, Lokalii can be viewed as a service that targets non-consumers, and based on this emerges from a new-market foothold. This means that Lokalii creates a new market, and this is literally something they have done. They have created a new marketplace (the app) for experiences. This is probably not what Christensen meant when he developed the theory of disruptive innovation, but it is worth mentioning. With this in mind, Lokalii does not only offer experiences for tourists, but also for locals. It has also been shown that there are many locals that use the app to explore their own city. Based on the definition of tourist from Hunt and Layne (1991) the locals that use Lokalii in their home city cannot be defined as tourists, because the locals do usually not travel away from their hometown (Hunt & Layne, 1991, pp. 7-9). Here, Lokalii can turn the non-consumers (the locals), into consumers. During the first focus group, I asked the informants if
they believe that Lokalii replaces an existing market. The informants did not give a conclusive answer, but many of them believed that Lokalii creates a new market, rather than replaces one. Lokalii does have some competitors, but the other similar services either do not offer many experiences in Oslo, or none at all (referring to Nanook, Exploro and Airbnb experiences). The other travel apps, such as TripAdvisor, VisitOSLO, and Stay.com, are competitors in some ways, but they offer different services. They can be complementary to Lokalii, and the other way around. The non-consumers which are described here, can also be people who usually do not participate in any typical tourism things, they rather travel on their own, attempting to locate new places and new people. By using Lokalii, these people get the opportunity to meet new people, experience or learn something new, and experience a city in a new way. Person 6 stated, “they [Lokalii] are the first, that I know of, that are putting it into a system”. This statement shows that Lokalii is doing something new, that separates it from its competitors and other travel apps and services.

5.2.2 Cost

The definition of disruptive innovations includes the aspect of cost. This suggests that the product or service is often less expensive than the competitors. Lokalii does have some competitors, when it comes to the cost of an experience. The informants mentioned Underskog, Jii and Remember, which offer experiences from established companies. Apps, such as TripAdvisor, VisitOSLO, Stay.com, and so on can also be seen in comparison to Lokalii. Other competitors are guidebooks and guided tours. The clearest competitors are Nanook, Exploro and Airbnb experiences. This is because the services offer something similar to Lokalii. Which are local experiences, and these are in many cases offered by private individuals. The services do not offer the exact same experiences, so it is not possible to compare the pricing correctly. Airbnb experiences offers some experiences that last for several days, such as “Being Cuban – Tune into daily rhythms with two Cuban scholars”, which consists of different experiences over two days. Lokalii only have a couple of experiences like this, such as “Improve your coffee brewing competition skills”, which last for 3 days. The content of these two experiences are different, the first consists of exploring Cuba. Where the latter consists of becoming better at competing in coffee brewing competitions. The experiences are illustrated in figure 17.
Other travel apps can also be viewed as competitors, even though the concept is different. But because something similar is offered, and many tourists can end up choosing one of these over Lokalii, based on what is offered in the app. This can be apps such as TripAdvisor, VisitOSLO and Stay.com, where the main purpose is to serve tourists with good information about a city, and the recommendation of sights and places to explore. This is in a sense what Lokalii also offers, that the tourists get a good experience of a city.

During the first focus group, the informants discussed the pricing of the offered experiences. All the informants agreed that the cost depends on the content of an experience. Person 1 stated, during the first focus group “some of them [the prices] are just sick”. Some of the other informants added that they feel that an experience must be very interesting, if the pricing is high. Because private individuals generate the experiences, it is difficult to determine what the cost should be. During the second focus group the informants had booked and participated in the “10-minute hand-brewing lesson” experience. Based on this, I asked them about the cost of the experience, which was 97,75 NOK. They stated that the cost was fair, considering that a cup of hand-brewed coffee costs 42 NOK (at the location of the experience). They added that the users get more than one cup of coffee, in addition to learning something at the same time. One clear competitor is the café where the experience took place. They charge 42 NOK for the coffee. However, the user does not get the experience of learning how to brew the coffee. This particular experience was quite cheap, and some of the other experiences have a higher price.
Another aspect regarding the cost is that the service is new. This implies that the people who offer experiences cannot compare the cost with another service. The experiences offered in Lokalii range from 97,75 NOK to 164 000 NOK. “10-minute hand-brewing lesson” is the cheapest experience. “North Pole – Top of the world in a day” is the most expensive, and it costs 18 400 EUR, which is almost 164 000 NOK. Because of this there is an experience in every price range, which is illustrated in figure 18. If one highlights the materials being used in an experience, in addition to the cost for the work the host put into it and the profit, there is a way of calculating the price. The informants argued during the first focus group, that if the person hosting an experience must buy things to conduct the experience, it is fair for the higher price. However, there are many different experiences, therefore it is not possible to compare the prices within the app. In addition, the service gives the users something that they do not get from guided tours and apps such as TripAdvisor, a personal aspect. It is however difficult to price the personal aspect of the experience. If the example from the introduction is brought up here, it shows why it is difficult to determine the cost of the personal aspect. James and Nancy did not just experience travelling down Akerselva river, with an inflatable boat. They got to meet the friends of the host, and got to know them as well. They made friends during the experience. This example shows how the personal aspect of Lokalii works. One of the informants in the second focus group, argued that Lokalii is cheaper than renting a guide. This is something that probably varies, based on the content of the guided tour. The case is the same with Lokalii, the prices vary based on what the users want to experience. Some people will always think that the cost is too high, but if the cost is too low it can scare some users as well. It is the hosts that determine the cost, and therefore we must include the human factor. One person can believe that their experience is worth an amount, but this does not necessarily mean that the users of Lokalii is willing to purchase it for the same amount.
Many of the experiences are quite cheap, at least considering the amount of e.g. food, drink, experience, or knowledge the user gets. Based on this, it is difficult to say whether Lokalii can be described as a disruptive innovation. The prices vary, and so does the content of the experiences.

5.2.3 Simplicity

Another aspect that is pointed out in the definition of disruptive innovation, is that the product or service must be simpler than what the established companies offer. This can imply that the product or service e.g. does not have all the wanted functions in place, or that the content is narrower than other established actors. Lokalii is an entrant, which often implies that everything is not quite in place yet. In addition to the fact that app has not been on the market for that long. The app is being updated frequently, giving it new functions and features, to make it better for the users. The app works as it is meant to, and the users can book experiences. However, the informants missed some functions and features, during both focus groups. Such as, search based on distance (“nearby”), notifications, and categories/filter options to find the perfect experience for one user, in addition to pictures from the experiences. These functions would according to the informants give them a better experience of the app, but they all agreed on that the app is good enough. Person 4 said during the second focus group “I just think that they have a satisfactory product, but there is of course always something that could be done better”. The service is still simpler than some of their competitors, such as e.g. TripAdvisor. In comparison to Nanook, Exploro, and Airbnb experiences, Lokalii is more advanced than some of these services. Lokalii offers more experiences, in more cities. It also has an app that is more developed than the others. The different services serve the same purpose, but for instance Exploro is still in the beta stage (as of March 2017), and many functions are not quite in place. Nanook has developed the service a bit more and offers experiences in different cities around the world. Airbnb experiences has been implemented in Airbnb’s app and website, so they have the potential to reach many people, because of this it can be argued to be more advanced than Lokalii. Other services, such as TripAdvisor, can here be viewed as the mainstream market. Lokalii is a simpler service than TripAdvisor, not only because it serves different purposes, but also because TripAdvisor fathoms a bigger market. The TripAdvisor app is more complex, there is more content in the app. This is because the user can book e.g. a hotel and flights directly through
the app. The app also contains information about more than experiences. Based on the aspect of simplicity, Lokalii offers a simpler service.

Christensen’s theory also includes that a disruptive innovation can eventually assert themselves in the mainstream market. It is when the mainstream market adopts a service, that disruption occurs. Lokalii is still a new provider in the market, so it is difficult to determine if it potentially can assert itself in the mainstream market. However, if several functions and features are implemented, it could in theory become more of a mainstream service. The mainstream market in this case involves travel apps such as TripAdvisor, VisitOSLO, tourism agencies, guidebooks, guided tours, etc. There are a lot of aspects of the app that has to be changed or added to make it competitive in the mainstream market at this point. Ruhi insinuated that they want everyone in the world to either purchase, or offer an experience. If they manage to do this, Lokalii will be competitive in the mainstream market. This will be elaborated in the discussion, but I will only be able to give a prediction at this point.

