

Design-Led Strategy: HOW TO BRING DESIGN THINKING INTO THE ART OF STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT

California Management Review
1–23© The Regents of the
University of California 2020

Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/0008125619897594

journals.sagepub.com/home/cmrv**Eric Knight¹, Jarryd Daymond¹, and Sotirios Paroutis²**

SUMMARY

Design thinking has emerged as an important way for designers to draw on rich customer insights to enhance their products and services. However, design thinking is now also beginning to influence how corporate managers bring customer data into their day-to-day strategic planning. We call this integration of design thinking into the practice of strategic management “Design-Led Strategy” and show how it complements but extends current design-thinking perspectives. Adopting a strategy-as-practice perspective, this article identifies four archetypal practices that managers can use to strategize with design-thinking content. Its findings provide insight into the practices associated with situating design thinking within organizational practice.

KEYWORDS: design thinking, strategic management, strategy process, strategy formulation, strategic planning, multimodality

Design, it seems, is now everywhere—it is no longer just the purview of designers. The nondesign world has come a long way since the work of Professor John E. Arnold over 60 years ago to bring the disciplines of mechanical engineering and business administration more closely together around the ideas of design thinking. Examples now abound of corporate managers and engineers making design thinking central to their business operations, from conservative organizations hiring chief design officers (CDO) to “suits” talking about personas and point-of-view statements. However, hiring design studies graduates, sending employees to design-thinking courses, and setting up cross-functional teams is not enough for an organization to become “designerly.” To make a difference to the kinds of products and

¹The University of Sydney Business School, University of Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

²Warwick Business School, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK

services that get routinely implemented in market, design thinking needs to be integrated into the organization's strategy. This is the only way that design can move from thinking to action, from lab formulation to strategic implementation across marketing, sales, and operations. We call the integration of design thinking into organizational strategy "Design-Led Strategy."

Design thinking needs to be integrated with strategy because firms wrestle with the problem of product-market fit. This problem relates to how organizations construct products that are relevant to their customers. As Liedtka and Kaplan note "[u]nderstanding the job customers are trying to do and the problem they have doing it" is a strategic issue.¹ It is crucial for competitive advantage as it mobilizes the organization's strategy toward products that offer greater value than existing alternatives.

Product-market fit is particularly acute in innovation contexts, where organizations must either re-imagine existing product and services or create new offerings. Dougherty has argued that the creative linkages needed here between market and technology are challenging because there is a lack of knowledge spanning both contexts.² Metaphors, drawings, and gestures play a crucial role in transforming tacit knowledge into articulable knowledge so that shared understanding emerges between what customers want "out there" and what managers can do "in here."³ Design thinking offers a way to constitute such knowledge processes, focusing not only on the discursive aspects of knowledge translation but also on the visual, sensory, and material means through which market-oriented concepts are rendered interpretable.

In order to bridge this link between design thinking and the art of strategic management, we conceptualize strategy *as a practice*.⁴ A practice perspective is particularly appropriate for approaching the context of design thinking as it is actively engaged in how visual, discursive, and material interactions make strategy meanings.⁵ Building on the work of Reckwitz⁶ and others, practices are defined as "a routinized type of behavior" that managers adopt through the interconnected use of "bodily activities, forms of mental activities, 'things' and their use, [and] a background knowledge in the form of understanding." A strategy-as-practice perspective examines an organization's strategy through what managers and other stakeholders *actually do*, in a day-to-day sense, to bring the company's strategies into being.⁷ The strategy-as-practice literature has begun to grow rapidly over the last decade, prompting studies that not only go beyond discourse by examining visibility and materiality in strategizing, but it is also beginning to concern itself with how actors external to the firm (such as consultants or customers) influence strategy making, thereby going beyond what is already known about top and middle manager interactions.

In this article, we focus our attention on managers working with "design thinking"-led content collected from customers and understanding how they integrated externalized understandings of the market into their strategy making by way of mundane, routinized activities or practices. Our insights are based on ethnographic data collected from product and strategy managers working together

in a digital-only bank to formulate a new savings product for its customers through their use of customer data.

From Design Thinking to Design-Led Strategy

Design thinking has emerged over the last 60 years as a method for collecting and analyzing market and customer-level data, using tools that are visually instantiated, such as personas and sketching, and physically instantiated, such as prototypes and customer observation.⁸ Design thinking originated in engineering as a way for engineering construction to become more embedded within its physical environment⁹ and has evolved into being part of design studies as a discipline in its own right. However, it is being increasingly embraced by business managers as an empathetic way to understand the market environment and advance strategic management.¹⁰ Liedtka and Kaplan suggest that design practices improve strategy development in several ways by enabling businesses to see opportunities differently and learn through prototyping.¹¹ This enables a portfolio approach to innovation by exploring a range of “bets” and accommodating greater emotional engagement in strategy making.

This intersection between design thinking and strategic management has gained attention in recent times. Several of the world’s leading strategy consulting firms now integrate design into their strategy offering. Boston Consulting Group now has a design function called BCG Digital Ventures. McKinsey & Company operates McKinsey Design to complement its strategic services and bought Lunar, a top design firm known for its work with clients like HP, Apple, and SanDisk, as well Stockholm-based design firm Veryday.¹² ADAPT@Bain® is Bain & Company’s advanced digital and product team, which combines design-thinking approaches, such as human-centered design and prototyping, with software engineering, digital marketing, and advanced analytics.¹³ And Booz Allen Hamilton draws on design thinking by “building a rich understanding of their experiences to identify strategic opportunities for innovation and build solutions that matter to people, but also fit with the business and are technically feasible.”¹⁴ The proliferation of design roles at a C-suite level is further evidence that design thinking is gaining attention at a more strategic vantage point in organizations. Covering a range of industries, CDO are employed in a diverse range of companies including 3M, ANZ Bank, Apple, Electrolux, Hyundai, Johnson & Johnson, Lloyds Banking Group, PepsiCo, and Philips. At Lloyds Banking Group, the CDO appointment was cited as a “strategy for transforming for success in a digital world”¹⁵ at Lloyds Banking Group and as building capability around “strategic design” at ANZ Bank, one of Australia’s “big four” banks.¹⁶

The integration of design thinking and strategic management is not entirely unexpected. Research by McKinsey & Company found that among 300 listed companies over a five-year period, those with the best design practices achieved 32% higher revenues and 56% higher returns to shareholders.¹⁷ Furthermore, as design thinking enables firms to address questions of product-market fit, it may

reveal new opportunities for market creation and platform development. Modern smart phones, for example, have evolved in response to customers' desire to not only use the device as a phone, but as a platform to access cameras, media storage, digital communications, and computing capabilities. In this respect, design thinking offers a way for firms to acquire new knowledge about customers that not only enable efficiencies within their existing business but also transform their entire business model.¹⁸

Why Strategy Needs More Than Just Design Thinking

Despite the importance of greater integration between design and strategic management, the fit is not straight forward. To start with, the challenges of bringing new ways of thinking into organizations are substantial and not ones that the discipline of design studies has really engaged with. For managers, these challenges arise from the way in which knowledge is created and translated with organizations and into day-to-day strategy making. Cohen and Levinthal, for example, argue that much of the knowledge managers gain about their market emerges from observation and know-how (i.e., tacit knowledge) rather than codified forms of expertise that might be delivered through standard training or workshops.¹⁹ This places a premium on the ability of executives to change their cognitive mindset, empathize with their customers, and observe the unexpected. This is a difficult attribute to develop for two reasons. First, senior executives in charge of the firm's strategy may live a very different life to their customers, thereby making their connection with customers in the "outside" world, and the frontline of practice, difficult.²⁰ The founder of Facebook Mark Zuckerberg, for example, is allegedly himself not a customer of Facebook, instead deferring his day-to-day interactions with the product he created to staff in his office.²¹ Very few senior leaders at the helm of universities continue to teach students or write research papers as their responsibilities for the institution's strategy grows.²² Although it is good practice for senior executives to consume the products and services they sell, when this does not take place, executives need to find other ways to understand what it is like to walk in the shoes of their customers.

