

dmi:ADMC 2020 
IMPACT THE FUTURE BY DESIGN
Academic Design Management Conference

The 22nd dmi: Academic
Design Management
Conference Proceedings

3-7 AUGUST 2020
VIRTUAL FORMAT
WWW.DMI.ORG/ADMC

dmi: A | D | M | C

This conference proceedings version was produced on 22 July 2020

Production assistance by **Sophia Jaber**i, Designer Admin, Design Management Institute

©2020 DMI and the Authors. All rights reserved

ISSN – The ISSN application for these proceedings is in process. We will update this space soon.

Published by the Design Management Institute
24 Thorndike Street, 2nd Floor
Cambridge, MA 02141
USA

The Design Management Institute (DMI) is an international membership organization that connects design to business, to culture, to customers— and to the changing world. Founded in 1975, DMI brings together educators, researchers, designers, and leaders from every design discipline, every industry, and every corner of the planet to facilitate transformational organizational change and design driven innovation. DMI focuses its mission in three areas: education, design valuation and connection.

The 21st DMI: Academic Design Management Conference Impact the Future by Design was organized by DMI

LEGAL NOTICE: The publisher is not responsible for the use which might be made of the following information.

Conference Organization

Carole Bilson, President, DMI

Chris Hancock, ADMC 2020 Conference Program Coordinator

DMI Board of Directors

Kevin Bethune, (Chair, DMI Board), *Founder & Chief Creative Officer, dreams • design + life*

Carole Bilson, *President Design Management Institute*

Michael Gallagher, (Vice Chair, DMI Board), *Vice President, Design, Crown Equipment Co.*

Jerry Kathman, (Treasurer), *Emeritus DMI Board Chair; Chairman, LPK*

Betsy Goodrich, (Secretary), *VP/Co-Founder, MANTA Product Development Inc.*

Iain Aitchison (Chair, DMI Advisory Council), *Founder Graft Ltd.*

Mauro Porcini, SVP, Chief Design Officer, Pepsico

Bob Schwartz, Emeritus DMI Board Chair; Former VP, Global Design & UX, GE Healthcare

Ernesto Quinteros, Chief Design Officer, Johnson & Johnson

DMI Founder

William J. Hannon, Professor Emeritus, Massachusetts College of Art and Design

CONFERENCE TRACK CO-CHAIRS

1. Design Research-Led Innovation

Eric Anderson, Associate Professor, Carnegie Mellon University (USA)

Hillary Carey, PhD student, Carnegie Mellon University (USA)

Philip Ely, Discipline Lead, Design Futures, Curtin University (Australia)

Ninela Ivanova PhD, Innovation Fellow, Royal College of Art (UK)

Holger Fricke, Professor, HAWK University of Applied Sciences and Arts (Germany)

Robert Luke, Vice President, Research & Innovation, OCAD University (Canada)

2. Design in the Digital Environment

Pia Tamminen, Principal Research Scientist, HAMK University of Applied Sciences (Finland)

Loredana Di Lucchio, Full Professor, Sapienza University of Rome (Italy)

3. Design for the Public Good

Beatrice Joger, Professor (Full), Arch. PhD Habil., "Ion Mincu" University of Architecture and Urban Planning (Romania)

Rebecca Kelly, Assistant Professor, Syracuse University: VPA, School of Design (USA)

Preeti Shroff - Mehta, Dean, MICA Institute, Ahmedabad (India)

4. Design Leadership

Travis Brown, Senior Executive Assistant Dean, Indiana University (USA)

Fei Fan, Associate Professor, Tongji University (China)

Yujin Kim PhD, Professor, Kongju National Univ. (South Korea)

Ki-Young Nam, Associate Professor, KAIST (South Korea)

Sunghee Ahn, Assistant Professor, Hongik University (South Korea)

Özlem Er, Professor Dr. Head of Department, Istanbul Bilgi University (Turkey)

5. Business - Design and Design Management for Economic Growth

Hilary Jane Collins, Lecturer, The Open University (UK)

Wei Liu, Programme Director, Aston University (UK)

Ian Parkman, Associate Professor, University of Portland (USA)

Beatriz Itzel Cruz Megchun, Assistant Professor of Innovation and Design, University of Portland (USA)

6. Open Track for papers that do not directly fit themed tracks

Tod Corlett, Director of Industrial Design Programs, Thomas Jefferson University (USA)

Mary McBride, Chair and Full Professor, Design Management Graduate Program, Pratt Institute (USA)

Hyunyim Park, Doctoral Researcher, Royal College of Art (UK)

Amy O'Keefe, Studio Director, Segal Design Institute at Northwestern University (USA)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TRACK 1: Design Research-Led Innovation

