

The Alignment of OD and Design Thinking: Opportunities for Practice

Researcher: Emily Kessler
Instructor: Martin Greller
Advanced Seminar in Management
Fall 2015

Introduction

Design thinking is a problem solving methodology popular across disciplines that has been embraced by management education and corporate America in recent years. It is widespread, with opportunities to learn the practice in workshops and classes all across the country in both accredited and continuing education programs.¹ However, this methodology is not prevalent in the field of organization development (OD). Indeed, it hasn't been integrated into educational programs targeting new OD practitioners. I find it perplexing that design thinking is not routinely employed by OD practitioners since I believe there to be great symmetries among original OD theories and design thinking principles. In this paper, I aim to demonstrate first that there is an alignment of principles and values among the design thinking methodology and traditional OD theories. Second, I argue that a design thinking methodology can bring something new to the practice and potentially help OD practitioners more effectively solve problems. It is my expectation that by demonstrating a connection to well-established OD concepts, practitioners will feel more inclined to embrace design thinking as a valid methodology in their work.

This paper will take the reader through the steps of my argument that OD would benefit from embracing design thinking principles. I begin with a brief description of design thinking and demonstrate how it's been embraced by business and management literature, as well as higher education. Next, I discuss the minimal mention of design thinking in OD literature and its absence from OD-centric graduate program curricula. I then highlight the shared characteristics

¹ A recent Google search yielded a wide array of courses available, including, but not limited to: the d/school's Virtual Crash Course in Design Thinking; Design Thinking for Innovation at the University of Virginia; IDEO U's Design Thinking Online Courses; Mastering Innovation and Design-Thinking Course at MIT; Design Thinking at the School of Visual Arts; and General Assembly's Design Thinking in Practice, to name a few.

and values among design thinking and OD theories. Thereafter, I demonstrate that design thinking can bring something new to the field of OD and describe several current approaches that incorporate design thinking principles into the field. Finally, I close with a discussion about larger implications for the field and how this kind of approach might help in solving some of the major issues facing the field today

What is Design Thinking?

Design thinking is a current strategy, adapted from the design sciences, and often used today to help solve deep, intractable, “wicked problems” (Eneberg & Holm 2013) through a combination of integrative thinking and empathetic values. Design thinking is characterized by its ability to identify solutions rather than analyze and assess problems (L. Meyer 2015). Traditionally employed in product design, this process generally begins (in simplified terms) with exploring the end user’s needs and perspectives, developing prototypes, testing, reflecting, and re-testing to achieve the desired product (Brown 2008; Brown & Katz 2009). More recently, design thinking has been used beyond mere product design in the development of organizational strategies, processes and systems (L. Meyer 2015). It has become synonymous with the concept of innovation (Brown 2008).

It is my speculation that design thinking is unique in its methods, and a valuable problem-solving methodology, for two reasons: its consideration of users and its approach to learning. Design thinking incorporates users’ needs early on in the design process, experimenting along the way, learning from mistakes, and adapting as a result (Brown 2008). It is a strategic choice to employ this methodology at the beginning of the creation stage, rather than towards the end when

design had previously been used to make a product more aesthetically pleasing (Brown 2008). The result of this intentional focus on the user is a better, more well-received, product. Moreover, the design team has learned from this process of experimentation and is better equipped to tackle future challenges.

Embracing Design Thinking in the Field

To be sure, popular business literature has embraced the concept of design thinking. A recent Google search for “design thinking” yielded 5,330,000 results. *Harvard Business Review* has reported on the methodology on as least nine occasions, most recently in its September 2015 issue, with a cover article entitled “The Evolution of Design Thinking”. In that issue, HBR also reported on Pepsico’s employment of design thinking as a strategic initiative (Ignatius 2015). *The New York Times* recently reported on IBM’s use of design thinking in an effort to re-energize the company and stave off declining revenue (Lohr 2015). The *MIT Sloan Management Review* dedicated their entire Summer 2009 issue to design thinking for managers, covering such topics as communications, management, leadership, and sustainability, all highlighting the link to innovative problem solving. Tim Brown, CEO of the “innovation and design” firm IDEO, is the most likely individual responsible for popularizing the term “design thinking”. His two TED talks, in which he demonstrates the power of design thinking, have received over 2.5 million views. *Forbes*, *Fortune* and *Fast Company* have all reported on the benefits (and downfalls) of design thinking in stimulating creativity, driving growth, and increasing profits. The *Stanford Social Innovation Review* has focused on design thinking’s ability to help organizations solve social problems, due to its intrinsic tendency to focus on the needs and perspectives of stakeholders (Brown & Wyatt 2010).