Second, even as senior executives make use of design-thinking methodologies to bridge the gap between their own and customers' experiences, the sheer variety and difference of data this introduces can increase cognitive load and make strategic decision-making difficult.²³ Design thinking goes beyond verbal data (for example, through customer interviews), to introduce visual data (for example, through contextual observations of how customers use products or services), and material data (such as the development of prototypes). Nike, for example, overlaid data on shopping experiences with emotional journey mapping to help design the integrated digital app-based and physical shopping experience of their recently opened Nike Live concept in Melrose, Los Angeles.²⁴ This visual and material data are immensely valuable in enriching a manager's understanding of how products and services are used by customers in real life. But it can also be overwhelming for inexperienced senior executives. Moreover, as strategists, senior executives need

to go beyond just making sense of this new kind of visual and material data. They need to triangulate it and then interpret it in relation to traditional strategy tools that provide guidance over when and how to balance tensions versus make trade-off choices.²⁵ This means that integrating design thinking into strategy involves a multimodal approach, which goes beyond what design studies offer, but also requires managers to transform their approach to strategy by integrating multiple and more varied types of data that can advance an organization's strategic ends.

Given the importance but also the challenges of integrating design thinking and strategic management, strategy scholars have sought to tackle the synergies between the two fields by examining different aspects of the strategy function. Each aspect brings a different strategy focus to the fore.

Design and the Cognitive Aspects of Strategic Management

One stream of work in the strategic management literature has taken a cognitive perspective, focusing on the *thinking* side of design and how this influences the decision making of strategists.²⁶ Within this stream of work, Martin has argued that having managers who apply design thinking by blending analytical thinking and intuitive thinking is a means for firms to gain competitive advantage.²⁷ Liedtka similarly focuses on the cognitive elements, showing how strategic *thinking* can enable more synthetic, dialectical, and adductive strategies to emerge compared with traditional, hierarchical decision-making.²⁸

Other work emphasizing the cognitive elements of design-thinking focuses on tools themselves and how these guide particular ways of knowing²⁹ and solving problems.³⁰ Dong, Garbuio, and Lovallo show how these tools can inform behavioral characteristics.³¹ They argue that managers can develop a set of "generative sensing capabilities" that allow them to generate hypotheses about observed events and, through doing so, make decisions that improve a firm's dynamic capabilities.³²

Design and the Structural Aspects of Strategic Management

A second stream has focused on how design thinking influences strategy from a structural perspective. This work is concerned with where design thinking should be located within the organizational structure³³ and also considers how design can be elevated to a strategic level in organizations.³⁴ For example, in 53 interviews across 12 companies, Micheli, Perks, and Beverland identify the following six practices that elevate the structural positioning of design in organizations: top management support, leadership of the design function, generating awareness of design's role and contribution, interfunctional coordination, evaluation of design, and formalization of product and service development processes.³⁵ They suggest that strategic design is more effective when designers operate cross-functionally because it enables designers to better balance the role of design champions alongside commercial considerations.

The structural perspective on design and strategic management also considers the effects on firm performance and strategic decision-making when designers reside outside the organization.³⁶ For example, Calabretta et al. examined

seven cases involving design consultancies influencing their clients' strategies by contributing to their innovation agendas.³⁷ Finally, the structural stream is also interested in how design thinking is "managed" within the firm. Perks, Cooper, and Jones, for example, found that design had different effects on firm performance when it was organized top-down as a functional specialism, or as part of new product development, compared with when it operated cross-functionally as a way to integrate multi-functional teams.³⁸

Design and the Organizational Culture Aspects of Strategic Management

A third stream of work has focused on how design thinking shapes organizational culture,³⁹ giving more attention to the process elements of strategy.⁴⁰ This work is less focused on structural design choices and more attuned to how design thinking shapes the flow of activities over longer periods of time. For example, John Body, in a study of the Australian Tax Office, found that the use of design-thinking tools instigated new routines that allowed teams to collaborate that had previously not worked together.⁴¹ This allowed for "shared understanding" to emerge across interdisciplinary teams, thereby opening up new forms of working.⁴² Similarly, Vetterli and colleagues found that design thinking helped to challenge ways of working in the IT division at Deutsche Bank.⁴³ In their case, design thinking served as a powerful legitimating approach that allowed managers to challenge and discuss underlying assumptions about "the right way to work."⁴⁴

Beyond design thinking influencing ways of knowing and working in organizations, design can also play an integrative role between functional areas at odds with each other⁴⁵ by contributing practices that complement existing organizational approaches.⁴⁶ Rather than focusing merely on the cognitive aspects of design thinking, this stream gives attention to process of "designerly"⁴⁷ ways of thinking influencing the rest of the organization. The enculturation of design helps overcome factors that prevent design from achieving strategic relevance in organizations, such as transcending different mental models⁴⁸ and managers lack of design appreciation.⁴⁹

These three streams of work reflect different ways of conceptualizing strategy—as cognition, as structure, and as process—and give emphasis to different kinds of aims and contributions related to how design thinking and strategic management are related. These are summarized in Table 1.

Design and the Practice Theory Aspects of Strategic Management

Building on the importance of the above three streams, this article adds a fourth stream through which this integration can be conceptualized—namely, how design thinking is integrated into strategy *as a practice*. While process and practice perspectives have much in common,⁵⁰ a practice approach seeks to go "inside" the process⁵¹ to investigate what is actually going on in the moment.⁵² In particular, this has allowed strategy-as-practice scholars to delve more deeply into the multimodal dynamics at play when managers move beyond

TABLE I. Design-Thinking Perspectives and Relationship to Strategic Management.