- 20 **A Framework of Integrated Design Process to Achieve Efficient Design of Complex Equipment**
Jianping Luo, Wei Liu, Songhe Ye
- 31 **A Systematic Thinking Design Research Approach Combining the ConOps with Design Scenario – Use Commercial Cislunar Space Development Project as an Example**
Sheng-Hung Lee, John Rudnik, Chaiwoo Lee, Shabnam Fakhr Hosseini, Olivier L. de Weck, Joseph F. Coughlin, Jonathan Chapman
- 43 **ARCTA – Building a Design-and-Art-Driven Accelerator for Sustainable and Meaningful Business in the North**
Heikki Samuel Ahola, Jari Tapio Rinne, Melanie Augusta Sarantou, Satu Anneli Miettinen
- 55 **Bridging Gaps in Academic Product Innovation Processes**
Tod Corlett
- 64 **Dealing with changing environments: prototyping practices in organisations**
Jan-Maarten in 't Veld, Niya Stoimenova
- 75 **Design for enabling bottom-up creative thinking in organisations through shaping the workplace**
Xue Pei, Daniela Maurer, Francesco Zurlo
- 85 **Design Thinking: From Interdisciplinary Perspective**
Jianping Luo, Jun Cai, Tanqiu Li, Shengyu Huang
- 96 **Development of data-based personas for user-centered design of the connected home**
Chaiwoo Lee, John Rudnik, Maryam FakhrHosseini, Sheng-Hung Lee, Joseph F. Coughlin
- 108 **Exploring Communication and Collaboration in Two Multi-Stakeholder Design Thinking Tracks**
Claudia Louisa Adriana van den Boom, Rens. G. A. Brankaert, Yuan Lu
- 119 **From Self-Advocacy to Public History: Building Collaborative Capacity among Remote Communities**
Neha Mann, Brooke Brandewie
- 136 **Innovating with People: creating an Inclusive Design publication and toolkit**
Onny Eikhaug, Rama Gheerawo
- 148 **Integrating Systems Thinking and Drawing Methodological Strategies to Visualize a New Future**
Brigid Patricia O'Kane

Design for enabling bottom-up creative thinking in organisations through shaping the workplace

Xue PEI^a, Daniela MAURER^a and Francesco ZURLO^a

^a Design Department, Politecnico di Milano;

The role of the working environment on the wellbeing of employees and on companies' performances has been analysed and studied. It is noticed that a good workplace could actively support employees to be active, motivated and collaborative. But, how to shape the workplace through balancing the needs from employees and the company still remains open. Is there an approach that could guide this explorative investigation? Nowadays, companies are increasingly applying design (thinking), as an effective problem-solving method, to dealing with internal and external issues, and studies in this realm have started to pay attention to the employee's engagement in organisational change and development. Therefore, considering the workplace as an touchpoint of the organisation, this paper aims at understanding the relations between workplace and design thinking practice in organisations: how they interact with each other and how employees could benefit from their interplay? From interviewing companies from different sectors, the research has identified four initial findings, illustrating the workplace and design thinking implementations could collaboratively foster an innovation culture in the organisation.

Keywords: *Design thinking, design in organisation; workplace; employee engagement*

Introduction

In order to cope with the constantly changing market conditions, companies need to be resilient, reinventing and innovative. This requires companies and businesses to follow and integrate principles from science, humanity and also design, the importance of which has been revealed by a number of scholars (Buchanan, 2001; Romme, 2003; Boland & Collopy, 2004; Junginger, 2009; Barry, 2016). Companies are increasingly showing their interests in applying design thinking methods and tools to dealing with internal and external issues they are facing, especially those relevant to create innovations. Studies have demonstrated that the workplace plays an important role in fostering innovative behaviours that require a physical and social environment supporting the development and implementation of new ideas, products, strategies, and systems (Hogan & Coote, 2014). And employee engagement is correlated with workplace satisfaction and the possibility to control over where and how to work (e.g. self-regulation, territoriality).

Considering the workplace as a “lens” to identify interpersonal and relational processes (Khazanchi, Sprinkle, Masterson, Tong, 2018), this paper begins with the aim to understand the relationship between workplace and design thinking in organisations, trying to better identify how they interplay between each other. This research will treat workspace as a design “artefact” of the organisation, where environment conditions, layout setting and furniture are physical touchpoints to how an organisation looks like. More importantly, we would like to better understand if the workplace is able to play a strategic role in motivating and engaging individual employees through shaping behaviours and actions. If yes, how does it work?

