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Design is increasingly seen as a potential driver for innovation and growth both in commercial and public and policy sectors. However this imply design capacity utilized as a strategic resource, which as Svengren Holm points out mean focusing not only on the product, but also the process (Svengren Holm, 2011). Many studies show however that companies with little prior experience of design have a traditional view of design mainly concerning styling thus focusing only on the outcome, the product (e.g. European commission, 2010; Acklin 2011a; Ward, Runcie & Evans, 2009). With design entering into new fields such as services and public and policy sectors it becomes necessary to look further at how higher design capacity can be achieved for inexperienced organizations within these contexts as well. In a forthcoming study, which is presented and discussed here, we look at integration for design capacity in public sector organizations in regard to issues seen in a previous study (Malmberg & Holmlid, 2013).
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Introduction

In the report “Design for growth and prosperity” the European union argues for design as an important driver for increased growth (Thomson & Koskinen, 2012). Design is described as a driver for innovation in a time when Europe’s previous strategy is no longer viable since emerging competitors are catching up (ibid.).

Design is today increasingly seen as a process to identify and create solutions in a cross-disciplinary manner with engaged user involvement and other stakeholders. It is even seen as part of an organizations’ strategic toolbox (ibid.). This stands in contrast to a traditional view where design has been seen as something mainly connected to industrial product development, concerned with the aesthetic and creative aspects of the tangible products. However the contemporary and broadened view on and perception of design is mostly valid for companies already familiar with design. Within organizations that lack experience of design, the perception of design is often still connected to the traditional view of design and its role as styling (European Commission, 2010).

According to Svengren Holm organizations must utilize design on a broader scale throughout the development process and not only to differentiate and communicate (Svengren Holm, 2011), which is usually the result when focusing on styling aspects, if design is to contribute as a strategic resource. To reach organizations with no design experience and widen their perception is therefore an important issue if design is to contribute as the driver for growth and innovation that for example EU is aiming for it to be.

In this paper we first discuss the results from a previous study (Malmberg & Holmlid, 2013), on integration of design in a non-commercial organization with little prior experience of design, from the new perspective of experiences from integration of design in SME organizations. Secondly we highlight questions raised from this discussion, and present a forthcoming study focusing on anchoring the perception and contributions of design in ventures to integrate design. What actors that are involved in the ventures, as well as how their focus might effect the anchoring and integration of design. We present the study where we follow three ventures to integrate design in public sector organizations, and an initial analysis of the three cases. In the final section we discuss the expected results and contribution of the forthcoming study in relation to prior knowledge in the field. The contributions of the paper is the questions raised on integration of design from the discussion of the results from the prior study, how this knowledge
can be further developed through the upcoming study, as well as the initial analysis of the three ventures.

**Background**

There are several ways of describing how design works in an organization. It is not uncommon to describe design as a competence, usually of an individual, as a defined structure in the organization, such as a design department, or from a process perspective. In this paper, our initial point of departure is to view design as a capacity of an organization. And that organizations are taking different steps to integrate design capacity. Typically this capacity is the organizations ability to involve users and stakeholders in innovation and development work, the organizations ability to work with and develop design as a competence and a practice, etc.

There are previous studies on how to introduce and integrate design in contexts and organizations with little or no prior experience of design, Acklin for example have looked at the integration of design competence in order to drive development and increase the revenue in SMEs (Acklin, 2011a, 2011b; Acklin, Cruickshank & Evans, 2013) and there are yet other studies of other commercial settings (e.g. Ward, Runcie & Morris, 2009)

Acklin found that since design capacity is a new knowledge source and might diverge from the usual way a company looks at their business, companies with little or no prior design experience are more able to work with designers and integrate design if they get to build up the structure to manage design and integrate the new knowledge themselves (Acklin, 2011b). She also states that SME’s need to be sensitized to what value design can bring as a strategic resource before they consider it as complementary knowledge (Acklin, 2011a). In later studies Acklin et al. (2013) have also seen the importance of a trigger of some sort as well as an open-minded and curious gatekeeper who has a vision and strategy for what design can add to the company in order to develop design capacity which can be utilized in a strategic manner. They say that since the value of the new knowledge is fuzzy in the beginning of the process to integrate design knowledge the gatekeeper must have seen the potential of design as a strategic resource in some other setting (Acklin et al., 2013). This supports Acklin’s previous conclusion that there is a need to sensitize the companies to the value design could bring as a strategic resource (Acklin, 2011a). Acklin et al. also highlights the discussions and negotiations between the company and the designer leading up to a design brief as an important factor to
support the company to create a relationship with the new area of knowledge (Acklin et al., 2013). This process will according to Acklin et al. (2013) bridge the move within the organization from seeing potential in the new knowledge to being able to exploit it. This process can be seen as a process of anchoring the perception of design with the aim of increasing the design capacity of the organization.