Organization Development literature has occasionally discussed the use of design thinking as a methodology, although it still remains largely minimized. OD literature has devoted entire issues to the topic on two separate occasions. First, in 2007, the *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* dedicated their March issue to “Bringing the Design Sciences to Organization Development and Change Management”. Recently this year, *OD Practitioner’s* Summer 2015 issue featured seven articles focused on using a design approach in OD work. Indeed, although a number of practitioners highlight in this literature how their design thinking approaches have led to successful outcomes in their work (Coughlan & Canales 2007; Bate & Robert 2007; Beaudry 2015; Gadbaw 2015) the practice does not appear to have been fully embraced by the field. Descriptions of sessions at the 2015 OD Network/IODA Annual Conference and World Summit² indicate that design thinking was not a topic of conversation among the speakers and presenters. Annual conferences and convenings in the field are a strong measure of the current discourse. It appears that design thinking is not a topic of consideration presently among OD practitioners.

School Curricula

Design thinking as a methodology has been embraced by business and management schools across the United States, but it is virtually absent from OD-centric graduate programs. Progressive academic institutions, such as Stanford University, are promoting inter-disciplinary education for a richer academic experience. Students at Stanford’s business school can take electives at their well-known d.school (at the Hasso Plattner Institute of Design) in design

² See: <http://www.odnetwork.org/?page=2015Sessions>

thinking to supplement their MBA programs. Other schools featuring design thinking methodology in the MBA curriculum include: Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio; Suffolk University in Boston, MA; the University of California Berkeley; and the University of Virginia Darden School. According to their website, the Rotman School of Management at the University of Toronto offers an experiential business design studio called DesignWorks, which puts great emphasis on user-centered design - a key component of design thinking.³ Roy Glen, Christy Suciu and Christopher Baughn call for supplementing traditional management education with design thinking to more effectively solve complex problems. They argue that the design thinking approach is “a more general cognitive process facilitating adaptive reasoning”, leading to deeper learning and analysis (Glen, Suciu, & Baughn 2014, p. 663).

An analysis of the OD-centric programs offered in the New York City⁴ area revealed no mention of design thinking in any of their published materials describing the curricula. To be sure, the OD Network of New York lists the various organizational psychology, organizational behavior and organizational change management programs offered at New York University's Tandon School of Engineering, Baruch College's Zicklin School of Business, Columbia University's Teachers College, Manhattanville College, Mercy College, and Milano The New School for Management and Urban Policy. None of the schools' webpages hinted at an interest in design thinking. In fact, there has been no integration of design thinking into the curriculum for the Organizational Change Management program at Milano despite the inclusion of the Parson's School of Design in the University's consortium of academic institutes. This is quite

³ For more information, see <https://www.rotman.utoronto.ca/FacultyAndResearch/EducationCentres/DesignWorks/About%20DW.aspx>

⁴ I used ODNNY's resources section of their website to guide my research on OD-centric programs offered in the New York City region. See more information at: <http://www.odnny.org/od-resources/degree-programs>

shocking given that Parson's has recently launched new programs in their School of Design Strategies with a new Master of Science in Strategic Design and Management program.⁵ If design thinking is not being taught in OD programs, then students are not being trained in this methodology. The profession cannot fully adopt or consider design thinking if it is only practiced on an ad hoc basis.

Commonalities Among Design Thinking and OD Theories

There is no definitive list of design thinking principles, but an analysis of the literature has unearthed some commonalities that can also be linked to well-established OD theories (see Figure 1)⁶. Indeed, these design thinking principles are characterized by values consistent with OD tradition. I propose that there are tremendous similarities between design thinking and OD, and that practitioners can utilize design thinking principles to help frame the values that are important in OD work.