5.3 Summary

This chapter has addressed different innovation theories, and compared them to Lokalii. The statements from the focus groups have been highlighted to show which theories that can be applied to Lokalii. The next chapter will concern the theory of experience design in tourism.
6 Experience design in tourism

In this chapter, Lokalii will be viewed in the light of experience design in tourism. In the literature, experience design is often used as a theoretical approach. Here the theory will be used on a case: Lokalii. This will be done to elaborate on the concept of Lokalii. Experience design is often used as a theoretical approach within innovation and tourism, because the theory can be used to innovate a destination, or a tourism service, and because various experiences can occur during a trip. Generally, an experience is often defined as an immediate response to an event that has just happened. An experience (within tourism) can be defined as a set of micro-experiences that occurs during a trip, or it can be one single event, e.g. a concert or a visit to a museum (Kim & Fesenmaier, 2017, pp. 19-20). Because Lokalii’s concept is the sharing of experiences, it is interesting to view if the theory of experience design in tourism also fit with the concept. Different functions and features from Lokalii will be highlighted. These functions and features can help tourists in their search for experiences that can lead to a memorable trip.

6.1 Concept

To give a simple description of why Lokalii fits with the theory of experience design, it can be said that what Lokalii offers is experiences, which is the first word of the term. The other thing is that these experiences give the users something that several other services do not, such as the personal encounter between tourists and locals. Lokalii fits within this perspective because it can give the users an emotional attachment to an experience. This is something that James and Nancy got through the participation in “Akerselva with an inflatable boat”. They exchanged friendship, and got to experience some of what Oslo has to offer. The whole experience for them, both the participation and meeting new friends, can lead to an emotional attachment to Lokalii. This scenario shows what Lokalii can lead to. It shows that the app is much more than a regular travel app. It connects people, and gives them memorable experiences. Tussyadiah (2014) gives a narrower definition of the term. This involves the development of experience-centric services, which gives the customers an experience that is personal and memorable (Tussyadiah, 2014, p. 544). This definition, in many ways, shows what Lokalii offers and it could be the definition of the service. The personal aspect described above lead to an emotional attachment for the customer. When a customer experiences
something emotional within an experience, this tends to lead to loyalty. The customer either wants to come back to experience the same thing, or something similar (Tussyadiah, 2014, pp. 543-544). Or the customer feels loyal to the service provider, which in this case is Lokalii. Based on this, the customer might want to purchase additional experiences from Lokalii.

Customers tend to want personalized experiences, molded to their needs. This is because of the amount of data that is available. In the technological world that we live in, many customers are aware of this data, and they know that many providers have the ability to offer custom services to that customer. This is positive for Lokalii, because it already has a large base of experiences, over 300 as mentioned introductory. This implies that it is an experience that suits almost everybody. This aspect of experience design is especially important for tourism destinations, where the customers want to experience something at the place that they are visiting. Regarding the aspect of personalization, Buhalis and Amaranggana (2015) describes the importance of Smart Tourism Destinations, and what tourists expect from this. They divided this into three categories: before trip, during trip and after trip. The study they conducted focused on smartness within a destination. Smartness within destinations is important to get feedback, and the data that is collected about the users can be used to give them an even more personalized experience. Lokalii wants to reach people all over the world, not just at a specific destination. The three categories can be transferred to Lokalii’s concept. This will be elaborated on later in this chapter (Buhalis & Amaranggana, 2015, p. 387).

The literature on experience design indicates that tourists want to experience something personal and memorable, when they are travelling. This is probably the case for most people. However, during the focus groups, the informants kept pointing out that they felt it was difficult to trust the hosts. This reflects upon the aspect of personalization. They want something personal, but at the same time, they cannot trust anyone. During the first focus group, the informants discussed this aspect of Lokalii. They discussed who the service fits, and which people that would probably use it. Some of the informants stated that people who find Lokalii safe, would probably use it. It is the same with people who have used services such as Couchsurfing and Airbnb. Person 1 pointed out that “my dad, he does not trust these kinds of things at all”, and person 2 added “there are a lot of people that are skeptical to the Internet, at least when you are a bit older. Then this becomes a way of putting yourself in other’s hands”. The rest of the informants added that it would help if there were some
additional information about the person hosting the experience. According to several of the informants, people often trust a collection of other tourists, rather than the host itself. Some of the informants did not agree to this statement, because they thought that it was difficult to know who to trust. During the second focus group, the informants had participated in an experience. This led them to rely more on the service, and to trust the host. They all wanted to book another experience. The informants gave various suggestions regarding how Lokalii can feel safer and more trustworthy, such as someone the users know tells them that Lokalii is cool. Another suggestion was to focus on marketing, and to get the brand out to people. This can lead to users trusting the service, because they have heard of it. As said in the introduction, it is the personal and memorable that the tourists want. However, the informants gave different feedback regarding this, but they concluded with wanting to try another experience from Lokalii.

6.2 Functions and features

The users can use Lokalii to plan their trip to a destination. They can browse through the different categories, in addition to searching for a destination. James and Nancy browsed through the app before their trip to Oslo. They used the app to locate exciting experiences, and based their choice on this research. Because of this they could make an informed decision. The users get the opportunity to book experiences before they go on a trip, or they can browse and book an experience when they arrive at the destination. They can also contact the host via the app, to get answers to different questions that they might have. By reading the reviews in the app, they can get an image on how an experience was perceived for other users. Based on this they can choose which experience they want to book. They do not need to book an experience in advance, that is up to the users. After the trip, they can give a review of the experience(s) they participated in. This will help others in choosing which experience(s) they want to book. In addition to making the process more assuring for other users. There should also be an option to give feedback directly to Lokalii, if the experience was horrible, or if some information was wrong. Lokalii checks all the experiences, but not all are participated in before they are published. Therefore, the users should be able to press a button, and give direct feedback.

This section will address the functions and features that can help the users who do not trust the service, to book an experience. Reviews give the user a feedback on an experience, and if
it is worth booking it. It can also remove the fear of participating in an experience with people that they do not know. Often tourists go on guided tours, when they are travelling. This can, to many people, seem safer, because there is often a professional company that stands behind the offered tour. But at the same time, many tourists are interested in meeting new people, and making new friends. The informants emphasized this, during both focus groups. There will always be someone who is skeptical of these kinds of services, because it is something new and unknown. Another function that make the process of booking an experience less intimidating, is that the users can contact the host, and get more information about him or her, or information about the experience. This can make the threshold to book an experience smaller. During the focus groups, the informants stated that they felt that there was a threshold stopping them from going through with a booking. One of the informants stated that they were proud of booking, and participating in the “10-minute hand-brewing lesson”. One of the informants contacted another host about participation in an experience, during the second focus group. This shows that the users of the app just have to try one experience, to understand that there is nothing intimidating about it. The users can also read about the host, to get some information about the person behind the experience. Many of the hosts have also added a photo of themselves; this makes the booking process more personal. Lokalii is a service that is supposed to be personal, to connect people, and at the same time get the opportunity to experience something new. The functions and features are there to help with the personalization of the service. The important thing is to get tourists in contact with locals, so that they can experience a city in the best possible way.