The second part of this paper starts with literature review on two main realms. Firstly, a study on the role and impact of the workplace on companies with a focus on the relation with employees. A summary of employees’ needs at work and how they relate to organisational development goals have been identified. Secondly, a review of studies on why design thinking is commonly used at different organisational levels has been done. Papers collected from these two areas have created the basic knowledge and indications to elaborate the questions for the following step. Afterwards, semi-structured interviews have been conducted to gather first-hand data and information of three selected cases, in which companies have told in detail their experiences in implementing design thinking and the impacts on shaping their workplaces. Questions have been categorised in three sub-topics: i) objectives of implementing design thinking (why); ii) approaches and results of their experiences iii) impacts on employees and the work environments. Eventually, the research uncovers four main insights to answer the research questions defined at the beginning. The findings have demonstrated roles that the workplace could play to facilitate changes in organisations driven by a design thinking approach, such as ways of working in projects, closer relationship with clients, employees’ engagement on adopting a new approach and mindset, and being the trigger to changes from the organizational core assumption.

Theoretical background

We divided the literature review in two sections: the first explores the impact of the workplace on employees’ wellbeing and job satisfaction; and the second focuses on the different level of adoption of Design Thinking in the organization.

The impact of workplace on organisations and employees

The role of the working environment on the wellbeing of the employee has been analysed for decades (Horr & Arif, 2017; Maier & Fadel, 2009). The studies have mainly focused on how the space can be designed to encounter his physical needs and therefore to foster efficiency. However, if we look at today's employees’ needs, we have to consider that wellbeing can be accomplished not only through the satisfaction of physical conditions. The employee is a human person with psychological needs and desires. Needs satisfaction is the necessary condition for employees to perform well, which subsequently could help to improve organizational performance. (Appel-Meulenbroek & Kools, 2019). Moreover, studies have demonstrated the role of the workplace in fostering innovative behaviours that require both physical and social environments supporting the development and implementation of new ideas, products, strategies, and systems (Hogan & Coote, 2014).

Needs of employees can be categorized in physical, functional, psychological ones (Vischer, 2006), which lead to decide specific elements of the working environment design (Budie, 2019). Physical needs are associated with ambient factors, like climate and visual comfort, and the control over them in terms of personalization and adjustment to personal preferences. Functional needs are communication and concentration, and the environment can support proximity and accessibility of co-workers for communication but opposite for concentration.

Psychological needs are not work-related but equally important because they consider the personal sphere of the employee and can affect the satisfaction of the working environment. These needs are competence, autonomy and relatedness (Deci, Ryan, 2000), which can be reached when the space fosters social interaction, privacy, territoriality, personalization, status expression and aesthetics (Budie, 2019). In particular, studies have underlined the relationship between personalization of space and employee commitment, that is indirectly affected by organizational culture. More the organization gives the employee opportunity for self-expression, higher is the level of commitment that can be reached: Meyer and Allen call it Affective Commitment (1991). The fulfilment of psychological needs is furthermore important nowadays, since employees are demanding more from their working environment, looking for job satisfaction. Work is seen not only as a source of income: it has to have meaning and bring enjoyment in the life of a person. Harter (2017) goes even beyond, introducing in the discussion topics like the employees' need of purpose and identity '... the new workforce is looking for things like purpose, opportunities to develop, ongoing conversations, a coach rather than a boss ... They see work and life as interconnected, and they want their job to be a part of their identity'. It's a demand of identification of the person's value into the organization, a demand of belonging and being part of a community, a need that is endemic to the human being. (McMillan, D. W., & Chavis, D. M. 1986).

Communities are based on relationships: the more eased and smooth these relationships are, the better the community performs. In organization these relationships are defined as social capital. According to Prusak and Cohen (2001) they can be improved through enabling connections, giving people time and space to bond, enabling trust and fostering cooperation. Community in a workplace can be seen as an interconnected ecosystem of design and people (La Pietra, Rowell 2019), where the design of the space collaborates with a layer of human connection.

In fact, design of the workspace alone cannot foster a sense of community: the organizations that performed well are the ones that are considering the design of the employee experience too. Look at existing case studies of working environments in innovative organizations (e.g. Wework and Steelcase), new spatial characteristics can be observed: multiple options like open spaces, meeting rooms of different sizes, communal gathering informal spots, small cosy rooms fostering concentration. Solutions that borrow languages and styles from the domestic world, proposing an atmosphere in which the user can easily feel comfortable. The new workspaces are offering an ecosystem of options (Zurlo, 2016) that gives back to the user a role in choosing, individually or collectively, how to configure the scene of its working environment, choosing the space that suits more his needs.

Some organizations' cultures are more willing to accept this type of workspaces that affect the physiological needs of the employee than others, in particular, the ones that Cameron and Quinn (1999) named as Clan Organization and Adhocracy Organization. The first one is characterised by collaboration, teamwork, open communication, empowerment and leaders that operate as mentors. While the Adhocracy organization may frequently be found in creative industries, characterised by adaptability, flexibility, and creativity where uncertainty, ambiguity, and information overload are typical. These types of organization are likely the ones that perform an agile methodology and have been experiencing Design Thinking practices.