Ward et al. conclude in their study on the Design Councils program Designing Demand, that demonstrating design as a business tool and to engage senior management are key aspects when integrating design thinking in small businesses (Ward et al., 2009). They saw that many of the managers initially assumed that design capacity would help them restyle or rebrand (ibid.) showing a traditional understanding and view of design as seen in organizations with no prior design experience according to the European commission (2010). By demonstrating case studies of how other SME's had used design as a business tool for small businesses the managers invariably discovered how it could also help redefine their strategy, open up new market or reduce costs by reorganizing their product range (Ward et al., 2009).

We can see parallels between the results found by Acklin (2011a, 2011b), Acklin et al. (2013) and Ward et al. (2009) when it comes to the need to see and understand the value of design as a strategic resource for the company before it can be integrated successfully, as well as the gatekeepers position within the organization and the need for support from management. Our interpretation is that there is a need to anchor the concept of design in the organization for it to be successfully integrated as a strategic resource.

However these studies are all done in commercial settings and as design is increasingly entering public and policy sectors there is a need to learn more about how design can function and be integrated in these context. Contexts that like the studied SMEs usually have little experience of design. The Design Council has looked at the integration of design in public sector organizations and describes three ways in which design is and can be utilized within public sector organizations. As one off projects where the design capacity is not integrated within the procuring organization and the projects is run by a consultant. As projects where the public sector employees are involved in the process, working together with the designer. Design capacity becomes integrated to an extent where the employees understand and utilize a design approach and some methods in their own day-to-day work. This also makes them more proficient to hire design competence when needed. Or design could in the organization be utilized on a policymaking
level within the organization (Design Council, 2013). However the later way to utilize design, for strategic policy decisions, is according to the Design Council relatively new and most work on it has this far been experimental (ibid.). As utilizing design as a strategic resource is of importance if the aim is to drive innovation and growth, not only for commercial actors, the integration of design capacity as a strategic resource also in the public sector is something that needs to be studied further.

Results from a previous study
During two years we followed a research and development team within a research institute as they started working with design. The technology development within the research institute was strongly driven by a technology focus and all development was funded through policy or partner funding. By using design competence and methods in the development process, the organization aimed to balance their technology driven focus to better meet the needs of possible users and clients. In a previous paper (Malmberg & Holmlid, 2013) we present the study and focus on identifying frictions that occurred when trying to embedding design in the technology development process. In this paper we will use some of the results from the prior paper (ibid.) to further discuss the effects the identified frictions might have on the success of integrating design as a strategic resource in the organization.

Design was in this case taken in as a resource to increase proactivity in the commercialization of the technology, in other words with the aim to be a strategic resource. However as the European commission (2010) states we could also in this organization, which had little prior experience of working with design, see that design was primarily perceived and utilized as styling. Svengren Holm argues that it is likely that if the knowledge structure to integrate design on a conceptual level is perceived as irrelevant for the organizations knowledge production, design will not be perceived as a strategic resource (Svengren Holm, 2011). This resonates with the results we could see in this study on how the perception of design and how it can contribute affected the integration of the design capacity within the organization. We could see a hesitation towards using design as a process within the team as they saw the design approach and process as too resource intense. When not understanding how the process contributes it was difficult to judge what value it would bring in consideration to the resources it would take.
The development team also argued that most of the initial phases of the design process, such as research and analysis were not part of their work but the responsibility of the client, not seeing how the knowledge from these phases in the process would affect their task, developing the technology. From a multidisciplinary perspective this could be seen as a valid argument, each competence focusing on their expertise area. However the development team had no control of whether the client had this expertise or if they had done user research at all, resulting in no knowledge of whether the concepts developed were viable in any other regard than the technical feasibility. The lack of any information about users and use contexts also affected the teams ability to relate to demands made by clients based on user needs or context prerequisites again leading to a focus on technical feasibility aspects of the ideas. Ward et al. (2009) studied a spin out company from a university working on developing a biosensor system. They describe how user research through observation turned out to be an important aspect for the spin out company in order to understand the use context and it’s prerequisites when developing their biosensor system from a technical solution into a product (ibid.). User focus in the development process of the technology was new to the development team we studied that had traditionally been very technology driven in the sense that research results steered the feasibility of the technology, which steered the possibilities for development.