6.3 Experience design in Norway

As presented in the theoretical chapter, both Norway and Oslo have become popular tourist destinations. What tourists want to experience, when visiting these places, has also changed. At least in Oslo, many tourists want to experience the urban city, with its culture, food, and atmosphere (Hansen, Hagen & Mordt, 2016). This shows how important it is to use experience design to fulfill these expectations that the tourists have, when visiting Oslo. Tourists seem to have different expectations when it comes to travelling in Norway (not to a specific place), and in Oslo. In Norway, they want to experience the fjords, the nature, the northern lights, local food and drinks (Innovasjon Norge, 2016, pp. 30-35). The difference might be because Oslo is a city, and the tourists compare it to other cities. Norway on the other hand, is known for its fjords and wild nature. It is difficult to differentiate between the
two, because Oslo is the capital of Norway, but they hold different values for the tourists. *Lokalii* is a Norwegian company, and most of the offered experiences are located in Norway. The different categories that tourist can navigate through, correspond with the expectations that they have regarding experiences in Oslo. These categories are: off the grid, outdoor, food, urban, culture, and nightlife. *Lokalii’s* naming of the different categories is consistent with what kinds of experiences that tourists want to have. *Lokalii* fits with what tourists visiting Norway want to experience, and especially with the tourists visiting Oslo. The important thing is to make tourists acquainted with the service, so that they can experience more of Oslo.

### 6.4 Summary

The easy answer is that *Lokalii* fits with the theory of experience design in tourism, because the core of both *Lokalii*, and the theory, is experiences. Experience design is a theory that is connected to experiences at destinations, which are often offered by tourism agencies. Generally, *Lokalii* fits well with both the theory of experience design, but especially with what tourists in Norway want to experience. In addition to the personal aspect of *Lokalii*, and that tourists often want personalized experiences during a trip. Functions and features have been discussed regarding the aspect of the personal and memorable touch that tourist often want to experience during a trip. The experience design theory states that people want to experience something on a trip. These experiences vary in size and complexity. Experiences can occur many times during a trip, or they can consist of one main event, such as visiting a famous building, etc. *Lokalii* makes these experiences more available to the tourists, but also to the locals. Experience design does not necessary need to be only for tourists. Many times, locals want to experience more of their own city, and with *Lokalii* they have the opportunity to do so.
7 Discussion and conclusion

This chapter will discuss the topics presented during the analyzes. The structure will be the same as in the analyzes. The findings will be highlighted during this chapter. The research question will also be answered: “How can Lokalii’s concept, with the functions and features of the app, be described as a disruptive innovation?” Lokalii’s concept, functions and features will be emphasized. In doing so, different elements of the thesis will be highlighted, and put into context with the topics of the research question. This has also been done throughout this thesis, however, the discussion will take it a step further in order to summarize the complete thesis.

7.1 Mobile app design

7.1.1 The concept

The next sections will summarize and discuss Lokalii’s concept, functions and features. Most of the findings are from the analysis of the 10 principles for mobile app design. The overall concept of Lokalii has been described as the sharing of experiences. This is consistent with what the informants thought about the service. The concept is a large part of the app, because the app gives the users the opportunity to both share an experience, and to participate in one. Several of the informants emphasized the importance of getting a network when travelling, and getting to know people in a new place. This is something that can enhance the experience of a city, but it can also enhance the lives of the people involved. Tourists can make new friends that can potentially change their lives. The informants also pointed out that most of the experiences are offered by what they described as normal people, and they thought that was cool. It was also mentioned that they thought that it was inspiring and cool that so many people have a talent that they want to show off. The concept of Lokalii can, according to the informants, change the tourism app market in Oslo. They believe that people are concerned with genuine and local experiences when travelling. Person 4 stated that the concept of Lokalii is “current and relevant”. The other informants agreed to this, and they said that they thought the concept was relevant because it includes experiences. The experiences offered in the app are what make the concept personal, and what give the users a new experience of a city. One aspect that was mentioned is that Lokalii can give a user motivation to travel to a specific destination, based on the experiences offered in the app. When the user browses
through the app, he or she can get inspiration, which can lead to a trip to a new place or city. *Lokalii’s* concept is something that separated the app from other travel apps. The concept facilitates a meeting between a local and a tourist. The informants mentioned this, and emphasized the personal feature of the app. Several of the informants believed that *Lokalii* offers something new, and person 6 said “*Lokalii* is the first ones to put it all into a system”. They added that *TripAdvisor* includes recommendations, but established actors facilitate these. The other informants said that *Lokalii* is the first to focus on experiences offered by private individuals.

All the apps and services that have been presented throughout this thesis serve the same fundamental purpose, to give tourists a good experience of a city. *TripAdvisor*, *VisitOSLO* and *Stay.com* can be described as guiding apps, these gives the users recommendations for what to see, eat, and experience through a city. Guided tours, which are facilitated by established actors are offered. These are the parts of the apps that are most similar to *Lokalii*. However, the difference is still big. Services such as *Nanook*, *Exploro* and *Airbnb experiences* are more similar to *Lokalii*. Both *Nanook* and *Exploro* contain few experiences located in Oslo. *Nanook* offers 10 experiences in Oslo, and *Exploro* offers one experience. Because of this, the services are not so comparable, and cannot be said to be big competitors of *Lokalii*. *Airbnb experiences* offers more experiences, but these are not located in Oslo. However, *Airbnb experiences* is *Lokalii’s* competitor in other countries, because the service is a known provider of accommodations. By offering experiences, the users that are already acquainted with the brand, get an opportunity to experience even more within the same service. In Oslo, *Airbnb experiences* is not a competition, and this is where the focus has been through this thesis.

### 7.1.2 Functions in the app

Functions and features were described in the introduction of this thesis. As far as functions are concerned, these are the elements that an app contains, and how these elements are perceived and recognized by the users. It also concerns how these functions differ from other travel apps. The first focus group started with the question on which functions a travel app should contain. The informants mentioned several wanted functions, some of these were; rating, local map, specific area search (nearby), and offline map function. Some of these functions would rather fit with a guiding app, where e.g. the map of a city could be offline,
such as Stay.com. Lokalii could implement this function, but then most of the app had to be offline, and this could take up much storage space on a user’s smartphone. The function of having a specific area search, which the informants called “nearby”, was pointed out on several occasions. They felt that it was confusing when a user opened the app, and experiences from all over the world appeared. They wanted the ability to search for experiences that they could participate in, which were located near them. This is the function that has been mentioned most frequently during the two focus groups. A form that gave the user the ability to check off different places, things, and interests was also something that the informants though would make the app user-friendlier. This is in the same path as the nearby search function. Both functions would narrow down the number of experiences displayed in the app. The latter would make the experience of the app better and more personal for the user. Then the specific user would only see the experiences that are consistent with what that specific user is interested in. Rating was discussed during the focus groups. This function was implemented in the app before the first focus group. However, there were only a few experiences that had been rated. The informants emphasized the importance of having this function in a travel app. Later, in the focus group they criticized this function. This was because they felt they were not sure whether they could not relate to the person giving the review. Person 6 stated that

I am a bit critical, who are you [the people that have rated something], are you someone that I can identify with or not. I would rather check with my friends, and see if they have tested it, that is more validating to me.

This implies that the informants both want the function, and are a bit skeptical to it at the same time. All in all, they believed that it is necessary with some sort of confirmation saying that it is okay to try. The review and rating function gives them this, at least to some extent.

The informants also discussed the functions that are in the app. These will be presented here. They include review and rating, in app contact seller option, extended seller profile page, booking, and search. Review and rating were included in the previous section, and will therefore not be included here. The option to contact a seller was a new function that had been implemented in the app between the two focus groups. The informants had not tried this function, but they tried it during the focus group. All of them thought it was a chat, and got a bit confused when they understood that they did not get a reply directly in the app. They understood that it is more like a contact form, where the user gets feedback via e-mail. The
informants meant that the user should get feedback directly through the app, preferably by getting a notification. They mean that this could lead to the user having to use the app more often, because the information is locked in the app. They did, however, like the function because it gives them the opportunity to get to know the seller better, and get answers to possible questions, before choosing to book an experience. The extended seller profile gives the user more information about the seller. This gives the sellers the opportunity to give more information about themselves. All the informants thought that this function was good, and they had noticed it when they booked the “10-minute hand-brewing lesson” experience. Both the functions mentioned above, were said to remove much of the threshold that the informants mentioned during the first focus group. The booking process was said to be easy, and faster than they thought it would be. They had no objections to how the booking solution worked. All the informants located the experience, in various ways. Some of the informants located the experience by scrolling down on the first page, and found the experience there. The experience was located under “top experiences”, which are the ones that are on the first page. Some of the informants experienced different problems related to this, because they tried to search for it, or browse through the different categories. The problems were primarily related to how the search functionality works in the app. The users get the opportunity to search for city, address, or neighborhood. They cannot search for e.g. words connected to the title of an experience. This caused some confusion for the informants, and they referred to this as deficient. So, this is something that Lokalii should change in the app.