Design Thinking in Organisations: purpose and approach

Companies all over the world are increasingly showing their interest in Design Thinking theories and practices, which originated from how designers think and work. Both in academic and practical fields, it is very difficult to give a definition to Design Thinking, instead, articles, reports and discussions on this term are growing bigger, wider and confusing. On the one hand, this phenomena is actively enabling scholars, practitioners with different backgrounds and expertise to contribute; on the other hand, there's a lack of shared consensus to take this discourse in depth including different perspectives, approaches and terminologies.

Companies are implementing and practising design thinking for diverse reasons and objectives. As a cognitive way of seeing and dealing with problems, one of the main features of design thinking is the capability to creatively solve problems by creating unexpected and compelling solutions (Carlgren et al. 2016; Dorst, 2010). Therefore, design thinking has mainly been considered as a competitive resource to foster innovation (Martin, 2009; Brown, 2009) that impact at the four different levels and orders (Buchanan, 2001): graphic; physical product; service, process and system and organisation's internal culture (Deserti & Rizzo, 2014; Elsbach & Stigliani, 2018). And many contributions of design (thinking) for companies have been identified quantitatively on the improvement of business. This explains why design thinking entered the business realm and gained so much attention. However, what design thinking brought to companies is definitely beyond their business performance. The values of implementing design thinking also influence companies' soft and intangible performance. One well-acknowledged point is that design thinking could promote an adoption of new mindset and practical tools to involve employees in

shaping an innovative culture inside the company (Kelley & Kelley, 2013; Sato et al., 2010) and to change their conventional attitude to deal with problems. These impacts might not be easily observed when design thinking practices are carried out for a short period, and the impacts could hardly be measured and linked to the company’s financial performance. However, these changes, even the minor ones, are worthy to study in depth through well-structured investigation to demonstrate their impact on the organisational culture (table 1).

Table 1 Main contributions of Design Thinking for companies and business.

| Topics | Main contents | Main references |
|---|--|--|
| Financial performance and economic purpose of business | A systematic approach to design support a sustainable financial performance in long-term. | Swan, Kotabe & Allred, 2005; Bedford et al., 2006; Design Council, 2007; Dell’Era & Verganti, 2009; Gemser, Candi & van den Ende, 2011 |
| New business opportunities and customer segment | Design (thinking) has been used as a strategic resource for identifying new opportunities on the market. | Inns, 2002; Utterback et al., 2006; Martin, 2009; Liedtka, 2011; Dorst, 2016 |
| Distinguished offerings (products, services, experiences) | Creation of compelling offerings that could help companies to win among other competitors. | Borja de Mozota, 2003; Dunne & Martin, 2006; Brown, 2008; Fraser, 2009; Beverland et al., 2016; |
| Iterative experimentation and fast test | Learning by doing experience, to fail often and soon. | Brown, 2008; Lockwood, 2009; Rylander, 2009; Mckinsey & company, 2018; Sato et al., 2010; |
| Engagement employees in collaboration during the process | Motivate and actively involve employees in participating creative actions and exercises. | Kelly & Kelly, 2015; Dell’Era et al. 2020 |
| Branding as creative companies | Adding values to the brand and company to attract talents and investments | Dunne, 2019; |
| Social good | Good for all the society | Design Council et al. 2013; Brown & Wyatt; 2010 |
| Organisational learning and culture | Shaping an innovative culture (e.g. facilitating learning) inside the companies | Boland & Collopy, 2004; Deserti & Rizzo, 2014; Elsbach& Stigliani, 2018; |

Moving from the first order to the fourth order of design, the objects that design (thinking) practices dealing with are becoming less visible but more essential to the assumption of an organisation. This challenges the shared acknowledgement of the strategic values of design thinking. Besides, it also pushes designers and design thinkers to search for methods and channels to communicate their efforts and achievements. Leveraging organisational changes through design (thinking) practices have been suggested by scholars. Junginger (2007) have pinpointed the approach of human-centered product development could transform the organizational environment in which this product is embedded. Junginger and Sangiorgi (2009) then proposed a framework on the possibility of utilizing service design to generate and implement internal changes within an organization. Both of these two concepts are pinpointing the importance of involving tangible touchpoints relevant to organisational norms and behaviors (Rousseau, 1992; Schein, 1993) in achieving intangible changes at the core. In order to develop companies’ new offerings, the internal aspect, the backstage, needs to collaboratively reorganize and adapt itself to changes required from the periphery (artefacts) of the organisation - new products, services and other kinds of offerings on the market. Another crucial touchpoint for leveraging this change has not been well studied is the context that all employees are staying and working day by day: the workplace. Very few researches and articles from the academic area could be found.

Following the studies of importance of the workplace for companies and the design thinking approach to trigger organisational change, the hypothesis is that a workplace, as a touchpoint to leverage organisational change, could be considered as a factor that impacts the implementing design thinking practices in companies. The research question will focus on: how the workplace could impact the strategic values of design thinking for the company

(positively or negatively), especially on the ways to engage and motivate employees. And how does the working environment in organisations should be properly set or designed? How does it relate to other working tasks and routines?