	Design-Thinking Perspectives			
	Cognitive Perspective	Structural Perspective	Organizational Culture Perspective	
Primary Aims	To understand the way designers think and how this influences the decision making of strategists.	To understand how design thinking should interact with organizational processes for strategic purposes.	To understand how design thinking relates to organizational culture.	
Key Contributions and Insights for Managers	Highlights the value of thought processes associated with design, such as intuition, analysis, framing, abductive reasoning generative sensing, and mental simulation.	Highlights how design thinking practices gain legitimacy and strategic significance, and the implications of such changes.	Highlights how knowledge is created between the market and managers, and how technologies are constructed to bridge these gaps.	
Relationship to Strategic Management	Provides insight into strategic opportunity creation and decision-making which improves firms' dynamic capabilities.	Gives consideration to the need for organizational capacity to accommodate new practices alongside existing ways of working.	Provides insight into how strategy is opened up to new voices, such as those of customers.	
Exemplar and Related Studies	<p>Exemplar studies:</p> <p>J. Liedtka, "Perspective: Linking Design Thinking with Innovation Outcomes through Cognitive Bias Reduction," <i>Journal of Product Innovation Management</i>, 32/6 (November 2015): 925-938.</p> <p>A. Dong, M. Garbuio, and D. Lovallo, "Generative Sensing: A Design Perspective on the Microfoundations of Sensing Capabilities," <i>California Management Review</i>, 58/4 (Summer 2016): 97-117.</p>	<p>Exemplar studies:</p> <p>S.L. Beckman and M. Barry, "Innovation as a Learning Process: Embedding Design Thinking," <i>California Management Review</i>, 50/1 (Fall 2007): 25-57.</p> <p>P. Micheli, H. Perks, and M.B. Beverland, "Elevating Design in the Organization," <i>Journal of Product Innovation Management</i>, 35/4 (July 2018): 629-651.</p>	<p>Exemplar studies:</p> <p>K.D. Eisenbach and I. Stigliani, "Design Thinking and Organizational Culture: A Review and Framework for Future Research," <i>Journal of Management</i>, 44/6 (July 2018): 2274-2306.</p> <p>C. Bason and R.D. Austin, "The Right Way to Lead Design Thinking," <i>Harvard Business Review</i>, 97/2 (March/April 2019): 82-91.</p>	<p>Related practice studies:</p> <p>L. Heracleous and C. Jacobs, "Understanding Organizations through Embodied Metaphors," <i>Organization Studies</i>, 29/1 (2008): 45-78.</p> <p>E. Knight, S.E. Paroutis, and L. Heracleous, "The Power of PowerPoint: A Visual Perspective on 'Meaning Making in Strategy,'" <i>Strategic Management Journal</i>, 39/3 (March 2018): 894-921.</p>

conversation to refer to different types of materials (e.g., prototypes or customer data) alongside the conversations. For example, studying consulting-manager interactions, Knight, Paroutis, and Heracleous showed how multiple versions of PowerPoint slides were manipulated alongside evolving conversations and strategies in order to progress strategic understanding.⁵³ Other studies in this tradition have explored other kinds of materials as well, such as Lego objects,⁵⁴ cardboard cubes,⁵⁵ and flipcharts,⁵⁶ albeit without any focus on customer or design-thinking-led materials. Research on material artifacts has, therefore, revealed benefits of engaging multimodally in strategy work.

For these reasons, a practice perspective complements and enhances the aforementioned approaches by providing greater insight on the micro-dynamics of how strategists can integrate design thinking into strategizing in the moment. This gives more specificity to the nature of how knowledge gets created between the market and managers and how technologies get constructed to bridge these gaps. Moreover, since these studies have predominantly focused on traditional topics within strategic planning with very little attention to what design thinking might add, such a study has the opportunity to extend our understanding of strategy-as-practice in terms of how strategy gets opened up to new voices, such as those of customers.⁵⁷ Given this particular focus, we therefore frame our research questions as follows: How do strategists integrate design thinking into their management practice to advance strategic outcomes?

Methodology

To address this question, we conducted a qualitative case study of DigitalBank, a digital-only bank. Our interest was spurred by the fact that DigitalBank's product managers, who were deeply imbued with design-thinking methodologies, had significant influence over the Bank's strategy functions as well. Prompted by the opportunity to observe how these product and strategy managers worked together to enact this integration in practice, we attended 36 meetings over 57 hours; meetings composed of strategy workshops, operational meetings, and design sprint meetings. Alongside our observations, we conducted 19 semi-structured interviews with senior managers, middle managers, designers, and external consultants. In addition to the semi-structured interviews, there were 46 informal discussions with employees and consultants that we documented. We also collected 236 pages of field notes, including artifacts from workshops and photographs of key materials such as personas, prototypes, planning boards, and corporate posters.

To analyze our data, we first composed timelines of each of the strategy workshops in our study, outlining the major issues discussed in the workshops and the tensions they surfaced. These issues were delineated by working between transcripts of the strategy workshops and video data showing how these conversations were conducted.

In the second stage, we analyzed for issues that involved the use of customer data and design thinking to inform how major issues were addressed. Even

though the workshops covered multiple issues, we found that managers engaged in four distinct practices of integrating design-thinking data into their practice. Working inductively between the transcripts and the video data, we started to notice patterns in how managers interacted with customer data and design artifacts. We took screenshots of exemplar moments and discussed these as a team. This led us to identify and code for four distinct practices: reviewing, simulating, conversing, and collaborating.

In the third stage, we analyzed these four practices in terms of how participants interacted with design materials and how participants interacted with each other. This led us to delineate two dimensions in our data—dynamism of materials and engagement context—which informed our theoretical figure. To further validate our findings, we shared our figure with respondents within DigitalBank as well as 32 strategy practitioners actively involved in integrating design thinking into strategy. This process led us to re-label some of our practices while simultaneously adding to our confidence that our four practices captured the key ways in which design thinking was being integrated into strategy practice.

The Four Practices of Integration in Design-Led Strategy

Design thinking brings rich customer-centric data about an organization's position in the market inside the organization. However, these data need to be taken further by managers in order to yield insights into how they influence the organization's strategizing.⁵⁸ As noted, there are four different ways in which managers in the workshops interacted with "design-thinking" data and then used it in their interactions with each other to advance a new product-market insight for the organization's strategy (see Figure 1).

We observed how the use of design thinking influences strategy making through the manipulation of two dimensions. One dimension we call the "dynamism of materials." Design thinking generates a range of different materials—from personas to Point-of-View problem statements through to raw customer data—that need to be interpreted in the context of the strategic issues facing DigitalBank.⁵⁹ Managers use these materials in one of two ways: either statically, by treating the content independently of other visuals at hand; or dynamically, by collating and (re) combining the materials at hand and even generating new materials so that insights could emerge at their intersection. These two alternate practices create different kinds of openness in terms of how managers engage with design-thinking content.

The second dimension we call the "engagement context." Managers either engage with the design-thinking data individually (by reflecting on the data themselves) or collectively (by discussing their interpretation of the design-thinking data with others), thereby unleashing a third interpretive path. In this respect, design-led strategy from a practice perspective prompted different degrees of engagement in terms of who was involved in the strategy process. These dimensions of engagement context and dynamism of materials are reflected on the axes of Figure 1.

FIGURE 1. Practices of interaction with design-thinking data.



Reviewing

Design thinking puts much emphasis on the quality of data collected from customers, with data capturing customer’s emotional responses to prototypes⁶⁰ and prototype use in context,⁶¹ an important principle for data collection. In the words of prominent design-thinking practitioner Gianfranco Zaccai, “You have to know your customers not as statistics but as human beings.”⁶² However, from a strategy-as-practice perspective, the customer data are not as important as how internal managers go on to engage with the data for enhanced understanding. In our case study, we found that it was imperative that managers had time during strategy workshops to “sit with” the design-led data. Often, this involved surfacing a single material—such as a strategy document, or a piece of customer data—and reviewing its significance in the context of a strategy conversation. We labeled this practice “reviewing” and coded it as an individual practice involving static materials.