To begin, the design thinking process has been described as integrative, experimental and iterative (Brown 2008; Brown & Katz 2009; Razzouk & Shute 2012; Nixon 2013;). Designers practice integrative thinking, holding opposing viewpoints in order to generate new solutions (Brown 2008). They use action-based methods to synthesize data and learn from the experience (Eneberg & Holm 2013). Designers practice trial and error, creating prototypes, and test and re-test as part of the exploratory process (Eneberg & Holm 2013; Razzouk & Shute 2012; Brown 2008; Brown & Katz 2009). The entire process is repeated - adapting, growing and evolving until

⁵ For more information on Parson's School of Design Strategies with a new Master of Science in Strategic Design and Management program, see: <http://www.newschool.edu/parsons/masters-design-management/>

⁶ An analysis of design thinking in the literature also uncovered such characteristics as "bounded" and "holistic". For the purposes of this paper, I have chosen to concentrate on the concepts most relevant to this discussion.

a solution is achieved. Designers “...draw relations between ideas to solve the problem...” (Razzouk & Shute 2012, pp. 334) and “...dramatically improve on existing alternatives...” (Brown 2008). These characteristics of the thinking process lead to deeper understanding and a profound learning experience whereby knowledge becomes intuitive.

Figure I: OD & Design Thinking Matrix

OD Traditions	DT Principles	Commonalities
Donald Schön Chris Argyris Double Loop Learning Model I & Model II Reflective Practice	Integrative Experimental Iterative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • action-based methods • action learning • interaction and practice • trial and error • exploratory • testing and re-testing • prototyping • evolving • repetition of a process
NTL Edgar Schein Process Consulting	Collaborative Empathic Optimistic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • interactions between stakeholders • participatory • human centered • humanistic

Design thinking has also been characterized as being collaborative, empathic and optimistic in nature (Brown 2008; Brown & Katz 2009; A Meyer 2013; Eneberg & Holm 2013). Designers engage in interactions between stakeholders, practicing participatory behavior (Eneberg & Holm 2013). They use a human-centered approach, emphasizing the perspectives of the end user of the product or system (Brown 2008; L Meyer 2015). Finally, design thinking is known to be optimistic in its manner, focusing on identifying solutions rather than hashing through problems (Brown & Wyatt 2010). “By taking a ‘people first’ approach, design thinkers can imagine solutions that are inherently desirable and meet explicit or latent needs” (Brown 2008, p. 87).

NTL, Schön, Argyris, and Schein

Design thinking, at its basic elements, should not be unknown to OD practitioners. Indeed, characteristics of a design thinking methodology are consistent with traditional OD theories, particularly the democratic values put forth by the National Training Laboratories (NTL). The NTL, a forerunner to the practice of OD, introduced the T-Group, which has become the basis for participant-led change in the field. Their approach underscored sensitivity training, empathy in practice, and embracing diversity and inclusion. These values correlate directly with such design thinking characteristics as human-centered and collaborative. Kurt Lewin, Ronald Lippitt, Kenneth Benne, and Leland Bradford “...shared a personal and professional interest in the applied behavioral sciences and in the belief that science should be used to integrate democratic values in society” (Clayton & Lucas 1999, p.7).

Reflective Practice

As we move beyond the NTL and into such theorists as Donald Schön, Chris Argyris and Edgar Schein, we see even deeper similarities among their work and design thinking. Donald Schön’s theories on reflective practice and knowing-in-action form the basis of organizational learning, which have contributed significantly to the field of OD (L. Meyer 2015, p. 43). In *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*, Schön analyzed the problem solving skills of a number of professionals, from architects to psychotherapists to managers. In fact, Schön specifically addresses the methods in which a designer does his/her work:

In a good process of design, this conversation with the situation is reflective. In answer to the situation’s back-talk, the designer reflects-in-action on the

construction of the problem, the strategies of action, or the model of the phenomena, which have been implicit in his moves (Schön 1983, p. 79).

He concluded that theirs was an improvisation of practice, testing and re-testing, and applying critical thought. Schön advocated for a movement away from technical knowledge towards a more reflective practice as an effective way to solve deep, intractable problems.

Double Loop Learning

As previously mentioned, design thinking is an integrative process, characterized by action-based learning methods and practice. Donald Schön and Chris Argyris' theories on single loop and double loop learning are obvious models that describe such a process and help explain the phenomenon of organizational learning. There is a direct correlation between this kind of "learning by doing" and the double loop learning model that Argyris and Schön introduced to help organizations solve the most intractable problems. Briefly, single loop learning occurs when an organization receives data and makes corrections to its systems (Argyris 1977). Whereas double loop learning requires reflection and an examination beyond the data to the root cause of the problem (Argyris 1977). It is a deep and exploratory process, requiring us to question not only our original assumptions and methodologies, but also any underlying biases and belief systems (Argyris 1977). Design thinking mirrors this practice, particularly during the prototyping stage when deep reflection is required to unearth assumptions that are hindering the process.