Research methodology

The aim of this research is to investigate how the workspace can affect the application and implementation of design thinking in organizations and the relation with employees' behaviour at work. And if both design thinking paradigm and the workplace could concurrently foster the engagement of the employee towards forming an innovation culture? Therefore an exploratory case study methodology was planned, in order to obtain insights from real experiences and best practices run in the organizations.

Empirical setting

From an empirical perspective, we have identified 3 cases that apply the design thinking paradigm inside the organisations. They are three different typologies of organizations and from two different industries: the Furniture industry and the Finance and Insurance industry. Companies in the Furniture industry by nature have "design" at the core of their offerings: they design products in relationship with the space, the design culture is used not only for problem solving but also as a mindset to lead the company. Therefore we can assume that companies in the furniture industry have rich experiences, knowledge and unique insights in exploring the strategic values of design (thinking) in relation to diverse physical aspects (e.g. the workplace). Nevertheless, Design Thinking is most applied and is increasing its presence in the finance and insurance sector according to the research results of Observatory on Design Thinking for Business (2019). Companies in this industry have service at the core of their offerings and they are not traditionally linked to the design culture. The analysis of organizations from both industries can provide emerging signals on how design thinking is differently adopted, and therefore how it influences the design of and employees' experience in the workplace.

Three cases that have been interviewed and studied are:

- Doing, a design consultancy on service and UX design, and now it is part of Capgemini group.
- Illimity, an innovative digital bank in the private sector.
- Steelcase, a leading international furniture company specialized in the office sector.

We selected and identified the case studies among a list of organizations based on industrial association, digital innovation observatories and secondary resources (mainly websites), selecting only the organizations that provide services/product explicitly based on design thinking. We excluded micro enterprises and freelance consultants that are not structured enough to have a recognizable methodology in the application of design thinking and spaces properly designed to welcome design thinking practices. (in particular freelance consultants mainly work at client workplace, therefore they have no or limited control on the space settings).

Data collection

We mainly conducted three semi-structured interviews to get first-hand data. In the interviews, we have discussed the experiences of design thinking practices and the role of working space inside their companies. The interviewees have been done with senior UX or service designers together with managers in charge of marketing or research, which gives us access to people that are at the frontline promoting the design culture and applying design thinking within the companies and with their external clients.

Each interview involving 2 researchers lasted on an average of 1.5 hours. And all the interviews were recorded and transcript in text. We applied a research protocol structured in five main sections:

- General information: aims at collecting information on the company (dimension, age) the offering, the organization of the work, on the employee professional background (capabilities and competences).
- Design thinking adoption: aims at collecting information about the familiarity with design thinking in the organization, the strategy and the experience in its adoption, the structure of the team dedicated to design thinking projects, the initiative aimed at absorbing / diffusing design thinking.
- Workspace characteristics: aims at collecting information regarding the spaces where daily activities and design thinking practices are held, noticing differences and communalities, focussing on tangible and intangible characteristics. In the case of the service design agency, we collected information about the organization space and the client spaces where commonly design thinking workshops are held.

- Community engagement: aims at collecting information about the influence of design thinking practice and of the workplace experience on the engagement of the employee (relationships among colleagues, sense of belonging and being part of a community).
- Smart working: aims at collecting information about the impact of the remote working on the employee engagement (distance relationships with colleagues, absence of a common physical space, new rituals).

Data collection

Two researchers analysed each case. Based on the interviews transcript, we examined factual elements with the aim of identifying commonalities and differences in the adoption of design thinking and its application in the workplace and therefore the different echo on the employee engagement.

More specifically, we clustered the data looking at:

- Why and how design thinking is adopted in the analysed organization (e.g. physical products, development process, organisation's internal culture).
- Where it is applied (e.g. dedicated space, client place, with which characteristics)
- Who promotes Design Thinking inside the organization (e.g. designer teams, chief officer)
- What impact both Design Thinking and Space have on internal and external client in the relationship with the organization.

Then we searched for regularities and patterns: based on the different degree of adoption of Design Thinking in the organization, a different approach towards the workplace (space setting and design of the experience) can be observed. The space is given a different relevance that has an impact on the workflow and process, the organization mindset, the relationships among employees.

Research findings

The detailed study and analysis of the three interviews enables us to find out some similarities for understanding the links among workplace, design thinking practices and organisational changes.

Design thinking practices nudge workplace to facilitate its distribution

Adopting and implementing a mindset of design thinking in organisations does not happen in a day or after one workshop, instead, it might go through a very long and tough process. Many companies couldn't easily understand the strategic values if they don't see some visible changes inside the organisations during the process. And in many cases, changes brought by design thinking, especially relevant to the development process, systemic dynamics and organisational issues, happen quite slowly and are not easy to be tangibly perceived.