7.1.3 Features in the app

Features, here, concern how the users perceive the app. In addition to how they feel after using it. These are the characteristics of the app. This was described in the introduction of the thesis. The features that the informants highlighted can be divided into four characteristics; personal, local, eventful, and learning. The personal aspect of the app is probably the feature that was mentioned most frequently by the informants. The app puts people in contact with each other, and gives them a market for the exchange of experiences. During the focus groups, it was emphasized that the people who offer an experience are probably interested in meeting new people, and teaching them something. There are of course those, who only offer an experience because they want to make some extra money. This was something that the informants mentioned shortly, but they did not emphasize it. Functions such as contact me, and extended seller profile are a part of making the app more personal. Both facilitate
communication, either one-way, or two-ways. The informants pointed out that they felt that there was a threshold to book an experience, because they did not know exactly what they could expect. This was emphasized during the first focus group. Person 6 stated

I had a very positive first experience [of the app], but I think that personally, there is a high threshold to book, but that might be because I do not get more information about the seller. I cannot click on the image of “anonymous” who offers one experience, and read more about him. I want to get to know him, or just talk to him […]..

This statement shows that the informants wanted to talk to the person behind the experience, before going through with the booking. During the second focus group, the informants said that the threshold to book an experience had gotten smaller. This was because they had participated in an experience, and because of the two new functions; contact me, and extended seller profile. One of the informants even contacted a seller for a new experience, during the focus group. The personal aspect of the app lies in the communication that is offered in the app, with the ability to contact a seller. It is also connected to the physical meeting between two, or more, people, with the exchange of communication through an experience. This meeting is what facilitates the local. Local as a feature involves the users of the app meeting a resident of a city, and experiencing something that this person wants to show them. The informants highlighted that the app gives the user a close and genuine experience of a city, and that this is something people like when travelling. This can involve to tourists wanting to experience a city like a local, and therefore seeing the experiences offered by Lokalii as genuine. The informants also said that the experiences give an authentic encounter with a city. The local feature can also be connected to the function of nearby search, which the informants requested in the app. The ability to browse through experiences that are physically near the user, amplifies the authentic feeling for the users. An example of an experience that facilitated both the personal and the local aspect of Lokalii is “Akerselva with an inflatable boat”, that James and Nancy participated in. This adventure gave them the opportunity to experience Oslo, with a resident of Oslo. As mentioned earlier, most locals in Oslo do not necessarily travel down Akerselva river on an inflatable boat every day. But, it is a fun way to experience the city, and to meet new friends. This is where the personal aspect appears. James and Nancy met friends of the host, and they got to know them. This resulted in new relations, and they planned to meet in James and Nancy’s hometown. This example shows how Lokalii can be a facilitator of relations, because of the personal and local aspect that the app holds.
Two features that were mentioned previously: eventful and learning, will be addressed here. The informants mentioned both regarding the experience “10-minute hand-brewing lesson”. During both focus groups, the informants tried the app while discussing. Because of this, they commented on different experiences, and got to know the app at the same time. During the second focus group, they all said that they had learned something, while drinking coffee. The informants liked this aspect of Lokalii. Many of the experiences that are offered, give the participants the opportunity to learn something. This is something that the informants mentioned, and they said that this aspect separates Lokalii from many other typical travel apps. This is because the experiences offered by Lokalii is personal (as mentioned above), moreover, many of them are eventful and the users can learn something at the same time. The aspect of being eventful is interesting, because some of the experiences that are offered are quite different. They are different because they cannot be found in a guidebook or in a typical travel app. Person 5 mentioned an experience that was a bit different, “rafting in Akerselva sounded like a blast” and person 6 followed up by mentioning “and the waterslide”. Both these experiences are out of the ordinary. The first experience is the one James and Nancy participated in, which has been addressed throughout this thesis. The second experience mentioned consists of a long waterslide that has been built by the hosts. It is located in Maridalen in Oslo, where you can slide down the waterslide and land in a big pool at the bottom of it. This experience is shown in figure 10. All the features mentioned in this section are a part of Lokalii. It is these features that make the app unique, and that can separate it from other travel apps.

7.2 Innovation

7.2.1 Media innovation

During the analysis of the first focus group, Lokalii was put in the context of the four Ps and one S; product, process, position, paradigmatic, and social innovation (Storsul & Krumsvik, 2013, pp. 16-17). These types of innovation have been used in the field of media innovation. The analysis showed that Lokalii could be described as all of them, but product, process, and social innovation fit best. Social innovation is the type that fits best with the concept of Lokalii. This is because a social innovation should meet a social need, and improve people’s lives. Lokalii puts people in contact with each other, via the exchange of experiences. Tourists who use Lokalii can get a better experience of a city. They will meet new people, and in many cases their lives will be improved because of these encounters. Person 2 stated
that Lokalii is “a natural extension of the Internet, where things get more and more social, and more personal. More people travel, and want to locate those unknown things”. It is the personal aspect of Lokalii that makes the service a social innovation. The personal aspect of Lokalii lies in the app, in the form of the interaction between the seller and the purchaser of the experience. It also lies in the social interaction through the experience, when the user and the seller meet face to face, and experience something together. In terms of product and process innovation, Lokalii is a new company, and these types of innovation often apply to established businesses that adapt changes in their products and services. They can however be related to Lokalii, because it offers a new service (product), and the service is offered in a new way (process). All in all, the social innovation is the best way to describe Lokalii. On a whole, Lokalii, can be described as a media innovation, because it facilitates communication between people.

### 7.2.2 Radical and incremental innovation

As stated in both the analyzes, Lokalii can be described as both a radical and an incremental innovation. This depends on which aspect of Lokalii that is highlighted. The informants stated that they believe that Lokalii has created a new market. This is consistent with the theory of radical innovation. However, at the same time, the informants mentioned several other services that they found similar to Lokalii. Lokalii diverges from many of these apps and services, because it offers a service that is not meant to guide the users. Rather, the service wants to offer the best experiences for the users, so that they get a unique experience of a city. By creating a market place for experiences, Lokalii lets the tourists choose what they want to experience. Without Lokalii, there are a lot of experiences that would not be known to the public, because now people have a marketplace where they can offer their talents to the public. The app is revolutionary in terms of what they offer, and because there is no one that offers it in the same way. According to the informants, Lokalii is the first to put the sharing of experiences, into a system. This is the underlying factor to why Lokalii can be described as a radical innovation. The other angle is to look at the other services as competitors, and the updates that Lokalii has done to the app. Thus, Lokalii can be described as an incremental innovation, because the service can be viewed as a development from existing services, or as an improvement. The personal aspect of the app makes Lokalii different from many other services. The updates can be described as incremental innovations. These improve the app for the users, and the updates help to remove the threshold to book an
experience. Many of the informants mentioned this after they saw the new functions. All these functions make the service feel safer for the users, in addition to making the process of booking an easier experience. This is something that is consistent with an incremental innovation.

Even though Lokalii can be described as both a radical and an incremental innovation, it does not necessarily mean that the service is one of these types of innovations. There is always a way of making a theory fit with a product or a service. Focusing on different aspects of e.g. a service can do this, to point out the aspects that are consistent with the theory. Different aspects of a theory can also be highlighted. This is what has been done through the analysis, and in this discussion. I mean that the updates done to the app can be described as an incremental innovation. Whether the updates in themselves are an innovation, I am not so sure. The updates are logical, and they should be in the app, but they are not unique or revolutionary. Regarding radical innovation, Lokalii can be described as this, because of the uniqueness of the app. There are however many similar services, and some of them offer almost the same concept as Lokalii, such as Nanook, Exploro and Airbnb experiences. It is important to stand out and offer something new, because the market is large. The theories of radical and incremental innovations are often addressed to established companies. This makes it more difficult in terms of relating these theories to Lokalii.