Model I and Model II behaviors

An element of the design thinking methodology pertains to how practitioners and organizations learn from past actions in order to change behavior. Chris Argyris' concepts of Model I and

Model II behavior help explain the inconsistencies between thought and action. He notes that most humans exhibit Model I behavior, acting out of defensive reasoning, protecting ourselves, seeking to be in control of our environment (Christensen 2008, p. 10). Model II behavior is more advanced, and demonstrates how reflective practice and the use of double loop learning can help move individuals to deeper understanding and lasting behavioral change. Argyris' models are helpful to OD practitioners in several ways. First, practitioners should critically examine governing values and assumptions, discussing issues openly, and discard or change values that are in conflict with the strategy or direction (Christensen 2008, p. 13). Indeed, self-awareness and critical thinking are valued competencies. Second, practitioners should include the perspectives of others in reflecting on their actions. Model II thinking combines inquiry and public testing. It is crucial to note that Model I behavior is an example of when practitioners' assumptions and biases can prevent insights and understandings necessary to achieve deep learning.

Process Consulting

In reflecting on the empathic and collaborative nature of design thinking, I am reminded of Edgar Schein and his theories of intervention. In *Process Consultation Revisited: Building the Helping Relationship*, Schein advocates for "process consultation", a philosophy on the process of helping in which the consultant does not advise, but rather supports the client towards self-determination. It is characterized by several stages in which the consultant asks a series of increasingly penetrating questions to help the client unearth information and involve them directly in the process of diagnosis and resolution. Schein has taken a human-centered approach in his advocacy for strengthening one's client in order for them to be able to diagnose and treat their own problems in the future (Schein 1999, p. 16). Indeed, Schein notes that consultants

cannot be experts in all fields, but need to access the knowledge and experience of their clients. Furthermore, “[u]nless clients learn to see problems for themselves and think through their own remedies, they will be less likely to implement the solution...” (Schein 1999, p. 18). In taking a collaborative and empathic approach, Schein empowers his clients to take ownership of their problems and solutions, becoming a deeply engaged participant in the process.

What Design Thinking Can Add to OD

Human-Centered Approaches

Design thinking can add to the practice of OD by emphasizing a human-centered approach and highlighting the user experience. Indeed, OD already has a history of applying humanistic values. There have been recent discussions about increasing the usage of empathy in OD, specifically regarding organization design. Natalie Nixon delivers compelling evidence of how design thinking can be employed in an organizational design project. In highlighting a user-centered approach, she notes that such a practice serves the needs of both an organization’s staff and its customers/clients, redirecting the focus from an organization’s financial stakeholders. In reporting on the Organizational Design Community’s 2013 Annual Conference, Alan Meyer noted that past approaches to organization design focused more on “fit”, “congruence”, or “alignment” (A. Meyer 2013, p. 17). More current thinking asserts that “[o]rganization designs should emerge from ‘design thinking’ by invoking principles that generate empathy with users, identify related worlds, and test new ideas via rapid prototyping” (A. Meyer 2013, p.17). Paul Bate and Glenn Robert advocate for the use of experience-based design (EBD) in OD, including user perspective in the design of organizational systems or processes (Bate & Robert 2007). They justify the presence of users and designers together in an EBD process so as to surface

knowledge of the users' experiences and insights and transform it into a more innovative product (Bate & Robert 2007). Bate and Robert claim that a user-centric approach can push organizational design beyond being functional or well-engineered, to address critical issues pertaining to the usability and accessibility of product or service (Bate & Robert 2007).

The inclusion of human-centered values in an OD intervention may lead to higher success rates. Researcher Quy Nguyen-Huy conducted a three-year ethnography of a large technology company undergoing a strategic change initiative and found that the inclusion of “diversity, humility, integrity, and justice... facilitate[d] the adoption of a proposed change...” (Nguyen-Huy 2000, p.A3). Jeremy Beaudry, MSAS, advocates for the use of design thinking in re-designing organizations to emphasize stakeholder engagement and support large scale change (Beaudry 2015, p. 15). In "Design Tools For Social Engagement In Organizations", he reports on an initiative whereby the use of design thinking produced such positive results as “increased collaboration”, a shift in “mindset”, and “new behaviors” (Beaudry 2015, p. 19). Tim Brown of IDEO notes that a human-centered approach, by focusing on user needs and perspectives, can unearth critical data and unforeseen insights and steer an organization to better solutions (Brown 2008).