We have noticed from our interviews that the workplace is playing an increasingly important role in diffusing the design thinking concept and practices, starting from the inhouse design team to other teams, colleagues, departments and also outside the company (to the clients). The diffusion happens through communication among employees not only through words but actions. Many design thinking activities have certain special requirements on the space and the design thinkers inside the company often change and reshape the workplace according to the use of specific methods and tools. For example, they used very big white boards or temporary walls in brainstorming activity or data analysis phase, in order to visually present and map all the ideas or data. The visible change in the workplace has often caught the attention of other colleagues and other teams working close to them, which makes them become curious about and attempting to try out the approach, methods and tools. Especially in companies, where a design-led mindset is not well acknowledged or established, the physical workplace is supportively "leveraging" the application and communication of design thinking practices and experimentations from a small dimension to a larger one.

In all the three cases, the interviewees have pinpointed the strong link between the design thinking practices and the physical environment. A common feature of their workplaces is that the possibility to switch from totally open to totally isolated is well provided. Individuals or teams are able to create a customised work space in very short time, and at the same time they keep the connection with other teams and colleagues in the same project.

Workplace fosters a closer relationship with customers through design thinking practices

From our interviews, we have witnessed the increasing changes of how companies are using their workplaces as a channel and platform to stay closer to their clients and customers. Workplace is no longer a physical internal

space where employees carry out their daily work and tasks, instead, innovative companies are using their workplaces to engage clients in various activities directly and indirectly relevant to build a long-lasting relationship. All the three companies interviewed in our research have mentioned their positive experiences in conducting design thinking practices with their clients or customers in the workplace. They invited their clients and customers to come to their workplace not only for official meetings in different moments of the projects, but more importantly, they provided hand-on actions, especially in the form of design thinking workshops, to show how a co-creation process worked towards solving the problems (Sanders & Stappers, 2008; Brown, 2009). The main aim is to bring people to where they could dedicate themselves 100% in trying and experimenting a new way of looking at and doing things. On the other hand, through practical interaction, the clients and customers were able to gain a comprehensive understanding of the company from its hand (operational capabilities) to its mind (strategies and visions).

For doing this, companies nowadays are paying attention to balancing the internal and external needs while creating their workplace. The concept of an office is also radically changing. For example, both Illimity and DOING (Capgemini) have a big open space inside their workplace, which have also been used for engaging the clients in certain phases of a design thinking process. They all mentioned the importance of keeping the possibility and flexibility to change and shape the open space according to the needs from different projects and clients. In Steelcase, this role of the workplace has been well integrated to the new concept of a workplace. LINC, the Learning Innovation Center and the biggest office of Steelcase in Europe, is acting as the most important location to meet (potential) clients all over the world, as well as a workplace for more than 200 employees. This totally transparent link between external clients and internal employees has been successfully established by how the workplace has been created, and the workplace presents who they are as a company.

Design thinking fosters employees' behaviour change through shaping the workplace

One of the objectives of implementing design thinking in organisations is to promote a mind-set to engage employees in participating and experimenting new approaches, methods and practices towards innovation. Scholars have named it as creative confidence (Kelly & Kelly, 2013; Dell'Era, et al. 2020), which highlighted the positive impact of the design thinking approach on motivating employees and considering their wellbeing at work. The creative confidence approach could not be obviously seen but is to leverage organisations to include "human-centred, empathy and iteration" in their culture (Elsbach & Stigliani, 2018). To make this happen, the workplace needs to provide a space for employees to feel comfort and motivated to actively contribute to the company. On the one hand, the top-down policy guarantees the importance and possibilities of exercising with design thinking methods and tools; on the other one, employees are capable to fit themselves in the changes and to feel confident to propose new ideas and concepts.

How does the workplace fulfil this mission? From our interviews, we have found out that the three companies have their own ways to make this happen. Doing has integrated its way of working to the other departments of Capgemini, as well as how the work environment should look like. The design team worked a lot in negotiating the design of the workplace in order to provide every employee with the access to design thinking mind-set and actions. Through intervention and collaboration, colleagues from different departments started to take use of some features of the workplace to open their doors, share and communicate among teams, get more physical contacts among different levels and departments. In Illimity and LINC (Steelcase), the concept of flat company and the spirit of entrepreneurship have been adopted at strategic level and almost in the DNA of the companies, they have built their workplaces to avoid barriers and to facilitate collaborations among all employees. They provide employees options and support to set up their own "work environment" - where and with whom they want to work. In return, employees spontaneously organize their work among them and react positively and efficiently. This is even more evident in comparison with the smart working situation that lots of organizations were already experiencing and that has sped up lately due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

Although all three companies were well prepared from both the mind set and technological perspectives, experiencing a prolonged remote working situation has made clear the importance of a common physical space in facilitating relationships, communications and the dissemination of knowledge between teams.