An example of reviewing occurred in one of the workshops. Managers had been having a wide-ranging discussion about what customers expect from their banks “as partners” based on raw customer data. This led to a number of insights

about the kinds of reminders that customers expect from their banks to help them save money or make investment decisions. As this conversation came to an end, the meeting chair shared a one-page document that summarized the discussion to date, noting the customer value propositions of a product that the bank was considering developing. This prompted participants to review the materials and evaluate them in light of prior discussions about the customer. Did the proposed document prima-facie respond to customer concerns covered in the immediate prior discussion? Were there other issues that needed attention but were not discussed?

In this example, participants were seated on one side of table giving individual attention to a printed piece of paper summarizing key issues. At the same time, managers responsible for designing the paper prototype were seated on the other side of the table and reviewed the body language of the participants. In this particular moment, the materials were static—there was no shifting between different versions of the prototypes or triangulating across diverse sources of data. Also, the strategy practice was individualized—there was no conversation: each actor reflected on the materials for themselves and how it related to their own understanding of the market.

Effect of the practice. What is the consequence of enacting a reviewing practice? We found that reviewing opened up the richness of the ensuing strategy discussion by shifting the conversational focus. When each of the participants had had a chance to review the same material, each were able to compare the others' points proactively. Schön has argued that reflection-in-action is a key attribute of how professional knowledge comes into being.⁶³ Unlike technical rationality, "learning from experience" arises from reflecting on actions in the moment in order to surface differences and work through diverse understandings.⁶⁴ Using static materials is a useful way to deliberately trigger such reflection. Reviewing materials in the context of discussions about customer needs forced participants to actively reflect on those customer needs. Building on the finding that user research produces insights which help clarify a design problem,⁶⁵ we show *how* reviewing practices prompt reflective strategy conversations by giving direct attention to strategy materials and artifacts from the customer's perspective.

In an interview, a Design Lead explained that he regularly used single page summaries of key design concepts in order to trigger reflections, which prompted colleagues to "come back with better summaries" once they understood the main design elements. In this way, reviewing the summaries enabled managers to understand the savings concept of the digital app—overall savings requirements that take into account personal savings goals as well as a buffer for unplanned spending—and enable better contribution to subsequent discussions and design iterations. However, in meeting segments where participants did not review materials (such as the moments before a review practice was enacted), the strategy discussions took on a different character. Participants often contributed their own perspectives to the discussion without reflecting on a shared theme or common

reference point. This shows how design-led strategy from a practice perspective can sensitize the focus of strategy making to reflective, learning activities.

Simulating

Managers sought to empathetically simulate their end user's experience of their product or service in real time. We label this re-creation of user's experience a "simulating" practice, which was an individual practice with dynamic materials. It was individual in the sense that managers wanted to reproduce the customer's experience of a product or service *for themselves*. At the same time, it was dynamic because it was a multimodal experience, bringing together different types of visual, verbal, and sensory data over time to re-create a real-life activity undertaken by a customer rather than a summary of the strategy discussion (as in the reviewing practice). The physical set up of design workshops was very much organized to enable this kind of dynamic with multiple materials or types of data.

An example of this is when managers met in a design studio to project the app on a computer screen and "walk through" the different aspects of the product under development. One group of managers, acting as customers, were sitting in front of a screen while another manager pressed different buttons on a connected device to move the image forward and backward between screen projections based on the managers' desired product journey. This re-created the experience of a user using a smart phone. This lay-out of materials is dynamic since there are multiple screens on display, and participants are able to interact with the materials by moving back and forth in an immersive way.

Effect of the practice. Simulating opens up strategy practice because it provokes managers to form an empathetic engagement with the customer experience, thereby making the market context immediately appraisable.⁶⁶ Design-led strategy from a practice perspective therefore moves from being a *rational* activity to also being an *emotional* one so far as empathy is recognized as a legitimate means of changing the strategy.⁶⁷ In the above example, this immersive experience enabled one of the participants to realize that the error messaging on the app was too small to read for some customers. This resulted in a change request to the design team to adjust the app.

In an interview, a Digital Product Owner explained the effectiveness of the simulating practice: "The prototypes are really effective at conveying [to Executives how] user feedback is shaping the product." A key attribute of a simulating practice, then, is not only the more interactive nature of the practice but also the extent to which it allows managers to experience what the strategy *feels like* "on the front line." This enacts a narrowing of the product-market gap. This allows managers to have a more multi-faceted connection with their market and alter their strategy directions through the different ideas, values, assumptions, and emotions this elicits about customers' problems. The ability of senior managers to deliberately construct these sensemaking contexts becomes crucial in design-led

strategy. This builds on Knight and Paroutis' insight within a media company where senior managers shaped the interpretative context experienced by lower level managers, thereby helping them to deal with contradictory demands.⁶⁸ Simulating, therefore, builds on this in a design-thinking context and supports more balanced a strategy-making process by ensuring bottom-up user perspectives moderate top-down managerial concerns.

Conversing

Design thinking has a focus on materials. However, there are times when materials are not a feature of the discussion. Instead, strategists discuss their conceptions of the strategic challenges in a free-flowing manner. We label these "conversing," which is a collective practice in the context of static materials. These moments are significant as they allow the managers to move away from "the data" and discuss the practical realities of the challenges they face at an inter-personal level based on their unit, organizational, and/or occupational backgrounds.

Although instances of conversing arose throughout workshops, they were particularly prevalent at the start when managers provided background updates, contextualized the purpose for the workshop, and discussed challenging priorities that needed to be taken into account beyond the data. For example, when a manager reconvened a workshop between the strategists and designers over a month hiatus, he grouped everyone together in a meeting and prompted a dialogue around what each person was doing and what needed to be addressed in the meeting. In this respect, the materials were static, but the practice was collective in the sense that each managers' response informed the others. For example, as the group settled on what needed to be implemented, each actor contributed different qualifying statements to test their understanding.

Effect of the practice. Conversing was particularly important in enabling collective reflection and getting agreement between participants with diverse understandings of the strategy. In order words, this aspect of design-led strategizing amplified managers' attention to the real fit within product-market fit. As a Design Lead commented,

we got [other managers] involved and [they] were able to give an unbiased opinion across what we were doing. Which is important because we don't want to get to a point where we're just going to support each other's great ideas. You've gotta run it by other people who are disconnected from the team in some way.

Collective rather than individual reflection exposes "prejudices and blind spots" and provides "a platform for articulating ideas and aspiration."⁶⁹ Through vocalizing different views, participants are able to negotiate alternative understandings of a problem that leads to a more consensual solution. Often design thinking is about the customer data, but frequently implementing new products and services based on the customer data depends on negotiating complex political

realities within the organizational strategy. This builds on work by Stigliani and Ravasi who found that the ability of individuals to notice and classify material issues enriched the interactive talk at the group level, thereby enhancing strategic influence.⁷⁰ Our findings further substantiate this finding in the context of how design thinking can influence strategy making. Conversing was more inclusive as a result of the design artifacts because it opened up discussions to more diverse and fully articulated opinions. For this reason, conversing frequently followed long technical discussions when design-led scenarios were developed but their link back into the organization was unclear.

Collaborating

The fourth practice in relation to design-led strategy we labeled “collaborating.” This was a collective practice, but one that also entailed dynamic materials. Participants not only engaged in collective dialogue about the customer data but also (re)organized and created new materials to surface collective understanding of design and strategy problems. These moments usually took place around a white board, using text, Post-It notes, or other materials or around a computer where the comment functions on programs were used to add additional insights around a central design material.

