

# The Human-GenAI Value Loop in Human-Centered Innovation: Beyond the Magical Narrative

**Camille Grange**

Department of Information Technology  
HEC Montreal, Montreal, Canada  
[camille.grange@hec.ca](mailto:camille.grange@hec.ca)

**Théophile Demazure**

Department of Information Technology  
HEC Montreal, Montreal, Canada  
[theophile.demazure@hec.ca](mailto:theophile.demazure@hec.ca)

**Mickaël Ringeval**

Department of Information Technology  
HEC Montreal, Montreal, Canada  
[mickael.ringeval@hec.ca](mailto:mickael.ringeval@hec.ca)

**Simon Boudreau**

Department of Analytics, Operations and  
Information Technology  
UQAM, Montreal, Canada  
[bourdeau.simon.2@uqam.ca](mailto:bourdeau.simon.2@uqam.ca)

**Cédric Martineau**

Carverinno  
[cedric@carverinno.com](mailto:cedric@carverinno.com)

## Abstract

Organizations across various industries are still exploring the potential of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) to enhance knowledge work. While innovation is often viewed as a product of individual creativity, it more commonly unfolds through a highly structured, collaborative process where creativity intertwines with knowledge work. However, the extent and effectiveness of GenAI in supporting this process remain open questions. Our study investigates this issue using a collaborative practice research approach focused on three GenAI-enabled innovation projects conducted over a year within three different organizations. We explored how, why, and when GenAI could be integrated into design sprints—a highly structured, collaborative, and human-centered innovation method. Our research identified challenges and opportunities in synchronizing AI capabilities with human intelligence and creativity. To translate these insights into practical strategies, we propose four recommendations for organizations eager to leverage GenAI to both streamline and bring more value to their innovation processes: (1) establish a collaborative intelligence value loop with GenAI; (2) build trust in GenAI, (3) develop robust data collection and curation workflows, and (4) cultivate a craftsmanship mindset.

## 1. Introduction

The use of computing technologies to support or automate work tasks has long captivated both academics and practitioners (Zuboff, 1988), and this interest has reached yet another peak since the advent of generative AI (GenAI). GenAI, recently popularized with ChatGPT and similar tools, is a subset of artificial intelligence (AI) that is deemed to excel in common knowledge-based tasks—like summarization, transcription, clarification, categorization and creative content generation.

GenAI is expected to be a transformative driver for knowledge work, which involves the cognitive processing of information to generate value-added outputs (Alavi & Westerman, 2023). The emerging empirical evidence and market data support this forecast. For example, a recent experiment showed that when they used ChatGPT, the time needed by midlevel professionals to complete a writing task diminished by 40% and the output quality rose by 18% (Noy & Zhang, 2023). Another study conducted in the context of a more complex knowledge work scenario showed a comparable outcome, with gains exceeding 40% in output quality and a 25% improvement in time efficiency (Dell’Acqua et al., 2023). Industry analysis from McKinsey also suggests that GenAI could lead to substantial financial benefits, potentially generating up to \$4.4 trillion annually across various sectors like customer operations, marketing, sales, software engineering, and research and development (Chui et al., 2023).

Beyond the immediate appeal of using GenAI for productivity gains at the individual task level, the McKinsey report mentions that “as generative AI continues to develop and mature, it has the potential to open wholly new frontiers in creativity and innovation” (Chiu et al. 2023, p.11). In the present study, we explore this largely uncharted area, which is crucial and intriguing for practitioners for two primary reasons.

First, innovation is the “lifeblood (...) for every organization trying to be successful today” (Bancel et al., 2022). Despite its critical importance (reflected in the adage “innovate or die”), innovation remains a challenging endeavor (Pisano, 2015) that involves the resolution of complex business problems (Kinni, 2017). Recent research by the Boston Consulting Group reported that 83% of companies saw innovation as a top-three priority. However, only 3% of them were ready to translate their priorities into results, revealing a surprising paradox: “Companies have never placed a higher priority on innovation—yet they have never been as unready to deliver on their innovation aspirations.” (Manly et al., 2024). Given the transformative effects of GenAI on knowledge work—an essential ingredient of innovation—its potential to improve readiness by facilitating the process of innovation is substantial.