The teams previous experience of working with design had been to get concept ideas presented to them that had been made without knowledge about technical possibilities and limitations of the technology. The teams focus on the technical aspects made it difficult to see how the knowledge about users and contexts could leverage the development and make the process more proactive through guiding what could be interesting to focus the research on, how these aspects could be relevant to their work. To the team the ability to present their technology in an interesting and favorable way through styling was seen as a strategic advantage compared to before. However, they did not see the strategic values in how, if used as a strategic tool in the manner expressed in design management literature the design process could contribute to the proactive commercialization of the technology initially sought for. Not seeing design as a strategic resource in the way it is perceived within the design field relates to the findings of both Acklin (2011a) and Ward et al. (2009). The hesitance towards using design competence in a broader way than just styling and packaging of ideas made it difficult for design to balance the focus on technology and support the
commercialization in the sense that the integration of design capacity as a strategic resource did not succeed.

The shift from seeking a strategic resource to increase proactivity in the commercialization to settle for only styling could be an effect of the aim of the integration of the design capacity not being anchored throughout the organization and a lack of clear support for this aim from management. The initiative to integrate design capacity as a tool to support the commercialization of the new technology came in the studied project from a managerial, tactical and strategic level (Mintzberg, 1980) in the organization and the integration was done on an operative level. However, the aim of the project, the goal to become more proactive in the commercialization was not properly anchored on the operative level which could explain why important aspects in the design process in order to contribute proactively was not seen as relevant within the team. Qian and Deserti (2013) show in a study the importance of anchoring the change that come with integrating design on all levels in the organization for the integration to be successful and durable even after the project ends. They point out that integration of design capacity within an organization to a great extent implies a cultural change that affects the entire organization (ibid.) not only as in our case the development team. Also Svengren Holm means that the integration must go through the entire organization not only being directed at management or for example RnD department. She argues that for design to be a catalyst and question and develop existing ideas and concepts it must be part of the strategic dialog in an organization, at a strategic level but also throughout the entire organization (Svengren Holm, 2011).

Proper anchoring of the aim to integrate design implies support and understanding of what design implies, how it should be utilizes and how it can contribute at a management level. In the case of the integration in the research driven development team, the initiative came from the strategic management level however, during the process to transfer design knowledge and integrate design capacity there was very little support or contact with this organizational level. Svengren Holm (2011) argues that understanding of and support for design on top management level is a vital aspect for a successful integration of design as a strategic resource. That top management supports and have knowledge about design and what design implies in their business context. She states that, ‘without clear guidance from management on the role of design in times of pressure for both the marketing and the product development side, there is also no opportunity to change practice and methods’ (ibid. pp. 307). We could in our study see
that the lack of commitment from a top management level to support and argue for the utilization of the design capacity on a process level made the team fall back into old habits and use design as styling. Had the aim of how design should have been utilized and why been anchored at the operational level this might have been avoided. We have in the previous paper discussed this issue in more detail (Malmberg & Holmlid, 2013). The lack of commitment and engagement from management can have contributed to the project aim and structure not being properly anchored. Both these aspects affected the integration by insecurity in regards to what resources were available and how these should be used. A clear directive from management to integrate design as a process, not only utilizing it for styling, would give mandate for the resources needed. The issue of the team not seeing parts of the process as their responsibility and therefore not committing to them could however remain, but a clear anchoring of the aim and possible contribution of the change within all levels of the organization would possibly have made the team better understand how these aspects of the process concern their work as well.