For example, in one of the early stages of the design project, product managers and strategy managers sat down on a couch to detail all the research tasks that needed to be completed in order to conduct appropriate customer interviews, marketing validation, budget appraisals, and other activities to consider a new product and service. Different members of the team made proposals while a manager wrote these up verbatim on Post-It notes and stuck them on the whiteboard against a timeline. As these Post-It notes were stuck up, managers commented on their location on the timeline, leading to several of the Post-It notes being moved around. This was an iterative activity as managers moved between a conversation about the design project (collective practice), emergent materials capturing action points (dynamic materials), and amendments to the design project plan. This approach is similar to a design-thinking exercise called the Gallery Walk, in which the seemingly most important data collected are “galleried” on walls for managers to review individually before collectively interrogating.⁷¹

Effect of the practice. This practice was especially useful when teams were dealing with complex issues that could easily be forgotten or lost in conversational dialogue. Rather than trying to empathetically understand each manager’s perspective (as in the conversing practice) the focus in collaborative translation was on generating a shared solution to a complex problem (e.g., how to prioritize the tasks in a project plan) by making connections between various ideas from disparate areas.⁷² Knight, Paroutis, and Heracleous have shown that visual materials (e.g., within a PowerPoint slide) operate as part of a visual semiotic process and helps tackle politically contentious issues.⁷³ However, what this work misses is the valuation process wherein managers come to more highly regard each other’s perspective as a result of close-quarter interactions.⁷⁴ Our findings

extend this research by showing how managers visualize their responses in-the-moment through Post-It notes to build collective buy-in to the design and strategy problems. For example, after visualizing a “gamified” customer journey on a whiteboard using Post-It notes, a product manager commented that “the penny dropped on how we can use gamification as a [broader] strategy in [changing] savings behaviors.” The collaborating practice, therefore, represented a values-enriched way to shape the strategy practice compared with the study of post-event PowerPoint revisions.⁷⁵ For example, as a manager updated Post-It notes on the whiteboard, another manager felt the need to visually clarify interpretation of the ideas and actions by sketching alongside the Post-It notes—thereby acknowledging the prior work but going beyond it. Thus, the manager was able to initiate concrete changes to the strategic plan that he felt had been misunderstood through the conversation alone. This builds on recent work that has suggested that organizational values can be seen through a practice lens, focusing not on the values *per se*, but by the process of *valuation* through which managers come to regard some issues as strategically important.⁷⁶ Although that work has attended to this issue in terms of balancing contradictory organizational values of innovation and preservation, this finding suggests similar processes are at play in design-led strategy to shape strategic decision making.

Contribution and Implications for Managers

How do strategists integrate design thinking into their management practice to advance strategic outcomes? Based on our ethnographic observations, we find that the multimodal use of materials, and the shift between individual and collectively enacted practices, are crucial in making design thinking go beyond a discrete design process focused on understanding customers to an approach that shapes the strategic outcomes within organizations. We illustrated this by surfacing four distinctive ways in which design-led strategy can be enacted through practice: reviewing, simulating, conversing, and collaborating. These entail different static (dynamic) uses of materials and individual (collective) engagement contexts through which to interpret these materials. These design-led strategy practices are significant because they allow managers to construct knowledge of their market environments through observation and engagement that goes beyond what is possible within the boardroom. That is, they acquire insights from outside the firm that can get incorporated into how they evaluate and change the organization’s strategy.

These findings extend research within the individual disciplines of design studies and strategic management and contribute to an emerging academic body of literature at their intersection. In this gap, prior work has elaborated the link between design and strategic cognition, structures, and processes.⁷⁷ However, a practice perspective offers a novel addition to this work and goes deeper into the modes of interaction and how these modes shape the richness of how design-led data get incorporated into day-to-day actions. Furthermore, the diverse modes of integrating data rely crucially on the multimodal use of materials to enable

managers to move beyond overly simple strategies.⁷⁸ This builds on prior work that suggests that strategy work is improved by weaving together and making use of different kinds of knowledge between participants, rather than relying on a single participant or echelon within the organization.⁷⁹

This finding is also important to design scholarship, by showing *how* materials get deployed and influence the ways in which they get integrated into and impact strategy practice, particularly in relation to product-market fit. Materials provide a means of surfacing tensions in conversation, but managers can change their behaviors toward them (e.g., reviewing, conversing, collaborating, and simulating), which challenges their own and others' assumptions. At the same time, we offer a more granular picture of how design issues develop compared with prior process-oriented studies.⁸⁰ Indeed, a key implication of our analysis is that organizations do not decide on a single design-thinking approach. Rather, managers instigate their own design-led strategizing in the moment by shifting between distinct practices. Thus, strategy is constantly renegotiated as managers work through different situated encounters and engage with the different kinds of openness to customer insights they afford.

Our findings also extend existing research within the strategy-as-practice tradition by offering design thinking as a more central theme for this work. Strategy-as-practice research has tended to focus on intra-organizational dynamics, in particular focusing on the practices enacted between top, middle, and front-line managers.⁸¹ However, these practices rarely incorporate the views of external stakeholders, such as customers, even though more open approaches to strategizing are increasingly common. This study therefore contributes to recent calls for studies of open strategizing by showing how design-led practices integrate external, customer-focused data into strategy practice.⁸² These practices allow greater empathy and emotional engagement with end-users of products and services and enable more diverse forms of participation.

Our study also has consequences for managers: using design-thinking tools to collect data from customers and users is not enough by itself for organization to innovate and change their strategies. The data also need to be successfully integrated into strategic management as a practice in order to open up new insights between diverse materials and engagement contexts in order to have an impact. This insight appears to be consistent with where strategy as a profession is also heading. Indeed, one of the world's leading strategic consulting firms, Boston Consulting Group, is reorienting how it works by incorporating design more centrally into its strategy practice. In 2014, BCG purchased S&C, an Australian strategic-design firm, and MAYA Design, an American design firm in 2017.⁸³ S&C was integrated into BCG Digital Ventures and MAYA was brought into BCG's digital offerings, representing a move to link traditional strategy consulting with design consulting. Our study has three key implications for managers who are thinking about design-led strategy.

Implication 1: To have greater impact in new idea generation, managers should consider the dynamic deployment of design-thinking materials.

Design-thinking approaches place considerable emphasis on the different types of design-thinking tools that can be deployed to capture customer data.⁸⁴ For example, design content arising from customer interactions in the market can be written down in long form, captured succinctly on Post-It notes, documented numerically, visually depicted in rough sketches or more sophisticated visualizations, physically modeled or storyboarded, and so on. However, it is the use of these materials *in dynamic combination* that is particularly important in enabling new idea generation through the practices of “simulating” and “collaborating.”⁸⁵ When design-thinking materials are used dynamically and multimodally in this way, they allow for open discovery and fresh ideas that emerge from new and interesting linkages between the data and materials, thereby fostering product-market fit.