Workplace represents how design thinking practices are shaping organisational culture

It is difficult to implement or create a new culture in an established organisation. Rousseau (1995) suggested that there are three basic change strategies organizations can pursue. They can either drift, accommodate or engage in a radical transformation. How companies pursue different strategies to change and transform could be

seen through shaping and designing their workplace. In many companies, the change strategies start from the periphery or a part of the organisation, referring to drifting and accommodating, and then go through in an outside-in process in order to have a larger and profound result. These changes are easier to happen and to be included in the existing one. Instead, companies that are searching for a radical change should start with their fundamental assumption and translate it through layers: norms, behaviours and offerings.

From our interviews, we have witnessed both of these approaches, and they provide different experiences and results. When design thinking practices happened at periphery or on part of the organisation, the primary function of a workplace is to enlarge the visibility of these actions to attract more attention and interest from the whole organisation. This is also why many companies have planned a very big open space in the workplace to conduct design thinking activities. This open space is essential to be flexible and multifunctional in order to respond to diverse urgent needs. Besides, it is generally well connected with several core teams for collaborating and sharing knowledge among them. Oppositely, when design thinking has been embedded in the core, the main assumption of an organisation, the workplace will engage all employees in better understanding the strategic values of this change and to balance it with their individual needs and behaviour at the work. In these companies, the workplace is shaped from a “human-centred” perspective, treating each individual as an important “human”, to guide their work activities to align with personal growth. Design thinking is no more the methods and tools they are convinced to use in projects, but becomes the attitude they have and way of doing at work, from dealing with projects to building up relationships with colleagues. In this type of organization, the workplace is like a palimpsest of options, through which the employee can choose the space that better suits his needs; spaces have various layers of transparency and are designed to allow causal interaction between colleagues of different teams, to ease communication and therefore to enable knowledge sharing. Finally, the workspace is strategically designed as a tool that hosts continuous changes and supports the attitude of an evolving organisations.

Conclusion and future steps

Design thinking has the essential feature of design activities that aim at changing existing situations into preferred ones (Simon, 1969). It co-evolves the problems and solutions during the process (Dorst & Cross, 2001). Design (thinking) is a way of inquiring and experimenting possible new solutions with the consideration of diverse actors and the context, instead of only analysing and studying what is happening at the moment. In the realm of design (thinking) in organisations, methods and tools don't deal with how the configuration and structure of an organisation should be like, more significantly, design as a discipline is able to drive and shape new environment (both visible and invisible aspects) to indicate a movement from structure towards an action-oriented interpretation (Magalhães, 2018).

Therefore, from this empirical research, the dynamic between workplace, design thinking practices and the organisations has been studied as a first step to explore the interplay among them towards fostering an innovation culture. On the one hand, the workplace is shaped according to how the design (thinking) approach has impacted the organisational issues, specifically, on which objects design thinking has been implemented, who have participated in and for how long it has been conducted. The differences could be observed from employees' behaviour at the workplace, individually and collectively. On the other hand, the workplace has enormous potential and power to guide and leverage organisations to include the design thinking approach at a higher level and in strategic decision-making actions. This means the workplace should not be limited to follow the functions defined by the companies, design thinkers, actually all employees who are willing to promote an innovation culture, could take full use of the working environment to set up a situated context to leverage a change at the core.

Future studies and researches will be continuously carried out on a number of topics: i) action research through observation in real work contexts to verify some of the findings as well as to gain more insights; ii) categorising different workplace models and setting for implementing different patterns and applications of design thinking; iii) producing practical guidelines and strategies at the individual level on how a human-centered approach intervenes the workplace towards shaping an innovation culture.

Acknowledgements: *we would like to acknowledge all the people (from the three companies) who have spared their time for our interviews in this research.*