Raising new questions

From the prior study on integrating design capacity in the research driven development organization (Malmberg & Holmlid, 2013) and the literature we can conclude that anchoring the aim of the integration, how design can contribute in the organization and the perception of design is important aspects which affects the integration and whether design will be able to contribute not only by differentiating products but as a strategic resource by for example identify new opportunities or reframe questions. We can also see that it is not just important that the aim and understanding of design is anchored on management level. The integration is affected also by how the perception of design capacity and the vision of its contributions are anchored throughout the organization, from strategic levels to the operative levels when these are affected by or involved in the design work.

Svengren Holm (2011) argues that the communication and interaction between the design function and the other functions and departments of the organization is an important aspect for successful integration of design as a strategic resource. This is also an argument for why the anchoring at all organizational levels is of importance as the communication will be affected by misunderstandings or different priorities if there is not a common
understanding of what design capacity implies and how and why it should be developed by the organization.

Based on this and in relation to the results of Acklin (2011b), which show that the integration is more successful if the companies are active in the integration themselves, it is of interest to look further at how ventures to integrate design capacity are set up in non-commercial organizations that might not have the same drivers and motivations as commercial organizations. How the concept of design and the aim of the venture are anchored within the organization, how the integration is carried out, what actors who are involved, how they are involved and what influence they have in the integration process. It is also of interest to look at whether the objective of the organization to integrate design capacity affects the integration and if the objectives evolve during the process for example from process to strategic.

As mentioned before, Svengren Holm (2011) argues that it is likely that if the knowledge structure to integrate design on a conceptual level is perceived as irrelevant for the organizations knowledge production, design will not be perceived as a strategic resource. Ward et al. (2009) has observed that management initially perceive design as styling and that it is therefore important to demonstrate how design could contribute as a business tool. On the same note Acklin (2011a) argues that SMEs has to be sensitized to the idea of design as a strategic resource before considering design as complementary knowledge. As we could see in the previous study (Malmberg & Holmlid, 2013) the development team had difficulties letting go of their focus on the technology and were hesitant towards design as a process or strategic resource.

Within the public sector the interest for design capacity and design approaches is growing, a sector that similar to the independent policy funded research institute has limited previous experience of design and are not commercially run (even if there in some countries is an increase in privately run actors, they have not traditionally had focus on financial growth). However, unlike the studied research driven development team with its strong technical focus, the public sector has a connection to the user focus in design work and design thinking. In many of the public sector organizations the user is a natural focus as he is at the core of the business.

This makes it interesting to look at whether the familiarity with a user focus affect the ability to integrate design and anchor the aim and perception of design as a process or strategic resource even though the organization lacks previous design experience.
The forthcoming study

Based on the new questions raised by the discussion of the results from the previous study (Malmberg & Holmlid, 2013) and the growing interest to develop design capacity within the public sector we see two new themes and questions that would be of interest to address.

- First as we have concluded that anchoring of what design is and how it can contribute is of importance in the success of the integration of design as a strategic resource it would be of interest to look further at how ventures to integrate design capacity are set up in non-commercial organizations. Looking at what actors are involved, how they are involved and what influence they have will develop knowledge about how the venture and perception of design is anchored within the organization.

- Secondly as the focus on technology within the development team at the research institute was one important friction and as the focus of most public sector organizations is more connected to people and users, a focus which is shared with design, it is of interest to look at whether the familiarity with user focus affects the anchoring and integration of design.

To look at these two new questions we are initiating a new study where we follow three ventures of two Swedish regional federations and one county council as they in various ways introduce design capacity within their organizations. The study has been set up as a cross-case study where we through interviews and self-documentation with reflections from the actors involved follow the integration process of the three ventures.

The three initiatives differ in their approaches to integrate design capacity and the scale of the ventures however just as the prior case of the research driven development team (Malmberg & Holmlid, 2013) they all represent an organization context that, unlike commercial actors such as SME’s or big corporations who often have a clear target image, is more complex and often have several different target images within the organization. This is something that might affect the anchoring of the ventures. A big difference between the three cases is the scale of the ventures, their resources and how well anchored the idea start integrating design is. Case A and B are of a smaller scale based on external temporary funding with limited resources and people involved whereas as Case C is a rather large case with both funding from the county council and external research funding. The descriptions below of the three cases is based on
initial interviews with the project managers from the three ventures that were done in order to get a basic understanding of the organization and aim of the venture.