7.3 Disruptive innovation

This section of the discussion will address the topic of disruptive innovation. During the analyzes I have described the principles and points from Christensen’s book The Innovator’s Dilemma, and articles that are relevant to Lokalii. I will go through these principles and points here, and summarize at the end of the section. The reason why I have conducted the discussions in this way is twofold; first, some of the principles and points are not relevant, because they address the theory from an established company point of view. They state how an established company should deal with disruptive innovations, and how they themselves can become disruptors. Second, this is done to show how applicable the theory is on an entrant company, which Lokalii is.
7.3.1 Market

The analysis of disruptive innovation concerned different points from the definition of the theory. These consisted of where Lokalii fits in the market, the cost of experiences and how simple the app is. It was argued that Lokalii can be described as not only an innovation that emerges from a low-end foothold, but also that emerges from a new-market foothold. Lokalii can be described as a service that emerges from the low-end footholds in the market. This is because it offers something different than the established actors in the travel app market; features such as personal, local and eventful. This implies that it targets customers who do not necessarily use typical travel apps. The customers who want to experience the genuine and unique a city can offer. It is important to clarify that there are many tourists who want to experience the typical sights when visiting a city. They have many apps and services to choose from, e.g. TripAdvisor, VisitOSLO and Stay.com. However, there are also a large portion of tourists who want to experience a city like locals do, and they have some apps and services to choose from, such as Nanook, Exploro and Airbnb experiences, and of course Lokalii. For some people, Lokalii might be used as a substitute to other apps. This depends on the tourist, and how different people appreciate to travel. Tourists tend to want to experience more when they are travelling nowadays. This has been shown to be a trend that has flourished in recent years (Fuggle, 2015). This aspect is consistent with Lokalii emerging from the low-end footholds of the market, because there are still the mainstream travel apps (TripAdvisor, VisitOSLO, Stay.com, etc.) are still being used my most travelers. During the focus groups the informants mentioned that these are the apps they normally use.

On the other hand, the informants stated that they believe that Lokalii creates a new market. Because it offers a unique service, based on the functions and features previously addressed, which separates it from other services in the market. Lokalii offers a new marketplace: the app. The marketplace consists of the experiences. Another aspect is that locals, as well as tourists often purchase the experiences. Based on this, Lokalii can turn non-consumers into consumers. This is because locals do not usually use travel apps when experiencing their own city. During the focus groups, the informants mostly referred to the use of travel apps in the context of visiting a new city, because this is when they normally use them. They also discussed how it is important to have a service like this, if they have problems coming up with something fun to do for instance on a Sunday. This implies that the informants want to
use Lokalii to experience the city that they live in. Based on the discussion above, Lokalii can be described as a service that emerges from a new-market foothold.

When focusing on the different aspects of Lokalii, the service can be said to emerge from different footholds in the market. Although the informants said they believe Lokalii creates a new market, I mean that the founders of Lokalii experienced a desire in themselves, and in tourists. This desire was to experience something that is genuine and unique. Based on this, they created Lokalii. My assumption is that Lokalii has emerged from the low-end foothold of the market. Because, at this point Lokalii’s target group is the people who does not want to experience the same as everyone else. Some aspects of the concept are consistent with them emerging from the new-market footholds, because it turns locals into consumers, and it offers a new marketplace (the app). However, the concept is travel and tourism, and the locals are probably not their main customers, at least not when it comes to whom they want to target. It is great that the locals use the app and purchase experiences. The new marketplace creates a market, but it is not viewable in the context of where the service emerges. This principle goes beyond the marketplace in the app, because it concerns the travel app market. Based on the discussion above, I mean that Lokalii has emerged from the low-end footholds in the travel app market.

7.3.2 Cost
A disruptive product or service is usually less expensive than that of established companies. The informants said that most of the experiences were priced fair, but some were insanely expensive. They discussed the cost regarding where Lokalii fits in the market, and person 6 stated “[...] because people are more concerned with local and genuine things, and money is also involved, this is cheaper than renting a guide for Oslo”. The informants participated in the experience “10-minute hand-brewing lesson”, and they thought the cost was fair. They got more coffee than they would have done if they had just ordered one cup, and they got to learn something at the same time. Because the seller determines the price, he or she has to decide what the experience is worth. Lokalii adds a small fee to the cost. It can be argued that the aspect of cost is up to the consumer. The content of the experience is a factor, in addition to what the user think about the cost. If a user really wants to learn how beer is brewed, they will be more willing to pay a higher price, than a person who does not care about learning this. The informants commented on this, and they said that if there is an experience that is
exciting to you, then paying more is not an issue. Of course, the cost can be an issue, but in many cases the content is the deal breaker, as to whether an experience is purchased. The personal aspect also plays a part in this equation, and this is even more difficult to put a price on. The personal aspect can be exemplified with James and Nancy, and their participation in “Akerselva with an inflatable boat”. They developed a relation through the participation; with the host, and his friends, in addition to experience Mathallen, with food and drinks. This aspect can in most cases have a high value, because the user gets relations to another person, which can lead to a friendship. Other travel apps and services do not offer the same experiences, therefore, it is not possible to compare the cost. Some apps do not offer experiences from private individuals at all. Because of this, it is not possible to give a conclusive answer to whether Lokalii is less or more expensive than the other services in the market.

7.3.3 Simplicity

A disruptive innovation is said to be simpler than the services offered by established actors. During this thesis, Lokalii has been updated several times. The informants said that the app was good enough to use, but there is always room for improvement. Lokalii is an easier and simpler service than many of the other travel apps in the market. Apps such as TripAdvisor and VisitOSLO embrace “all” aspects of a trip (hotels, restaurants, sights, architecture, art, and more). Lokalii has a unified concept, which involves local experiences. By implementing several new functions, the app becomes better for the users. The app is simply designed, but it does what it needs to do; it gives the users the opportunity to book an experience. The previous discussion about functions and features shows that the service gives the users what they need. But there are some additional functions that should be implemented over time, to make the service even better. The service is simple, and this is consistent with the theory of disruptive innovation. To be defined as a disruptive innovation, a service must assert themselves in the mainstream market. Lokalii wants everyone to eventually use the app, either by offering an experience, or by purchasing one. If this were to happen, Lokalii would assert themselves in the mainstream market. The tourism trends are changing, and more people want to experience a city like locals. If this trend continues, Lokalii will be an important service provider in the tourism industry. This can be a part of it asserting itself in the mainstream market, and potentially be defined as a disruptive innovation. Another scenario is that they implement more content in the app, so that Lokalii can offer a complete
travel app that offers everything a user needs before, during and after a trip. However, this might make it difficult to separate it from other services.

### 7.3.4 Other principles – disruptive innovation

Christensen gives the reader four principles of why management practices are antiproductive when it comes to developing disruptive technologies, in *The Innovator’s Dilemma*. They are developed for established companies, and they focus on why these companies have a hard time developing disruptive technologies. Because *Lokalii* is an entrant, it means that it (in theory) should not have a problem in developing a disruptive technology. Based on these principles, Christensen’s theory is not well suited for analyzing an entrant company. Rather, it is better to use the principles for analyzing what companies need to do to develop disruptive technologies. In this way, the principles do not give the reader a description of what a disruptive innovation is. This was probably not Christensen’s intention, but he should give a list of principles to this as well. During the analyzes and the discussion, I have used points from Christensen’s article in Harvard Business Review. Christensen used this article to specify and clarify many aspects of his theory. One thing that he drew upon in this article was that the word disruptive is in many cases used wrongly. Many people use the word, and in many cases, they have no knowledge of the theory, and what it consists of. Everyone wants to use the term and the theory, and because of this, it has become a buzzword. The theory is not applicable to all services, but some aspects can be used. This is the case for *Lokalii*, some of the principles and points are relevant, and some are not, I have focused on the ones that are relevant.