This suggests that setting up rooms with customer insights, personas, and other physically instantiated materials is important as it can allow managers to continuously reference back to design content surfaced throughout a project. McKinsey Digital Labs, for example, advocate using the four walls of a project room to track a specific focus such as customer experience, technology, team planning, and operations and process. This allows cross-functional teams to quickly and easily access information from each other’s domains and support new idea generation.⁸⁶

Implication 2: Managers should use static design materials when they wish to harness deeper engagement with strategy concepts.

Even though the dynamic use of materials was an essential aspect of design-led strategy, the less-exciting use of static materials also played a distinctive role through reviewing and conversing practices. Indeed, design-led strategizing that does not engage with materials statically may miss important insights. Indeed, static materials enabled immersive engagement with a particular aspect of the design content (e.g., a prototype or a type of customer feedback). This helped anchor the subsequent discussion and open up participants to new ways of engaging with design materials such as empathy and emotion.⁸⁷ This means that when managers find that design strategy conversations are superficial or too wide-ranging, it may be necessary to focus in on a key design material and draw attention to it. This will allow greater focus among the team members and avoid the risk of superficial engagement with the content.

Implication 3: Individual practices enhance knowledge of either the product or the market, whereas collective practices support discussions of fit between both areas.

Managers moved quickly between each of the four practices, moving in particular between the individually focused practices (e.g., reviewing) and the

collectively focused practices (e.g., collaborating). Both of these practices are important, but they help managers address different aspects of the product-market fit tension.

Prior research on design thinking has emphasized the individual aspects. This focuses on the empathy of the designer themselves and their cognitive ability to relate to their end-user.⁸⁸ However, this is really only part of the picture. From a strategic management perspective, it is useful to enabling members to understand their product or market better, but it does not assist with the organizational challenges of integration.

Collective practices, however, are crucially important in managing issues of fit. They allow managers to work between their newly created knowledge of the product or market with what is possible (or will fit) in the organization's strategy. Yet these processes of fit are only valuable *alongside* intense, individual reflection. For example, to improve their vacation booking process, Carnival Cruise Line engaged employees in a game in which they had to progress through checkpoints representative of the customer booking process.⁸⁹ A group debrief of the game then unearthed rich insights about how the current experience needed to change. In reporting on the activity, Henkel and Grant argued that it was because managers had gone through an *individual* experience of the process that they were then able to work through changes to the organization's process *collectively*. In other words, it was the movement from the individual practice that made the collective practice more meaningful.⁹⁰

For this reason, senior managers need to consciously and deliberately move between individual and collective practices in order to enhance product-market fit strategizing. The tension between these two practices is generative. Indeed, several instances in which strategy managers *pushed back* against product managers based on what they thought was feasible within the remit of DigitalBank's strategy. This allowed for a more effective integration or fit between the customer-led market concepts and the organization-led product solutions.

Conclusion

It is almost two decades since Jeanne Liedtka highlighted the parallels between design and strategy and its potential to enable a "more widely participative [and] more dialogue-based"⁹¹ approach to strategy. We further this conversation using recent advances from the strategy-as-practice perspective to conduct a practice-based study and develop an approach we term "design-led strategy." Managers who seek to leverage design thinking in their organizations need to do so through multimodal engagement with materials as well as applying diverse ways to interact with colleagues. Managers, individually and collectively, need to engage with static and dynamic materials to enrich strategy conversations and actions. By appreciating how materials and engagement contexts encourage different modes of engagement with design-thinking data, managers can better

integrate design thinking into strategy practice and open up strategies to new voices, ideas, and ways of seeing the market.

Funding

The author(s) received financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article from Strategy Research Foundation (SRF-2017DP-5379) and The University of Sydney Business School.

Author Biographies

Eric Knight is Professor Strategic Management at the University of Sydney Business School (email: eric.knight@sydney.edu.au).

Jarryd Daymond is a PhD Candidate at the University of Sydney Business School, University of Sydney (email: jarryd.daymond@sydney.edu.au).

Sotirios Paroutis is a Professor of Strategic Management at Warwick Business School (email: Sotirios.Paroutis@wbs.ac.uk).

Notes

1. J. Liedtka and S. Kaplan, "How Design Thinking Opens New Frontiers for Strategy Development," *Strategy & Leadership*, 47/2 (2019): 3-10.
2. D. Dougherty, "Interpretive Barriers to Successful Product Innovation in Large Firms," *Organization Science*, 3/2 (May 1992): 179-202.
3. I. Nonaka and H. Takeuchi, *The Knowledge-Creating Company: How Japanese Companies Create the Dynamics of Innovation* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1995).
4. This emphasis on strategy as a reflection of what organizations actually do is consistent with a strategy-as-practice theoretical perspective. See D. Golsorkhi, L. Rouleau, D. Seidl, and E. Vaara, "Introduction: What Is Strategy as Practice," in D. Golsorkhi, L. Rouleau, D. Seidl, and E. Vaara, eds., *Cambridge Handbook of Strategy as Practice* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2010): 1-20; G. Johnson, L. Melin, and R. Whittington, "Micro Strategy and Strategizing: Towards an Activity-Based View," *Journal of Management Studies*, 40/1 (January 2003): 3-22; P. Jarzabkowski, J. Balogun, and D. Seidl, "Strategizing: The Challenges of a Practice Perspective," *Human Relations*, 60/1 (January 2007): 5-27; R. Whittington, "Strategy as Practice Mapping the Terrain," *Long Range Planning*, 29/5 (October 1996): 731-735. This practice perspective differs from strategy traditionally conceived of as how and where firms should compete. See, for example, A.D. Chandler, *Strategy and Structure: Chapters in the History of the Industrial Enterprise* (Boston, MA: MIT Press, 1963); M. E. Porter, "What Is Strategy?" *Harvard Business Review*, 74/6 (November/December 1996): 61-78.
5. E. Knight, S. E. Paroutis, and L. Heracleous, "The Power of PowerPoint: A Visual Perspective on Meaning Making in Strategy," *Strategic Management Journal*, 39/3 (March 2018): 894-921.
6. A. Reckwitz, "Toward a Theory of Social Practices: A Development in Culturalist Theorizing," *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5/2 (May 2002): 243-263, at p. 242.
7. E. Vaara and R. Whittington, "Strategy as Practice: Taking Social Practices Seriously," *Academy of Management Annals*, 6/1 (June 2012): 285-336; P. Jarzabkowski and A. P. Spee, "Strategy-as-Practice: A Review and Future Directions for the Field," *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 11/1 (March 2009): 69-95.
8. S. L. Beckman and M. Barry, "Innovation as a Learning Process: Embedding Design Thinking," *California Management Review*, 50/1 (Fall 2007): 25-57; Brown (2009), op. cit.
9. J. E. Arnold, "Creative Engineering," in W. J. Clancey, ed., *Creative Engineering: Promoting Innovation by Thinking Differently*, Stanford Digital Repository, 1959/2016, pp. 59-150.
10. Brown (2009), op. cit.; R. L. Martin, *The Design of Business: Why Design Thinking Is the next Competitive Advantage* (Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press, 2009); K. D. Elsbach and I.