Experimental Techniques

OD can also benefit from adopting design thinking's tendency towards experimentation. Designers frequently work with prototypes, learning from successes and mistakes. It is an action-oriented process that provides the link from theory to something more tangible. In her organization re-design proposal mentioned earlier, Natalie Nixon also advocates for the use of

prototyping services and experiences to unearth new insights, and “...reveal mistakes, gaps in thinking, and inefficiencies” (Nixon 2013, p. 25). Nixon gives several examples of how organizations can use prototyping in developing new services and systems. She describes the use of a “pop-up shop” to test products, in-store experiences and delivery services. Nixon notes that an organization can experiment internally with role play and improvisation, walking through a mock-up of a potential service or system to explore what is and is not working. To be sure, she proclaims that this kind of experimentation works best in organizational cultures that embrace mistakes and failure as part of the learning process.

Prototyping is an important design tool that not only allows for experimentation, but increases learning and collaboration. IDEO designers/consultants Peter Coughlan, Jane Fulton Suri and Katherine Canales authored an article in *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* promoting the use of prototyping in OD projects to better “facilitate behavioral change” (Coughlan, Suri & Canales 2007, p. 122). They claim that “[p]rototyping allows teams to make small easily reversible changes before everything is fully resolved and to learn quickly by making recoverable errors of small scale” (Coughlan, Suri & Canales 2007, pp. 132-133). Coughlan and his colleagues note that this process can be more effective than traditional methods of planned change in which participants may feel the weight of implementing a fully realized theoretical plan. The authors deduce that not only does prototyping lead to better solutions, the process involving stakeholders in testing activities is equally valuable. Stakeholders are “... employed in the creative, collaborative, and rewarding pursuit of learning together in forward-thinking and constructive activities” (Coughlan, Suri & Canales 2007, p. 132). They conclude that organizations

that successfully experiment with prototyping tend to integrate the process into their ongoing work.

How Design Thinking is Employed in OD Work

Spotlight on Rapid Results, Positive Deviance and Open Space Technology

OD and design thinking have converged in at least three techniques that are currently in use by change consultants and practitioners: Rapid Results, Positive Deviance and Open Space Technology. Rapid Results is notable for its design thinking characteristics: using a human-centered approach combined with quick prototyping. Developed by Robert Schaffer and colleagues, Rapid Results is a “results-focused rapid cycle” (Schaffer & Siegal 2005, p. 13) process generating improved capacity and employee engagement. Schaffer describes the process in “Rapid Results: Unlocking the Door to Major Change”: employees create teams, with a facilitator or coach guiding direction, and work toward completing a goal (such as the development of a new product or creation of a new system) in a short period of time (Schaffer & Siegal 2005). He notes that these projects usually take 100 days to complete, which forces employees to take on more risk and behave more boldly. Such processes engage employees to take ownership of the work and drive the change within the organization. As a result, employees become more confident in their capabilities and become more fearless in testing new approaches. Schaffer has found that rapid results projects (a) produce “learning organizations” - ones that increase grassroots capacity to implement internal change; (b) cost little to roll out; and (c) result in higher success rates due to employee engagement at every level (Schaffer & Siegal 2005).

Positive Deviance is an optimistic, human-centered approach born out of the social change movement that has become adapted for organizational change efforts. Similar to Appreciative Inquiry (AI), positive deviance focuses on what is working in a particular situation as opposed to what is not working. However, while AI might shy away from discussing an organization's problems, positive deviance openly addresses problems and relies on the behaviors of those who are succeeding in order to identify solutions. The Positive Deviance Initiative⁷ was founded by Jerry Sternin in the early 1990s to effect social change around the globe. Their methods have since been adapted for organizational change, particularly with regards to leadership and management. Practitioners of positive deviance operate under the same assumptions as those employed in rapid results: that employees are the best resources of information for determining solutions to organizational problems (Leavy 2011). It is unique for its bottom up approach, rather than top down, emphasizing the knowledge and expertise of frontline employees. These stakeholders are charged with identifying what is working and then replicating it throughout the organization (Dubin 2013). Such internal change approaches decrease resistance and increase organizational learning opportunities (Tarantino 2005).