Second, while innovations thrive on teamwork (Edmondson, 2012), the prevailing discourse in academia and industry focuses on the effects of GenAI on individual knowledge work. For example, Alavi and Westerman (2023) suggest that GenAI can help reduce workers’ cognitive load by automating structured tasks, boosting their cognitive capacity for unstructured tasks, and improving their learning process. Jarrahi (2018) explains why and how AI can aid and augment human decision-making rather than replace human decision-making. Yet, as Benbya et al. (2024) highlighted, the dynamics of human-machine teams—including how roles and tasks are distributed between humans and GenAI—remain a crucial yet underexplored issue. This underscores the need for a deeper understanding of how GenAI can be effectively embedded into collaborative settings to foster collective creativity and drive innovation.

In this article, we shed light on why, when, and how GenAI can be valuable to innovation teams through a year-long learning and sensemaking journey of GenAI-enhanced innovation projects at three organizations (see Appendix A for methodological details). Central to our investigation is a critical reassessment of the common belief that innovation primarily revolves around creativity, and creativity is about generating good ideas (Gilson & Litchfield, 2017; Gotlar & Hutley, 2024).

We challenge this view, suggesting that it might underestimate the broader potential and complexities of integrating GenAI in innovation endeavors. Instead, we propose a process-oriented view of innovation, which recognizes that different activities might differ in their suitability for GenAI application. This approach allows us to thoroughly assess how GenAI can enhance the innovation process, beyond mere idea generation.

In sum, in line with the principles of Design Thinking, we consider innovation as a structured, collaborative problem-solving process (Brown, 2008; Liedtka, 2018). This approach extends beyond mere brainstorming and idea generation, which only constitute the initial part of the divergence phase of innovation. It also includes identifying patterns and connections among ideas and perspectives, ultimately narrowing down to converge toward definite choices. Within the three innovation projects featured in our field study, we observed distinct roles and impacts of GenAI across different phases of the innovation process, as both the technology and the efficacy of its main user, the facilitator, evolved. This variation allowed us to identify key mechanisms and conditions that either facilitated or impeded the effective application of GenAI.

Our findings have significant implications for practitioners looking to effectively harness emerging technologies for innovation, and underscore the need to integrate GenAI and human work thoughtfully. First, we observed that GenAI is particularly valuable during the divergence phase, which is essential for generating and organizing a diverse range of perspectives on problems or solutions. Not only does it inspire humans by providing examples, but it is also highly effective at identifying patterns and connections among ideas. Optimal results in this phase occur with a balance of approximately 80% human input and 20% GenAI support, highlighting the importance of human-generated insights. Second, our study shows that GenAI significantly aids in the convergence phase as well, assisting in the refinement and reformulation of ideas and the synthesis of these into actionable decisions. Here, GenAI can support 80% of the effort, contrasting with the earlier divergence phase.

These findings underscore GenAI's capacity to augment critical aspects of innovation processes like applied design thinking, where generating, communicating, and consolidating diverse perspectives are central to decision-making. This nuanced understanding of GenAI's role across different design thinking stages highlights its potential as a versatile tool for enhancing creative and analytical tasks within team-based innovation efforts. It provides a strategic framework for leveraging technology to complement and augment human skills, enabling a better use of innovation teams' domain knowledge within the same timeframe.

Our paper begins with an overview of the foundational premises of applied design thinking, specifically focusing on the format of design sprints (DS) and their role in fostering human-centered innovation. Following this, we present insights from our collaborative practice research, detailing the progressive integration and use of GenAI in three innovation projects. We highlight key lessons and challenges encountered during these projects. Next, we propose actionable recommendations for effectively integrating GenAI into innovation practice. We conclude by assessing the broader applicability of our results and recommendations, and by discussing their implications for research at the intersection of AI and innovation.

## 2. Human-Centered Innovation, Design Thinking, and Design Sprints

*Innovation* is closely tied to the practice of design as it involves the creation of a product, service, business model, or strategy that's both novel and useful (Osterwalder & Pigneur, 2010). It is about addressing complex problems that significantly improve upon the status quo. *Human-centered innovation* places people at the heart of this process, focusing on creating solutions that not only align with organizational goals and constraints but also resonate deeply with human needs and experiences (van der Bijl-Brouwer & Dorst, 2017). This approach leverages empathetic understanding to ensure that problems are tackled with a clear focus on the individuals, often called users, who will be served by the solution, considering their contexts, behaviors, and preferences. By prioritizing the user experience, human-centered innovation not only aims for viability and feasibility, but also seeks desirability to ensure the outcomes of innovation are genuinely beneficial and meaningful to those they are designed to serve (Norman, 2004; Osterwalder et al., 2014).