- Stigliani, "Design Thinking and Organizational Culture: A Review and Framework for Future Research," *Journal of Management*, 44/6 (July 2018): 2274-2306; U. Johansson-Skoldberg, J. Woodilla, and M. Cetinkaya, "Design Thinking: Past, Present and Possible Futures," *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 22/2 (June 2013): 121-146; M. Garbuio, A. Dong, L. Nidhida, T. Tschang, and D. Lovallo, "Demystifying the Genius of Entrepreneurship: How Design Cognition Can Help Create the Next Generation of Entrepreneurs," *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 17/1 (March 2018): 41-61.
11. Liedtka and Kaplan (2019), op. cit.
 12. McKinsey & Company, "New Day for Veryday," *McKinsey Blog*, November 11, 2016, <https://www.mckinsey.com/about-us/new-at-mckinsey-blog/new-day-for-veryday>.
 13. Bain & Company, "Advanced Digital and Product Team," Bain & Company website, accessed on March 16, 2019, <https://www.bain.com/consulting-services/digital/adapt/>.
 14. B. A. Hamilton, "Design Thinking: Innovate Forward," accessed on March 21, 2019, https://www.boozallen.com/content/dam/boozallen_site/sig/pdf/thought_p/Design-Thinking.pdf.
 15. K. Hope, "Better by Design: How Creatives Can Transform Your Business," *The Telegraph*, November 13, 2018, <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/connect/better-business/business-solutions/why-your-company-needs-a-chief-design-officer/>.
 16. J. Eyers, "ANZ Follows Apple with Chief Design Officer," *The Australian Financial Review*, September 7, 2017, p. 18.
 17. B. Sheppard, G. Kouyoumjian, H. Sarrazin, and F. Dore, "The Business Value of Design," *McKinsey Quarterly* (October 2018), <https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/mckinsey-design/our-insights/the-business-value-of-design>.
 18. Liedtka and Kaplan (2019), op. cit.
 19. W. Cohen and D. Levinthal, "Absorptive Capacity a New Perspective on Learning and Innovation," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35/1 (March 1990): 128-152.
 20. B. Evans, "10 Reasons Why CEOs Don't Understand Their Customers," *Forbes*, February 6, 2013, www.forbes.com/sites/oracle/2013/02/06/10-reasons-why-ceos-dont-understand-their-customers/#3354ed8d1333; Oracle, "Global Insights on Succeeding in the Customer Experience Era," 2013, <http://www.oracle.com/us/global-cx-study-2240276.pdf>; Forbes Technology Council, "11 Insights Gained From Executives Listening To Customers," July 17, 2018, www.forbes.com/sites/forbestechcouncil/2018/07/17/11-insights-gained-from-executives-listening-to-customers/#f7d105c46da8.
 21. S. Frier, "This Team Runs Mark Zuckerberg's Facebook Page," *Bloomberg Businessweek*, January 18, 2017, www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2017-01-18/this-team-runs-mark-zuckerberg-s-facebook-page.
 22. W. Bebbington, N. B. Dirks, D. Price, J. Rand, C. Stolker, H. O'Sullivan, and L. Yates. "What Is It Like to Take a Leadership Role at a University?" *Times Higher Education*, August 9, 2018, <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/features/what-is-it-like-to-take-a-leadership-role-at-a-university#survey-answer>.
 23. J. Kolko, "Abductive Thinking and Sense Making: The Drivers of Design Synthesis," *Design Issues*, 26/1 (Winter 2010): 15-28; Beckman and Barry (2007), op. cit.
 24. Y. Gagne, "Nike's New Concept Store Feeds Its Neighbors' Hypebeast and Dad-Shoe Dreams" *Fast Company*, July 12, 2018, www.fastcompany.com/90201272/nikes-new-concept-store-feeds-its-neighbors-hypebeast-and-dad-shoe-dreams; R. Witte, "Nike Is Leveraging Data to Create Local Culture-Specific Retail Locations," *Forbes*, July 16, 2018, www.forbes.com/sites/raewitte/2018/07/16/nike-is-leveraging-data-to-create-local-culture-specific-retail-locations/#ecfb4bcad4f7.
 25. E. Knight and S. Cuganesan, "Enabling Organizational Ambidexterity: Valuation Practices and the Senior-Leadership Team," *Human Relations*, published first online March 18, 2019, <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0018726718823247>.
 26. L. Kimbell, "Rethinking Design Thinking: Part I," *Design and Culture*, 3/3 (November 2011): 285-306.
 27. Martin (2009), op. cit.; R. L. Martin, "How Successful Leaders Think," *Harvard Business Review*, 85/6 (June 2007): 60-67.
 28. J. Liedtka, "In Defense of Strategy as Design," *California Management Review*, 42/3 (Spring 2000): 8-30.
 29. N. Cross, "Designerly Ways of Knowing: Design Discipline Versus Design Science," *Design Issues*, 17/3 (Summer 2001): 49-55; B. Lawson, *How Designers Think: The Design Process De-Mystified*, 4th edition (London: Routledge, 2006).

30. R. J. Boland and F. Collopy, *Managing as Designing* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2004); R. Buchanan, "Wicked Problems in Design Thinking," *Design Issues*, 8/2 (Spring 1992): 5-21.
31. A. Dong, M. Garbuio, and D. Lovallo, "Generative Sensing: A Design Perspective on the Microfoundations of Sensing Capabilities," *California Management Review*, 58/4 (Summer 2016): 97-117.
32. Ibid, p. 97.
33. B. D'Ippolito, "The Importance of Design for Firms' Competitiveness: A Review of the Literature," *Technovation*, 34/11 (November 2014): 716-730.
34. P. Micheli, H. Perks, and M. B. Beverland, "Elevating Design in the Organization," *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 35/4 (July 2018): 629-651; S. Roper, P. Micheli, J. Love, and P. Vahter, "The Roles and Effectiveness of Design in New Product Development: A study of Irish manufacturers," *Research Policy*, 45/1 (February 2016): 319-329.
35. Micheli, Perks, and Beverland (2018), op. cit.
36. G. Calabretta, G. Gemser, N. Wijnberg and P. Hekkert, "Collaborating with Design Consultancy Firms for Effective Strategic Decision-Making in New Product Development," in G. Muratovski, ed., *Design for Business, Volume 2* (Bristol, UK: Intellect, 2014); A. Filippetti, "Harnessing the 'Essential Tension' of Design: The Complex Relationship between the Firm and Designer Consultant," MPRA Paper No. 22002, April 9, 2010, <http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/22002/>.
37. Calabretta, Gemser, Wijnberg, and Hekkert (2013), op. cit.
38. H. Perks, R. Cooper, and C. Jones, "Characterizing the Role of Design in New Product Development: An Empirically Derived Taxonomy," *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 22/2 (March 2005): 111-127.
39. See Elsbach and Stigliani (2018), op. cit.
40. See A. Pettigrew, "The Character and Significance of Strategy Process Research," *Strategic Management Journal*, 13/S2 (Winter 1992): 5-16.
41. J. Body, "Design in the Australian Taxation Office," *Design Issues*, 24/1 (Winter 2008): 55-67.
42. Ibid, p. 63.
43. C. Vetterli, F. Uebernickel, W. Brenner, C. Petrie, and D. Stermann, "How Deutsche Bank's IT Division Used Design Thinking to Achieve Customer Proximity," *MIS Quarterly Executive*, 15/1 (March 2016): 37-53.
44. Ibid, p. 48.
45. Micheli, Perks, and Beverland (2018), op. cit.
46. Martin (2009), op. cit.
47. Cross (2001), op. cit.
48. P. Micheli, J. Jaina, K. Goffin, F. Lemke, and R. Verganti, "Perceptions of Industrial Design: The 'Means' and the 'Ends,'" *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 29/5 (September 2012): 687-704.
49. X. M. Song, M. M. Montoya-Weiss, and J. B. Schmidt, "Antecedents and Consequences of Cross Functional Cooperation: A Comparison of R&D, Manufacturing and Marketing Perspectives," *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 14/1 (January 1997): 35-47.
50. R. A. Burgelman, S. W. Floyd, T. Laamanen, S. Mantere, E. Vaara, and R. Whittington, "Strategy Processes and Practices: Dialogues and Intersections," *Strategic Management Journal*, 39/3 (May 2018): 531-558. Although others have argued that "process" and "practice" should not be used synonymously in relation to strategy. For example, A. Tavakoli, D. Schlagwein, and D. Schoder, "Open Strategy: Literature Review, Re-Analysis of Cases and Conceptualisation as a Practice," *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 26/3 (September 2017): 163-184; R. Chia and B. MacKay, "Post-Processual Challenges for the Emerging Strategy-as-Practice Perspective: Discovering Strategy in the Logic of Practice," *Human Relations*, 60/1 (January 2007): 217-242.
51. J. S. Brown and P. Duguid, "Knowledge and Organization: A Social-Practice Perspective," *Organization Science*, 12/2 (2001): 198-213.
52. Vaara and Whittington (2012), op. cit.
53. Knight, Paroutis, and Heracleous (2018), op. cit.
54. L. Heracleous and C. Jacobs, "Understanding Organizations through Embodied Metaphors," *Organization Studies*, 29/1 (January 2008): 45-78; D. Oliver and J. Roos, "Dealing with the Unexpected: Critical Incidents in the LEGO Mindstorms Team," *Human Relations*, 56/9 (September 2003): 1057-1082.