Open Space Technology is another problem-solving methodology which allows for diverse voices to be a part of the solution-seeking process. It is experimental and human-centered, often yielding results quickly. Developed by Harrison Owen in the 1980s, it has been used to implement large-scale organizational and systemic change. Following is a description of Open Space according to Owen in "Opening Space for Productivity". Open Space is essentially a group meeting - characterized by its democratic mechanisms, principles and laws - allowing for a

⁷ See <http://www.positivedeviance.org> for more information

diversity of voices and opinions to be expressed. It begins with all participants sitting in a circle. Individuals then propose topics of discussion, (the “bulletin board”) and set a time and place for said discussions (the “marketplace”). Anyone is free to participate in these discussions or move on to other concurrent discussions. No one individual is running the meeting. All participants are setting the agenda. (Owen 1997). According to Owen, this process quickly results in high productivity. Indeed, researchers Tom Thakadipurama and Linda Stevenson report in a case study that the use of Open Space Technology in a Roman Catholic Church facing an organizational breakdown resulted in a complete turnaround. They note that this process “...[effected] transformation for an organization in crisis with the least effort and maximum impact within a short time span” (Thakadipurama & Stevenson 2013, p. 116). Thakadipurama and Stevenson allude to the democratic nature of the process in being responsible for the success of the initiative (Thakadipurama & Stevenson 2013). Allowing stakeholders to have an equal voice, and giving them autonomy in how they assembled, contributed to positive outcomes.

Limitations of a Design Thinking Approach

For certain, there are limitations to a design thinking methodology. Although design thinking practitioners promote collaboration and team work, working with others can lead to conflict and tension. Design thinkers can learn from OD by embracing the values and practices advocated by training group (T Groups) processes, such as active listening, open mindedness, and self-awareness. Indeed, the literature on design thinking only tentatively advocates for diversity on teams. Even then, they refer to a diversity of professions and job titles. True organizational learning and advancement comes from a diversity of thought, with teams featuring a variation in race, gender, age, ability, and learning and communication styles. Furthermore, to

take full advantage of multiple perspectives a diverse team would bring, it's critical for the team to learn how to embrace one another and utilize each other's gifts. This is where T-Group trainings would benefit teams of design thinkers: giving them the tools to empower themselves to work together and leverage the diversity of talent and perspective brought by each individual.

Implications

In October 2015, the Organization Development Network and International Organization Development Association (IODA) convened in Portland, Oregon for an international summit to discuss the theme of "Our Field. Our World. Our Impact".⁸ A variety of international speakers took the stage to deliver an inspirational message about how the field of OD can move beyond individual organizational change to something far greater. Participants were emboldened to push their work deeper and further towards greater social change.⁹ How might a design thinking, human-centered approach impact the field of organization development at a time when practitioners are called upon to change the world, but change management success rates remain at 30% (Keller & Aiken 2009)? To be sure, design thinking shouldn't be employed as needed for specific projects, but rather inform the culture of an organization to work toward an overarching methodology of how to do their work. However, the infusion of such a practice that regularly employs a combination of empathy, experimentation, and reflection, through an optimistic and inclusive lens, might push the OD field to better address the limitations and challenges facing practitioners today.

⁸ See <http://www.odnetwork.org/?page=2015AnnualConfer> for more information

⁹ This information came about during a phone call I had on November 24, 2015 with an OD practitioner based in California who had recently attended the OD Network's annual conference in Portland, Oregon. She noted that high levels discussions focused on addressing more complex problems at the social level.

Conclusion

I set out to argue in this paper that OD practitioners would benefit by embracing design thinking principles in their practice. Indeed, it was my intention that by demonstrating a natural alliance with well-established OD theories, practitioners would feel more inclined to adopt this methodology. The advantages to integrating design thinking into one's practice are numerous. First, the approach involves stakeholders early on in a change initiative. Next, design thinking encourages collaboration, resulting in a richer set of ideas. These first two characteristics often lead to increased adoption or acceptance levels by users. Additionally, this approach can result in higher staff or stakeholder engagement levels. Finally, and importantly, design thinking can help create a learning organization through a process of reflecting, testing, and evaluating. Assuredly, in employing this methodology, practitioners must also support these collaborative design teams to better leverage the diversity of talents and perspectives. In this case, design thinking can learn something from OD and its rich tradition in sensitivity training groups. Gaining deeper insights into oneself and group members could certainly strengthen the benefits of a design thinking process.