### 7.4 Experience design

One of the analyzes involved the theory of experience design in tourism. This theory has many definitions, where most of them include the importance of tourist experiences during a trip. Basically, *Lokalii* fits well with the theory of experience design. The theory involves that tourists should have memorable experiences from a trip. The concept of *Lokalii* is the sharing of experience, and it wants to give the tourists an authentic and real experience of a city. An important aspect of experience design is that it should be personal. All the experiences in *Lokalii* is curated by private individuals, and the user gets to meet people who genuinely want to offer something to other people, otherwise they would not offer an experience. This personal aspect of the theory is consistent with *Lokalii’s* concept. This aspect of *Lokalii* has
been discussed during other sections in this chapter, and the functions and features that have been added via updates, have made the experience of the app better for the users. The important part is, that it will give the user a better experience of a trip.

Norway, and Oslo, are becoming more and more popular travel destinations (Innovasjon Norge, 2016). Because of this, it is important that experience design is implemented in the tourism industry. This is to give the tourists that are visiting Norway a better experience, and a memorable experience. The users of Lokalii gets a memorable adventure, when they participate in an experience. This is because they meet new people, and they get to experience a city like locals do. To meet the expectations that tourists have when visiting Norway, Lokalii must make sure that there are enough experiences located all over the country. By doing so, more people will get to know the service. This is an important point for Lokalii, but also for the tourism industry in Norway. The theory of experience design is probably being used in the planning of tourism for Norway, but Lokalii should be a part of this planning. This is because it offers what the essence of experience design is; memorable and personal experiences.

7.5 Conclusion

This thesis started with the ideal scenario of how an interaction with Lokalii should be. James and Nancy were travelling to Oslo, and they wanted to experience Oslo like locals. By using Lokalii, they got the opportunity to meet locals, and the locals showed them a bit of their Oslo. They participated in the experience “Akerselva with an inflatable boat”. They even got to see Mathallen, and eat and drink with the host and his friends. Because of this, they met new friends, and they got recommendations for other places to visit in Oslo. James and Nancy got to experience what Lokalii is all about; the sharing of experiences. Throughout the thesis, this kind of experience, with Lokalii’s concept, is what has been analyzed. All the aspects of the app have been addressed, from the first page, to the participation in an experience. The informants have taken place in all the different stages of the app. The thesis has enlightened different aspects of the travel industry, apps, and innovation. Lokalii has worked as a case study, where the theories have been put into practice. The unique functions and features have been pointed out, and they have been part of the analyzes. The thesis has dealt with theories and insights from different traditions, but all of which can be connected to tourism, and Lokalii. By conducting several focus groups, I have elucidated topics of human
computer interaction and mobile usability, innovation and experience design. The different theories combined have generated a background for analyzing Lokalii’s concept and the app. Some of the focus in this thesis has been on functions and features of the app. This shows what the users expect from a travel app, and how it best can serve the users. The concept, which has been defined as the sharing of experiences, has been highlighted. As well as the personal aspect that the users experience when using the app. Innovation has been the theory that has been emphasized throughout the thesis. Through the analyzes, I have examined whether the concept of Lokalii can enrich people’s lives when traveling, and as locals, exploring their own city. The informants who were a part of the analyzes, where all acquainted with Oslo, but most of them were born in another city or place. The informants can therefore be defined as locals, but in some ways as tourists too.

7.5.1 Research question

The research question that has been the basis for this thesis is:
How can Lokalii’s concept, with the functions and features of the app, be described as a disruptive innovation?

Regarding disruptive innovation, as the research question concerns, Lokalii can be described to have emerged from the low-end footholds of the market. Because the app offers something that the tourism industry did not have before; a service that targets customers that have not yet found the perfect service. Lokalii’s experiences give the users or buyers a personal touch. They get to meet people and learn or experience something at the same time. It is not possible for me to state that Lokalii can be defined as a disruptive innovation, or that they will be a successful disruptive innovation. It has not been on the market for that long, and the service just recently gotten investors. All the same, Lokalii has many users, and the users buy experiences. However, in spite of this, the answer to the research question is yes, Lokalii can be described as a disruptive innovation based on the analyzes done during the thesis. I have focused on the principles of disruptive innovation that are relatable to Lokalii. These principles have been; market, cost, and simplicity. Under the latter principle, I have included the ability to assert the service in the mainstream market. Lokalii has not done this, and this is the underlying factor as to whether a service can be defined as disruptive. This is however not what has been researched during the thesis. To summarize, Lokalii can be described as a disruptive innovation for three reasons: first, it emerged in the market from the low-end footholds. This means that Lokalii target the customers who do not normally visit the typical
tourist sights. The customers who want to experience a city, like a local. Second, the aspect of cost gave some inconclusive answers. However, according to the informants, Lokalii can be much cheaper than renting a guide. This depends on the content of the experience, and the person purchasing the experience. All in all, Lokalii offer many experiences that are quite reasonable. Third, Lokalii offer a simpler service, and has the ability to become competitive in the mainstream market. This depends on which way the founders of the app want to go. Ruhi stated that they want to reach the whole world, which is consistent with them asserting themselves in the mainstream market. This is only a prediction, at this point. It is something that can be analyzed when Lokalii, potentially, take a bigger share of the market. In the situation, as it is today, Lokalii can work as a supplement to other travel apps. If one were to address the other innovation theories that have been enlightened during the thesis, Lokalii can be described as radical, incremental and disruptive. This conclusion is based on the findings from the focus groups, in addition to how the different innovation theories are defined.

The second part of the research question regards functions and features. These are a big part of the app. The functions that have been focused on during the analyzes are contact me, booking, and information in the app. The features that have been most frequently highlighted are; personal, local, eventful and learning. These functions and features are closely connected. Contact me and the information in the app, are part of generating the personal and human aspect. The booking in the app is what gives the user the opportunity to experience a city like a local. All these functions and features are a part of the concept of Lokalii. Therefore, they are a part of what make it possible to describe Lokalii as a disruptive innovation. Had Lokalii been a service without the app, it would just be a concept without a platform. The functions and features are what make the app, in addition to making the users want to use it. During the focus groups, the functions and features mentioned above were highlighted and discussed by the informants. The informants pointed out that the updates that were implemented in the app between the two focus groups, made the app better, and that they felt safer when booking an experience. The different functions and features are in themselves not revolutionary, rather necessary, because they make the app better and easier for the users. The functions and features alone are not consistent with being described as a disruptive innovation. Rather, they are consistent with being described as an incremental innovation. This is because the updates in themselves are logical, and simple. They make the app better, but they are not new. Similar functions and features can be found in other travel apps.
There is a reason why the word *described* has been used in the research question. *Defined*, could also have been used. The reason why I chose to use *described* is because by doing so, I get the opportunity to focus on different aspects of the theory of disruptive innovation, and different aspects of *Lokalii*. Throughout the thesis, *Lokalii* has been described using Christensen’s theory, and this has allowed me to focus on the parts of the theory that are relatable to *Lokalii*. By describing *Lokalii* as a disruptive innovation, more of the service is brought forth, such as different elements that it contains. To define *Lokalii* as a disruptive innovation would not give any conclusive answer. This is because *Lokalii* has not been on the market for that long. It is therefore not possible to define the service as a disruptive innovation. However, the mainstream market must adopt a service, before it can be defined as disruptive.

### 7.6 Findings

During this thesis, various findings have been discovered. The most prominent findings will be summarized here. It is evident that experiences, especially within tourism, are a growing trend. According to the informants, people are more concerned with experiences that are genuine and local, during a trip. This substantiates the theoretical approaches. Through the analyzes *Lokalii* has been considered from the informants point of view, but also in light of other similar services and apps. This has showed that *Lokalii* is unique as a travel app, if it is compared with most of the aforementioned services and apps. Some are more similar, because the concept is the same. *Lokalii* separates from these services because they offer personal experiences, and many are in Oslo, which have been the focus in this thesis. The difference between *Lokalii’s* concept, functions and features have been concretized. This has given a comprehensive description of what *Lokalii* is, and what aspects the app contains, such as; the personal, the local, the eventful and learning, in addition to specific functions in the app. Some of these functions have emerged during the time span of this thesis, such as the ability to write and read reviews, the “contact me” button, and the extended seller profile. The aspects have been examined during the thesis, and they are also a part of what makes *Lokalii* unique. Because many other travel apps and services do not offer a personal experience where a tourist can meet a local, and experience something together. Another discovery is that many of the innovation theories can be difficult to apply to a new service, because they, in their original state, refer to how established businesses change. However, as
mentioned throughout the thesis, there is always a way of making a theory fit with a case. I have used aspects from the theories, and combined these with aspects from Lokalii, to give a comprehensive image of the service.