Case A
The venture to work with design was initiated by the regional federation as a trail to see if a service design approach could support the development and increase user influence when developing within social services in the region. A secondary goal was to spread knowledge about the process and the user centered way to work. The initiative came after having been approached by a service design consultant who presented what service design is and how it can contribute where especially the user focus and methods to involve the users caught the interest of the two people at the regional development that later initiated the project.

The regional federation decided to focus on a specific area of the social services for a pilot project and approached actors from three municipalities in the region who were asked if they were interested to participate. In the pilot project a development project was run in one of the municipalities using a design process and methods. For this a designer was procured to act as a facilitator. The other two municipalities participated as observers and took part in the design workshops that were set up. The project was managed by a project manager from the regional federation together with the designer and followed the design process steps of capture, understand, develop, and test. Each municipality decided individually which actors that should represent them and take part in the project. From the pilot municipality a manager and operative personnel took part and from the two other municipalities only personnel from the operative function took part in the project, which was to be conducted over a six months period. The project is currently ongoing with one month to go before project final. Except from the procured designer no one in the organization had prior experience of working with design.

Case B
The first step of the venture in case B had at the time of this study’s start already been finished. Knowledge built in case B will therefore be based on retrospective interviews.

After good experiences with the service design approach from student consulting projects the regional federation wanted to transfer knowledge about the approach to the different social services organizations in the
region. They wanted to look at possibilities for further use of the approach within the operational development work of the social services as a means to increase user involvement. To achieve this a designer with special skills in communication was procured to look into how to communicate the service design process in a way so it could be understood and picked up in the ongoing development work within the social services organizations. The work resulted in an information kit about service design and its user-centered approach, designed as a tool that could be used when discussing development. The information kit was addressed to and distributed among managers in the operative functions of the social service organizations. The aim was to transfer knowledge about how design capacity can contribute and how the approach could be used for development within the respective functions. Each year the social service organizations must go through and plan their business including potential operational development, an activity where the regional federation saw potential use for the information toolkit.

**Case C**

Case C is as mentioned larger venture than A and B. The county council has started a venture to integrate design in their regular healthcare organization. Through a design approach and methods the organization hope to increase patient use and to achieve sustainable operational development. To have to procure design competence for projects was seen as a barrier for the utilization of design within the organization so to make design available at all times a project with an in-house design department was initiated. The design department should support other parts of the organization with development involving different kind of design issues. The nature of the design issue varies depending on the need of the department. The design department also run projects initiated internally within the group or in collaboration with external research projects. The vision for this venture is to create value through the interaction between design and the other departments of the healthcare organization. Prior experience of working with design is limited within the organization, but some individuals who have more experience act as design champions. The venture is at the beginning of this study quite new and the organization around the design department is under construction. Following the venture from this early stage will hopefully give interesting insights to how the county council organization is reasoning.
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Table 1  Summary of case presentations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Case A</th>
<th>Case B</th>
<th>Case C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiator</td>
<td>Regional federation</td>
<td>Regional federation</td>
<td>County council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of the venture</td>
<td>Try out if the design approach works for them and disseminate knowledge.</td>
<td>Disseminate knowledge about design capacity.</td>
<td>Develop knowledge, experiences and skills within care as well as design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation for taking in design</td>
<td>Increase user influence in operational development</td>
<td>Increase user involvement in operational development</td>
<td>Increase patient benefit and create sustainable operational development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How</td>
<td>Pilot case</td>
<td>Information kit</td>
<td>Internal design department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved actors</td>
<td>Project manager from the regional federation, operative personnel from three municipalities, procured design professional</td>
<td>Project manager from the regional federation, representatives from municipalities, procured design professional</td>
<td>Design department, various health care departments, researchers, Management board for the design department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior design experience of the involved organizations</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Regional federation little, as client in student consulting projects municipality representatives none</td>
<td>Design department yes, other departments none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>During pilot project and follow up</td>
<td>Retrospectively and follow up</td>
<td>Retrospectively, during projects and follow up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data collection

All cases will be documented through interviews the different actors that take part in the ventures for example project managers, designers, and representatives on different organizational levels from the municipalities’ social services and the county health care organization. Actors that have a more active role in the projects will be asked to keep journals of the
projects, which will serve as self-documentation. Interviews will be held during the projects as well as after the projects to follow up on experiences and results. In Case C, which is a larger venture than the other two, some projects will be followed in retrospect and some will be followed as they are conducted. As case C concerns several different types of projects we have in this study decided to focus on how the design department is organized and their connection and work within the county health care organization. In all cases we will except from focusing on involved actors and organization of the ventures, also focus on the results of the projects conducted within the three ventures and how these are implemented or further managed. We see reactions of experiences, how new knowledge is handled and managed and how results are implemented as important indicators of the integration of design capacity. Each case, A, B and C will be analysed separately to learn about conditions and experiences from each case. After this a cross case analysis will be conducted to see similar patterns, contrasts and how the different set ups, scale and aims might have affected the integration of design capacity.