References

- Argyris, C. (1977, September). Double loop learning in organizations. *Harvard Business Review*, 55(5), 115-125.
- Bate, P., & Robert, G. (2007). Toward more user-centric OD. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43(1), 41-66.
- Beaudry, J. (2015). Design tools for social engagement in organizations. *OD Practitioner*, 47(3), 15-20.
- Brown, T., & Katz, B. (2009). *Change by design: How design thinking transforms organizations and inspires innovation*. New York: Harper Business.
- Brown, T. (2008, June). Design thinking. *Harvard Business Review*, 86(6), 84-92.
- Brown, T., & Wyatt, J. (2010). Design thinking for social innovation. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 8(1), 30-35.
- Christensen, K. (2008). Thought leader interview Chris Argyris. *Rotman Magazine*, Winter, 10-13.
- Clayton, W. B., & Lucas, D. G. (1999). History of NTL: A story worth sharing. In A. L. Cooke, M. Brazzel, A. S. Craig, & B. Greig (Eds.), *Reading book for human relations training* (8th ed., pp. 7-10). Arlington: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science.
- Coughlan, P., Suri, J. F., & Canales, K. (2007, March). Prototypes as (design) tools for behavioral and organizational change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43(1), 122-134.
- Dubin, J. (2013, May). How to unleash the power of Positive Deviance. *Medical Marketing & Media*, 48(5), 34-34.
- Eneberg, M., & Holm, L. S. (2013, April). Design thinking and organizational development: Twin concepts enabling a reintroduction of democratic values in organizational change? Retrieved from <http://www.academia.edu/2565227/>

Design_Thinking_and_Organizational_Development_Twin_concepts_enabling_a_reintr
oduction_of_democratic_values_in_organizational_change

Gadbaw, J.W. (2015). Using design intentionally. *OD Practitioner*, 47(3), 27-30.

Glen, R., Suciu, C., & Baughn, C. (2014, December). The need for design thinking in business schools. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 13(4), 653-667.

Ignatius, A. (2015, September). How Indra Nooyi turned design thinking into strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, 81-85.

Keller, S., & Aiken, C. (2009). The inconvenient truth about change management: Why it isn't working and what to do about it (Rep.). Retrieved December 15, 2015, from McKinsey & Co. website: <https://www.academia.edu/8368956/>

The_Inconvenient_Truth_About_Change_Management_Why_it_isnt_working_and_wh
at_to_do_about_it

Leavy, B. (2011, March). Leading adaptive change by harnessing the power of positive deviance. *Strategy & Leadership*, 39(2), 18-27.

Lohr, S. (2015, November 15). IBM's design-centered strategy to set free the squares. *The New York Times*, p. BU1. Retrieved November 27, 2015, from http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/15/business/ibms-design-centered-strategy-to-set-free-the-squares.html?_r=0

Meyer, A. (2013, December). Emerging assumptions about organization design, knowledge and action. *Journal of Organization Design*, 2(3), 16-22.

Meyer, L. M. (2015). Design thinking. *OD Practitioner*, 47(4), 42-47.

Nguyen-Huy, Q. (2000). Do humanistic values matter? *Academy of Management Proceedings & Membership Directory*, A1-A6.

Nixon, N.W. (2013, December). Viewing ascension health from a design thinking perspective.

Journal of Organization Design, 2(3), 23-28.

Owen, H. (1997). Opening space for productivity. *National Productivity Review (Wiley)*, 17(1),

67-71.

Razzouk, R., & Shute, V. (2012). What is design thinking and why is it important? *Review of*

Educational Research, 82(3), 330-348.

Schaffer, R. H., & Siegal, W. (2005, December). Rapid results: Unlocking the door to major

change. *C2M: Consulting to Management*, 16(4), 12-18.

Schein, E. H. (1999). *Process consultation revisited: Building the helping relationship*. Reading, MA:

Addison-Wesley.

Schön, D.A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic

Books.

Tarantino, D. P. (2005, September). Positive Deviance as a tool for organizational change. *Physician*

Executive, 31(5), 62-63.

Thakadipuram, Tom, and Linda Stevenson. Turnaround: From breakdown to breakthrough with

open space technology. *Human Resource Development International* 16.1 (2013): 116-127.