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More and more organizations are using designerly ways of innovating to improve and transform their innovation systems and outcomes (e.g. Liedtka, 2018). This transformation implies the adoption of an innovation process characterized by experimentation, iteration, and fast failure rather than a linear, stage-gate type of process that is focused on failure prevention (Brown, 2008). In particular, when seeking to create and implement innovations that are radical in nature, iteration and experimentation are essential and require organizational flexibility, for example, in the field of strategizing (Deken et al., 2018). It also requires organizations to open up their innovation systems and co-create with a broader set of stakeholders (e.g., Gemser and Perks, 2015). Interestingly, designerly ways of innovating are not only embraced by established organizations, but also by new ventures (Klenner et al., 2015). Organizations, be they newly created or established, not only borrow from the designers’ toolbox, but also seek to create a more enduring, overarching creative mindset within the organization. Such organizations may assist their employees in breaking out of their habitual ways of seeing, knowing, and acting by means of, for example, investing in creative, inspirational workspaces (Barry and Meisiek, 2010) or design thinking training programs. At the same time, the mass-marketing and commodification of designerly ways of innovating have led to a host of problems (Barry, 2017), and there are many challenges to overcome when implementing and using designerly ways of innovating in organizational settings (e.g. Carlgren et al., 2016). In this track, we seek to further explore these challenges.

Overview of the papers included in this track

The papers chosen for this track represent an eclectic mix of methodological approaches, conceptual frameworks, and data collection methods. Yet all papers share the same aim – the quest to advance our understanding of designerly ways of innovating and shed light on the phenomenon.

In our first paper, "Developing and applying performance metrics to evaluate co-design activities in design-led innovation" the authors Jamie O’Hare, Elies Dekoninck, and Lorenzo Giunta examine the role of co-design activities in design-led innovation. To advance the current debate around the effectiveness of co-design in design-led innovation, the authors develop a tailored suite of design process performance metrics that can be of use to design researchers and practitioners engaged in design-led innovation.

Christos Chantzaras’ paper "The 3rd Dimension of Innovation Processes" advances our understanding of how architecture can provide an alternative frame for fostering innovation. The author explains and discusses the basic principles of integration through two case study examples, and he proposes that the specific skill set and thinking of architects offers a valuable 3rd dimension of innovation processes.

Our next paper, "Design practices for strategic innovation in start-ups" was written by Daphna Glaubert, Zarina Charlesworth, Nathalie Nyffeler, and Luc Bergeron. The research team studied a 4-day Innovation by Design Challenge workshop. They found that design practice integration into the initial development of a start-up can
indeed provide a lever for success by providing the strategic vision needed to persevere and bring products or services to market successfully.

The fourth paper in our track is titled "Enhancing Collaboration: A Design Leader’s Role in Managing Paradoxical Identity Tensions Through Dual Identification." The authors Emma Coy and Johanna Prasch leverage paradox theory and social identity theory to shed light on the management of identity tensions in the context of multifunctional innovation teams. The authors argue that leaders should enable individuals to both identify as designers and innovation team members, and they provide suggestions for the implementation of such leadership practices.

Next, we turn our attention toward the use of design artefacts in innovation. The paper "Design artefacts as flexible and persuasive tools for customer-centric innovation" by Jacqueline Wechsler and Jochen Schweitzer reports on a practice-led case study proposing five distinct roles of design artefacts as flexible and persuasive tools that mediate the social and intertwined demands of customer-centric innovation strategies.

Our sixth paper, "Exploring the Design Space of Innovation Canvases" by Katja Thoring, Roland Mueller and Petra Badke-Schaub outlines the potential design space of innovation canvases. The paper advances our understanding of the working mechanisms and fields of application of existing innovation canvases and provides support for developing such visual innovation tools for new purposes.

The paper "Storytelling and Low-Resolution Prototypes for Innovative Simulated Experiences in User-Centered Research" was authored by Daniela Szabluk, Ana Berger, Andrea Capra, and Manuela Oliveira. The paper discusses the use of low-resolution prototypes and storytelling as tools for planning and building simulated interactive experiences as a part of an exploratory method of user-centered research.

Titta Jylkäs, Essia Kuure, and Satu Miettinen’s contribution shifts the discussion to the topics of service design and artificial intelligence (AI). Their paper "Service Design Creating Value for Industrial Corporates through AI Proofs of Concept" explores how proof of concept (PoC) is used at different AI project stages and explores how service design can support the creation of such PoCs.

Our next paper "Disruptive Innovation Ecosystems: Reconceptualising Innovation Ecosystems" by Badziili Nthubu, Daniel Richards and Leon Cruickshank reviews a variety of scholarly perspectives on innovation ecosystems and applies 'design focused ecosystem thinking' to propose a new type of Disruptive Innovation Ecosystem (DIE) that can be leveraged by businesses for building sustainable innovation ecosystems.

In their paper "Unlocking the Potential of the Salesperson in the Virtual Fitting Room: Enhancing the Online Retail Experience for Fashion Brands" the two authors Eirini Bazaki and Vanissa Wanick compare and contrast virtual fitting room models found in the literature with examples from popular websites. Their paper introduces the concept of the salesperson in the virtual fitting room and provides recommendations as to how this concept can be further explored from a design perspective.

The final paper in this track "Speeding-Up Innovation with Business Hackathons: Insights into Three Case Studies" by Myrna Flores, Matic Golob, Doroteja Maklin, and Christopher Tucci presents a methodology for organizing hackathons. The authors elaborate on this methodology through the application of case study examples.
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