In this way, a theory such as disruptive innovation is especially interesting. It is a theory, which has received much criticism over the years after its establishment. The theory has been specified based on this criticism, which is a good thing. This criticism concerns, among other things, that the word disruptive had become a buzzword, which implies that many people use it without having knowledge about the theory. However, a theory should not be too difficult to apply to a product or service. At least not when it is a widespread theory, which the theory of disruptive innovation is. It is a theory that many people have an opinion about. It has been possible to address the theory to Lokalii, but it is not to determine whether Lokalii will become disruptive. This is because of the limitations of the theory. You can get an idea, but as Christensen has described the theory, disruption only occurs when a product or service assert themselves in the mainstream market. So, in a way, it is difficult to describe a product or service as disruptive, before it is adopted by the mainstream market. Because of this, it can be that Lokalii cannot be defined as a disruptive innovation. I cannot give the reason for this, because Lokalii has not asserted the service in the mainstream market. I mean that Lokalii contain elements which is consistent with a disruptive innovation. Disruptive innovation is an interesting theory, with elements that separate it from other innovation theories. Such as focusing on entrant companies, where the services are meant to be something that changes the market, less expensive, and simpler than other providers. Other innovation theories tend to focus on changes within established businesses. However, I think that the theory can in some cases be too narrow. Sometimes it can be difficult to describe or define something as a disruptive innovation, because a service must meet various requirements that is set by the theory.

7.6.1 Media innovation
Media innovation has not been the primary focus during the thesis. Regardless of this, Lokalii can be connected to the discipline. Media is a term that holds many definitions, and I mean that Lokalii can be described as a medium, because it facilitates a market place where the exchange of communication occurs. The different theories, in the thesis, combined, connect tourism to the discipline of media innovation. Apps, and especially travel apps, can be
viewed as media. They convey offers, and they put people in contact with others. Their communication is not supposed to reach many people at a time, but one to one. The important aspect is that travel apps convey communication. Lokalii especially is a good example of this. It offers communication with other people in the app, via the communication in the description of the experiences, by giving the users the ability to contact the sellers, and by offering experiences that can be booked, where people physically have to meet. Media innovation involves changes that are made to different types of products or services, within the media landscape. Generally, the traditional media are involved in innovation through newspapers, television, radio, etc. Changes that are made to these types of media, can often involve the development of apps. In this case, the app can be the innovation, such as when different television channels chose to offer their content through an app.

The 4Ps and one S have been addressed through the thesis. The various types of innovation were laid out in the theoretical chapter. The second analysis described these different types in comparison to Lokalii. Social innovation was one type that fit best with Lokalii’s concept. This is because Lokalii facilitates a meeting between people, and by doing so, it can give the user a better experience of a city or place. During the analysis, it became evident that the 4Ps and one S could also be connected to established media companies. This is because they often involve changes that actually happen within these kinds of companies; such as the transition from printed newspapers to online newspapers, linear television to streaming services, etc. This is generally the tendency with many of the innovation theories. They focus on traditional companies, which are established. To compare them with an entrant company makes is more difficult because their principles are, in many cases, not transferable. The field of media innovation is constantly changing, which is good and necessary. It is a field where companies are rapidly developing new services, technologies, and products. Because of this, it is necessary that the theories include all these new types of communication platforms. With the emergence of the smartphone, apps are an inevitable aspect. Many of these apps are not relevant in the field of media innovation, because they do not generate communication between people. But there are also many apps that do so. The field of media innovations must address these kinds of services because they are a natural extension of the Internet and other media. They are already changing, and keeping up with other new services. So, there is no reason why media innovations should not grasp more services. I mean that travel apps can be connected to the discipline of media innovation, and that these types of apps should be implemented in the discipline.
7.6.2 Lokalii

During this thesis, several updates to Lokalii has been carried out. Some of these updates were done after I gave feedback to Lokalii, from the focus groups. Examples of these updates are the implementation of the possibility to contact the seller, and more information about the seller. These updates have been discussed during the thesis. After the focus groups, some alterations that the informants discussed have also been added. Lokalii has changed the “request booking” button, to “check availability”. Photographs of some of the experiences that the team behind Lokalii has participated in, has been added to the app. The most important thing that has been done is that Lokalii has made a mini-series where a person tries different experiences, and these are posted on Facebook. An illustration of this can be viewed in figure 16. On May 2nd, 2017, Lokalii released a new version of the app (0.9.50), which included the option to locate experiences near the user. This is something that the informants discussed, and suggested that Lokalii should implement in the app. The “nearby” function has been emphasized through this thesis, because it is a function that makes the app work better for the users, in addition to making it more personal. This update is shown in the app upfront, where Lokalii tells the users about the new function, and how to use it (Lokalii AS, 2017).

The app has been changed; functions and features have been added, during the time span of this thesis. It is good to see that Lokalii is constantly changing, to give the users a better experience of the app. It will be interesting to follow the further development of Lokalii, and to among others see if more of the functions and features that the informants wanted will be implemented in the app.

7.7 Concluding remarks

7.7.1 Limitations and further research

There is always something that could have been done differently with a research project, or something that could have been done if one had more time. As it is with this thesis. One thing that could have generated more data was if the second focus group had had more participants. However, the amount of data that I got through the focus group, has generated a lot of information about Lokalii. It would also have been interesting to use a different method, e.g. a user test, to see if that could generate different findings. In this case, the focus of the thesis would have changed a bit, but many of the theoretical approaches could have been used. This is something that can be suggested as further research. If I had more time, I would have done
a more thorough analysis of the various apps in the travel market. This could give an even broader image on where Lokalii stands in this market. The focus in this thesis has been on Lokalii, and other apps in Oslo. By doing a more extensive analysis, other cities could also have been addressed.

There are various studies that can be done on the subjects presented during this thesis. Other innovation theories can be addressed, to identify which theory that fits with Lokalii. Focus on radical and incremental innovation theories could deduce this. It would also be interesting to do a thorough examination of how different apps are represented in the field of media innovation, and if this is something that should be emphasized more. An interesting focus would be to view travel apps, as suggested above, as media innovations. To do a more extensive study of how these kinds of apps can both be described as media innovation, and how the field of media innovation can include these apps in the discipline. A study on how travel habits have changed, and how people are adapting new services, such as travel apps, would be interesting to see. The focus could be on the psychological aspects of why people tend to want more personalized services, and experience more of a city.
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Interview guide – first focus group:

Welcome/Introduction:
Good evening, and welcome. Thank you for taking time to come here, to talk about Lokalii. My name is Ida Marie Helgetveit, and I am writing my master’s thesis here at Forskningsparken. This focus group will mainly concern topics that I want to highlight through my thesis. Some of the questions will also be interesting for Lokalii. You have all been asked here because you answered a survey from Lokalii.

Ground rules:
Before we start, I will lay out some ground rules for the discussion. There are no correct or wrong answers, and it is normal that you will have different opinions regarding the different topics that will be discussed. Just share your opinions, even though they contradict or mean.
I will audio record this focus group, so that I do not miss any of your comments. I will not use your names in my thesis, and all personal information about you will be anonymized. When the thesis is delivered, the audio recording will be deleted. I am interested in hearing the opinion from each one of you, and I might direct a question to one of you. It is just to discuss among each other during the focus group. I am here to ask questions, and to listen. Just take coffee, soda, and cookies during the discussion.

Questions – divided into categories:
Test the Lokalii app for a couple of minutes, to get to know the app better.

Background/Introductory:
- Where are you born, where do you live and what is your age?
- What is your relation to travelling?
- Do you have a favorite place to travel?
- Do you use apps when travelling?
- Why do you use apps when travelling?
- Which apps do you prefer to use, and why these?
- What do you expect from a travel app? Is it certain functions that it should contain?