55. R. Whittington, E. Molloy, M. Mayer, and A.D. Smith, "Practices of Strategising/Organising: Broadening Strategy Work and Skills," *Long Range Planning*, 39/6 (December 2006): 615-629.
56. F. Werle and D. Seidl, "The Layered Materiality of Strategizing: Epistemic Objects and the Interplay between Material Artefacts in the Exploration of Strategic Topics," *British Journal of Management*, 26/S1 (January 2015): S67-S89.
57. E. Knight and H. Tsoukas, "When Fiction Trumps Truth: What 'Post-Truth' and 'Alternative Facts' Mean for Management Studies," *Organization Studies*, 40/2 (February 2019): 183-197.
58. Liedtka and Kaplan (2019), op. cit.
59. W. Brenner and F. Uebernickel, eds., *Design Thinking for Innovation: Research and Practice* (London: Springer, 2016); Johansson-Skoldberg, Woodilla, and Cetinkaya, (2013), op. cit.; J. Kilian, H. Sarrazin, and H. Yeon, "Building a Design-Driven Culture," *McKinsey Digital* (September 2015): 1-7.
60. Beckman and Barry (2007), op. cit.; S.H. Thomke, *Experimentation Matters: Unlocking the Potential of New Technologies for Innovation* (Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press, 2003).
61. Brown (2009), op. cit.
62. T. Lockwood, "Design Thinking in Business: An Interview with Gianfranco Zaccai," *Design Management Review*, 21/3 (September 2010): 16-24, at p. 19.
63. D. Schön, *The Reflective Practitioner* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1983).
64. Ibid.
65. Beckman and Barry (2007), op. cit.
66. B. Ewenstein and J. Whyte, "Beyond Words: Aesthetic Knowledge and Knowing in Organizations," *Organization Studies*, 28/5 (May 2007): 689-708.
67. Elsbach and Stigliani (2018), op. cit.
68. E. Knight and S. Paroutis, "Becoming Salient: The TMT Leader's Role in Shaping the Interpretive Context of Paradoxical Tensions," *Organization Studies*, 38/3-4 (April 2017): 403-432.
69. H. Mintzberg and J. Gosling, "Educating Managers beyond Borders," *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 1/1 (September 2002): 64-76.
70. I. Stigliani and D. Ravasi, "Organizing Thoughts and Connecting Brains: Material Practices and the Transition from Individual to Group-Level Prospective Sensemaking," *Academy of Management Journal*, 55/5 (October 2012): 1232-1259.
71. J. Liedtka, "Why Design Thinking Works," *Harvard Business Review*, 96/5 (September/October 2018): 72-79.
72. J. Dyer, H. Gregersen, and C. M. Christensen, *The Innovator's DNA: Mastering the Five Skills of Disruptive Innovators* (Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press, 2011).
73. Knight, Paroutis, and Heracleous (2018), op. cit.
74. Knight and Cuganesan (2019), op. cit.
75. Knight, Paroutis, and Heracleous (2018), op. cit.
76. Knight and Paroutis (2017), op. cit.
77. Elsbach and Stigliani (2018), op. cit.
78. An example of a paper linking tools to decision making is G.P. Huber, *Managerial Decision Making* (Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman and Company, 1980).
79. W. G. Bennis and J. O'Toole, "How Business Schools Lost Their Way," *Harvard Business Review*, 83/5 (May 2005): 96-104.
80. Body (2008), op. cit.; Vetterli et al. (2016), op. cit.
81. Knight and Paroutis (2017), op. cit.; J. Balogun and G. Johnson, "Organizational Restructuring and Middle Manager Sensemaking," *Academy of Management Journal*, 47/4 (August 2004): 523-549.
82. J. Hautz, D. Seidl, and R. Whittington, "Open Strategy: Dimensions, Dilemmas, Dynamics," *Long Range Planning*, 50/3 (June 2017): 298-309.
83. "BCG Acquires Digital Design and Innovation Lab MAYA," press release, July 18, 2017, www.bcg.com/d/press/18july2017-bcg-acquire-maya-design-165419; "BCG Digital Ventures Acquires S&C, an Award-Winning Strategic-Design Firm," press release, July 10, 2014, www.bcg.com/d/press/10july2014-bcg-digital-ventures-acquires-sc-728.
84. K. P. Schulz, S. Geithner, C. Woelfel, and C. Krzywinski, "Toolkit-Based Modelling and Serious Play as Means to Foster Creativity in Innovation Processes," *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 24/2 (June 2015): 323-340.
85. Knight, Paroutis, and Heracleous (2018), op. cit.
86. Kilian, Sarrazin, and Yeon (2015), op. cit.

87. Elsbach and Stigliani (2018), op. cit.
88. Elsbach and Stigliani (2018), op. cit.; Garbuio et al. (2018), op. cit.; R. Glen, C. Suciu, and C. Baughn, "The Need for Design Thinking in Business Schools," *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 13/4 (December 2014): 653-667; J. Liedtka, "Perspective: Linking Design Thinking with Innovation Outcomes through Cognitive Bias Reduction," *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 32/6 (November 2015): 925-938.
89. E. Henkel and A. Grant, "To Get Employees to Empathize with Customers, Make Them Think Like Customers," Harvard Business Review Digital Articles, September 28, 2018, <https://hbr.org/2018/09/to-get-employees-to-empathize-with-customers-make-them-think-like-customers>.
90. Ibid.
91. Liedtka (2000), op. cit., p. 28.