References

- Barry, D. (2016). Redesigning Organization Design. In *Designing Business and Management* (pp. 81-92). Bloomsbury Academic.
- Boland, R., & Collopy, F. (Eds.). (2004). *Managing as designing*. Stanford, CA: Stanford business books.
- Buchanan, R. (2001). Design research and the new learning. *Design issues*, 17(4), 3-23.
- Budie B., Appel-Meulenbroek R., Kemperman, A. & Weijs-Perree M. (2019). Employee satisfaction with the physical work environment: the importance of a need-based approach. *International Journal of Strategic Property Management*, 23(1), 36-49.
- Buehring, J. H., & Liedtka, J. (2018). Embracing systematic futures thinking at the intersection of Strategic Planning, Foresight and Design. *Journal of innovation management*.
- Cameron K. S., Quinn R. E. (1999). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Carlgrén, L., Rauth, I., & Elmquist, M. (2016). Framing design thinking: The concept in idea and enactment. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 25(1), 38-57.
- Dell'Era, C., Magistretti, S., Cautela, C., Verganti, R., & Zurlo, F. Four kinds of design thinking: From ideating to making, engaging, and criticizing. *Creativity and Innovation Management*.
- Deserti, A., & Rizzo, F. (2014). Design and organizational change in the public sector. *Design Management Journal*, 9(1), 85-97.
- Design Council. (2007). The value of design factfinder report. UK.
- Dorst, K., & Cross, N. (2001). Creativity in the design process: co-evolution of problem–solution. *Design studies*, 22(5), 425-437.
- Dorst, K., & Cross, N. (2001). Creativity in the design process: Co-evolution of problem– solution. *Design Studies*, 22(5), 425–437.
- Dunne, D. (2018). *Design thinking at work: how innovative organizations are embracing design*. University of Toronto Press.
- Dunne, D., & Martin, R. (2006). Design thinking and how it will change management education: An interview and discussion. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 5(4), 512–523.
- Elsbach, K. D., & Stigliani, I. (2018). Design thinking and organizational culture: A review and framework for future research. *Journal of Management*, 44(6), 2274-2306.
- Gemser, G., Candi, M., & van den Ende, J. (2011). How design can improve firm performance. *Design Management Review*, 22(2), 72-77.
- Harter J. (2017). Dismal Employee Engagement Is a Sign of Global Mismanagement. Gallup. Retrieved from <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/231668/dismal-employee-engagement-sign-global-mismanagement.aspx>
- Hogan, S. J., & Coote, L. V. (2014). Organizational culture, innovation, and performance: A test of Schein's model. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(8), 1609-1621.
- Horr Y.A., Arif M., Kaushik A., Mazroei A., Elsarrag E., Mishra S. (2017). Occupant productivity and indoor environment quality: a case of GSAS. *International Journal of Sustainable Built Environment*, 6, 476-490
- Junginger, S. (2008). Product development as a vehicle for organizational change. *Design issues*, 24(1), 26-35.
- Junginger, S., & Sangiorgi, D. (2009). Service design and organisational change. Bridging the gap between rigour and relevance. In *International Association of Societies of Design Research* (pp. 4339-4348)..
- Kahn W. A. Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work, *Academy of Management Journal*, 1990.
- Kelley, T., & Kelley, D. (2013). *Creative confidence. Unleashing the creative potential within us all*. New York: Crown Business.
- Khazanchi, S., Sprinkle, T. A., Masterson, S. S., & Tong, N. (2018). A spatial model of work relationships: The relationship-building and relationship-straining effects of workspace design. *Academy of Management Review*, 43(4), 590-609.
- La Pietra J., Rowell C. (2019) Creating workplace community through a human-centric approach. Wework. Retrieved from <https://www.wework.com/ideas/office-design-space/creating-workspace-community>.
- Liedtka, J. (2011). Learning to use design thinking tools for successful innovation. *Strategy & Leadership*, 39(5), 13–19. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10878571111161480>.

- Magalhães, R. (2018). Design discourse for organization design: Foundations in human-centered design. *Design Issues*, 34(3), 6-16.
- Maier, J. R., Fadel, G. M., & Battisto, D. G. (2009). An affordance-based approach to architectural theory, design, and practice. *Design Studies*, 30(4), 393-414.
- McMillan, D. W., & Chavis, D. M. (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory. *Journal of community psychology*, 14(1), 6-23.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human resource management review*, 1(1), 61-89.
- Prusak L., Cohen D. (2001). How to invest in social capital. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(6):86-93, 147.
- Romme, A. G. L. (2003). Making a difference: Organization as design. *Organization science*, 14(5), 558-573
- Rousseau, D. M. (1995). *Psychological Contracts in Organizations: Understanding Written and Unwritten Agreements*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). The darker and brighter sides of human existence: Basic psychological needs as a unifying concept. *Psychological inquiry*, 11(4), 319-338.
- Sanders, E. B. N., & Stappers, P. J. (2008). Co-creation and the new landscapes of design. *Co-design*, 4(1), 5-18.
- Sato, S., Lucente, S., Meyer, D., & Mrazek, D. (2010). Design thinking to make organization change and development more responsive. *Design Management Review*, 21, 44-52.
- Schein, E. H. (1992). *How can organizations learn faster?: the problem of entering the Green Room*.
- Simon, H.A. (1969). *The Sciences of the Artificial*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Steenkamp, P. L., & Basson, J. S. (2013). A meaningful workplace: Framework, space and context. *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies*, 69(1).
- Vischer, J. C. (2007). The concept of workplace performance and its value to managers. *California management review*, 49(2), 62-79.
- Wells, M. M., Thelen, L., & Ruark, J. (2007). Workspace personalization and organizational culture: does your workspace reflect you or your company?. *Environment and Behavior*, 39(5), 616-634.
- Zurlo F.(2016). Designing Options and New Workspaces, in Il Prisma (eds. by) *Now We Work*, McGraw Hill Education, pp.15-21.