Discussion - Expected outcome and contribution of the forthcoming study

Svengren Holm (2011) argues for the importance of support and engagement from management to show that design is important both through decisions and by allocation of recourses as well as continuous communication and interaction between the design function and other functions within the organization, as this support the development of a shared understanding of goals and conditions in projects, for a successful integration of design as a strategic resource in an organization (Svengren Holm, 2011). This also relates to the results described earlier from the studies by Acklin (2011a), Acklin et al. (2013) and Ward et al. (2009), which also show the importance of support from management or a gatekeeper.

Acklin et al. also highlight the production of a design brief as a tool for creating a relationship between the design competence and the other actors (Acklin et al., 2013) as mentioned before. As stated before this process can be seen as part of the anchoring of the perception of design and the aim of integration of design capacity in the organization. Acklin also argues that the integration of design capacity is more successful if the organization themselves are structuring and managing the design capacity and integration of the new knowledge (Acklin, 2011b), also this is connected to
the importance of anchoring. Even if the aim is to integrate design as strategic resource we cannot solely target the strategic level of the organization since as Svengren Holm (2011) argues design as a strategic resource is based on both the result and the process. In the cases studied much of the design work connected to process is done at an operative level in the organization this means also this level needs to understand and see the value in working with design in order for the integration to contribute.

In our previous study (Malmberg & Holmlid, 2013) we could identify frictions when embedding design, frictions that affected the integration of design so that it was not successfully integrated as a strategic resource but only as styling. The venture to integrate design in the technology development team and their organization did not have sufficient support from management even though the initiative to integrate design came from a strategic level of the organization. Also the anchoring of the perception of design and the aim of the integration was too weak especially on the operative level that was most directly affected by it in their day-to-day work. These are all issues that relate to important aspects for successful integration of design according to the literature and can all be related to the anchoring of the venture including the perception of design.

The three cases in the forthcoming study are different in scale as well as in their approach and aim when integrating design. They also present different levels of prior experience of design among the project managers who can be seen as the gatekeepers or design champions in these ventures. Given the different conditions, approaches and knowledge backgrounds but similar basic motives and function we expect to learn more about how aspects such as anchoring within the organization, management and motivation among the involved actors affect the integration of design in non-commercial contexts with other drives than SMEs.

One of the issues for successful integration of design capacity, other than as styling, seen in the case from the previous study (Malmberg & Holmlid, 2013) was the problem for the development team to let go of their strong focus on technology. As stated earlier Svengren Holm (2011) argues that it is likely that in order for design to be perceived as a strategic resource the organization must see the knowledge structure to integrate design as relevant to their knowledge production (Svengren Holm, 2011). To this team user focus was new and felt irrelevant, as their focus was to develop the technology, they did not see the value in the knowledge design could contribute. The cases in the forthcoming study are all, unlike the case in the previous study, used to working with and for users even if they have not
previously worked from a design approach. Through this study we expect to learn more about how and if this connection to design through the shared user focus will affect the ability to accept design as a strategic resource and integrate it as such. This would teach us more about prerequisites for integrating design capacity both in public sector organizations and in strongly technology focused organizations.

**Concluding remarks**

In order for design to driver innovation and growth also in areas where design has not traditionally entered we need to further look at how design capacity can be integrated in these settings in a way so that non commercial organizations with no prior design experience can utilize design capacity as a process or even as a strategic resource rather than getting stuck in traditional preconceptions of design as styling. Through studying different initiatives and look at the approach to integrate design, the actors involved in the process and the anchoring of these ventures within their respective organizations we expect to learn more about the issues identified after the previous study to better be able to describe what affects the integration of design capacity in non commercial settings.
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