Lokalii:
- What impression are you left with after trying the app?
- What do you think is the purpose of the app?
- What do you think that the concept of the app is? Try to explain what the concept is.
- What kind of market is there for Lokalii?

Functions and features:
- What do you think about the features that the app offers?
- Do you miss any functions or features? Which?
- Could you use the service as it is today?
  - If no: What could be different?
  - If yes: Why?
- Would you feel assured if you purchased an experience? Why yes/no?
- Now to some questions regarding Oslo.
- How do the concept fit with Oslo?
- Do you think that many tourists would use Lokalii? Why yes/no?
- Do Lokalii appeal to locals in Oslo? Why yes/no?

Innovation:
- What similar apps do you know?
- What do you think about apps such as these?
- Do Lokalii replace an existing market?
  - What kind of market do they replace?
- Do Lokalii create a new market?
- What do you think about the pricing of the experiences?
- Who do you think will use the app?
- Is this a concept for everyone, or only for someone?

Marketing:
- How do you think that you would discover the app?
- How can more people get to know the app?
- What would cause you to share information about the app? (to friends and family).

Closing:
- Is there anything that you would add?
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Interview guide – the second focus group:

Introduction:
This is the second focus group that you are participating in, and today, the focus will be on the experience that we just participated in. Some of the questions will be recognized from the previous focus group, but most of them are new. As with the previous group session, do not be afraid to say something, and it is good that you discuss among each other. It is just to ask if there is something that you are wondering about.

Questions – divided into categories:

The app:
- How did you locate the experience in the app?
- What do you think about the booking solution?
- What do you think about the payment solution?
- What are your overall impression of the app – from opening it, to purchasing an experience?
- What do you think about the feedback that was given after you purchased the experience?

“10-minute hand-brewing lesson”:
- How was the experience considering the price you payed?
- Do you have any comments regarding how the set-up of the experience was?
- Do you want to try more experiences from Lokalii? Why yes/no?
- Are there any particular experiences that should be offered?
- Is there anything that you want to add about the experience?

Innovation:
- What do you think about the cost of the experience? Regarding what similar experiences cost?
- After testing the app more, and participating in an experience – what do you think about the market in Oslo for Lokalii?
- How would you describe the market that Lokalii is entering, is it an existing market, or do they create a market?
- Can Lokalii change the market in Oslo? Why yes/no?
- What do you think about Lokalii’s future?

Closing comments/Functions and features:
- Do you have any thoughts regarding the functions of the app?
- What do you think about the new “contact me”-button? (test this).
- Do you have any new thoughts regarding the concept of the app?
- How do you think that Lokalii can reach out to more potential users?
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Interview guide – Pouria Ruhi:

Introduction:
Thank you for participating in this interview. I want to ask you some questions regarding Lokalii and how the idea of Lokalii emerged. There will also be some questions that can be directly connected to my thesis. It is just to ask questions if you are wondering about something.

The idea:
- How did you come up with the idea of Lokalii?
- What was the initial idea about the concept?
- Has this changed?

Lokalii:
- How did Lokalii emerge?
- How did you assemble the team?

Innovation/Methods:
- Do you see Lokalii as an innovation? Why yes/no?
- Was Lokalii created as an innovation? Disruptive innovation? Innovation methods?
- Do Lokalii enter an existing market?
- Did you use different methods in the creation of Lokalii?
- Have you used any design methods in the creation?

Numbers:
- How many users do you have?
- How many experiences do you sell?
- Has this increased after you changed something, maybe in the app?

The future:
- What is the future of Lokalii?
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Forespørsel om deltagelse i forskningsprosjekt:

The app based tourism industry in Oslo
- In collaboration with Lokalii

Bakgrunn og formål

Informantene til denne studien er trukket ut etter å ha besvart en spørreundersøkelse i regi av Lokalii. Informantene har selv uttrykket et ønske om at de ønsker å delta i en fokusgruppe.

Hva innebærer deltagelse i studien?

Hva skjer med informasjonen om deg?
Alle personopplysninger vil bli behandlet konfidensielt. De som vil ha tilgang til personopplysninger er meg (studenten) og veilederen av masteroppgaven. Personopplysningene og opptakene vil bli lagret på min personlige datamaskin, som er passordbeskyttet. De vil ikke bli lagret sammen med resten av datamaterialet.

Deltagerne i studien vil ikke kunne gjenkjennes i publikasjonen.


Frivillig deltakelse
Det er frivillig å delta i studien, og du kan når som helst trekke ditt samtykke uten å oppgi noen grunn. Dersom du trekker deg, vil alle opplysninger om deg bli anonymisert.

Dersom du ønsker å delta eller har spørsmål til studien, ta kontakt med Ida Marie Helgetveit, telefonnummer 41469090. Kontaktoplysninger til veileder: Gunnar Liestøl, telefonnummer 22850439.

Studien er meldt til Personvernombudet for forskning, NSD - Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS.
Samtykke til deltakelse i studien

Jeg har mottatt informasjon om studien, og er villig til å delta

(Signert av prosjektdeltaker, dato)
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Samtykkeerklæring for videoopptak:

Hva innebærer deltagelse i studien:
Deltagerne vil ikke kunne bli identifisert i forskningsprosjektet, de vil bli anonymisert. Videoopptaket vil kun bli brukt til sitater og eventuelle reaksjoner for en analyse i forskningsprosjektet.

Hva skjer med informasjonen om deg?
Alle personopplysninger vil bli behandlet konfidensielt. De som vil ha tilgang til personopplysninger er meg (studenten) og veilederen av masteroppgaven. Personopplysningene og opptakene vil bli lagret på min personlige datamaskin, som er passordbeskyttet. De vil ikke bli lagret sammen med resten av datamaterialet.

Deltagerne i studien vil ikke kunne gjenkjennes i publikasjonen.


Frivillig deltakelse
Det er frivillig å delta i studien, og du kan når som helst trekke ditt samtykke uten å oppgi noen grunn. Dersom du trekker deg, vil alle opplysninger om deg bli anonymisert.

Dersom du ønsker å delta eller har spørsmål til studien, ta kontakt med Ida Marie Helgetveit, telefonnummer 41469090. Kontaktopplysninger til veileder: Gunnar Liestøl, telefonnummer 22850439.

Studien er meldt til Personvernombudet for forskning, NSD - Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS.

Samtykke til deltakelse i studien med videoopptak

Jeg har mottatt informasjon om studien, og er villig til å delta

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
(Signert av prosjektdeltaker, dato)
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Forespørsel om deltagelse i forskningsprosjekt:

The app based tourism industry in Oslo
- In collaboration with Lokalii

Bakgrunn og formål

Hva innebærer deltagelse i studien?
Deltagelsen i denne studien innebærer at du vil bli intervjuet om Lokalii. Intervjuet vil være semi-struktureret. Du som jobber i Lokalii vil sitte på nye relevant informasjon i forbindelse med forskningsprosjektet. Intervjuet vil bli tatt opp med lydopptaker.

Hva skjer med informasjonen om deg?
Alle opplysninger vil bli behandlet konfidentielt. De som vil ha tilgang til personopplysninger er meg (studenten) og veilederen av masteroppgaven. Personopplysningene og opptakene vil bli lagret på min personlige datamaskin, som er passordbeskyttet. De vil ikke bli lagret sammen med resten av datamaterialet.


Frivillig deltakelse
Det er frivillig å delta i studien, og du kan når som helst trekke ditt samtykke uten å oppgi noen grunn. Dersom du trekker deg, vil alle opplysninger om deg bli anonymisert.

Dersom du ønsker å delta eller har spørsmål til studien, ta kontakt med Ida Marie Helgetveit, telefonnummer 41469090. Kontaktopplysninger til veileder: Gunnar Liestøl, telefonnummer 22850439.

Studien er meldt til Personvernombudet for forskning, NSD - Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS.
Samtykke til deltakelse i studien

Jeg har mottatt informasjon om studien, og er villig til å delta

(Signert av prosjektdeltaker, dato)
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