In this context, *design thinking* has become a prominent methodology for tackling complex problems through a user-centric approach, focusing on understanding end-user needs and challenges to develop solutions iteratively (Martin, 2009). Central to design thinking are the principles of human-centeredness, creativity, and iterative development (Brown, 2008; Liedtka, 2018). It is underpinned by two key meta-cognitive processes: *divergent thinking*, which involves generating and making sense of various ideas and possibilities, and *convergent thinking*, which is about aligning on actionable priorities and solutions.

*Design sprints* are a specific application of the design thinking methodology, designed for accelerated innovation through a condensed process that incorporates direct user feedback (Knapp et al., 2016). This method, a dominant paradigm in digital innovation (Dell'Era et al., 2020), is particularly effective for quickly assessing the viability of a product, feature, service, or strategy, significantly reducing the risk and resources associated with traditional product development cycles (Zeratsky, 2016). Unlike the broader design thinking approach, which can be an ongoing, iterative process spanning extensive periods depending on project needs, DS are highly structured and explicitly time-boxed. This makes them particularly well-suited for teams seeking swift resolutions to specific challenges (Wangsa et al., 2022).

In practical terms, a DS typically gathers a small, cross-functional team of about seven to eight members to work intensively over a predetermined number of days. The *original DS methodology* is structured around a five-day process (Knapp et al. 2016). Day 1 begins with framing, with the team coming together to understand the business challenge. This can involve conducting expert interviews and mapping the user journey, establishing a solid foundation for the entire week, and setting the design sprint goal. On Day 2, the focus shifts to divergent thinking, where team members individually sketch out solutions, generating a mass of ideas and solutions. By Day 3, these ideas and solutions are collectively curated and narrowed down through a structured selection process, and the most promising solution is selected through a voting process. Day 4 is dedicated to transforming the selected solution into a prototype that mimics a real-world product or service as closely as possible. This stage is crucial for turning abstract solutions into tangible, testable artifacts. The sprint concludes on Day 5, where the prototype is tested with users to gather feedback and insights, which are then used to evaluate the concept's viability and decide on the next steps. This

intensive, week-long process allows teams to quickly move from concept to concrete feedback, significantly speeding up the traditional development timeline (Gryskiewicz et al., 2018).

Although design sprints have proved effective in helping organizations innovate, they present challenges due to their condensed timeframe. This brevity often forces teams to make quick decisions, potentially overlooking complex, systemic issues that require thorough analysis for effective resolution (Kerguenne et al., 2023). Furthermore, DS demand high engagement and cross-functional teamwork, which can be difficult to sustain in larger or more hierarchical organizations where dynamic collaboration is not the norm (Henreaux et al., 2021). Additionally, the information-intensive nature of sprints imposes significant cognitive demands on participants. Managing and processing large volumes of data in a compressed timeframe can lead to cognitive overload, potentially impacting decision-making and overall effectiveness

Design sprints offer a prime opportunity to explore how GenAI can enhance the innovation process. Hopes are high, given GenAI’s potential to generate ideas and quickly synthesize vast amounts of information. However, further research is needed to fully understand the scope, reasons, and mechanisms behind these promises, as well as the obstacles to achieving them.

The following sections present insights from a year-long exploration of using GenAI-enhanced design sprints across three organizations. Through this collaborative research effort, we seek to delve deeper into the advantages and challenges of incorporating GenAI into the human-centered innovation process.

### 3. Insights From a Learning Journey into GenAI-Driven Innovation

#### 3.1 Projects Overview

Our study is set in the context of three innovation projects conducted sequentially between April 2023 and March 2024. As highlighted in Table 1, the use of GenAI within these sprints evolved significantly—from discovery to increased standardization. In each project, the practitioner member of our research team acted as the sprint facilitator. A facilitator in a DS organizes, guides, documents, and manages the team’s process, ensuring clarity of goals and efficient time use. S/he leads discussions, encourages participation, and handles conflicts to maintain focus on the sprint’s objectives. The facilitator also aids in synthesizing ideas and feedback, especially during the prototyping and testing phases, helping interpret results for further development.

Table 1 – Innovation Projects Overview

	<b>Project #1</b>	<b>Project #2</b>	<b>Project #3</b>
<b>Time period</b>	Spring 2023	Summer 2023	Winter 2024
<b>Project’s context</b>	A school offering creative skills training to industry professionals. The sprint project was part of the	A borough within a large municipality. The sprint project was part of a plan to design a	A public television company with a mission to promote educational and cultural content. The sprint project was part of the company’s

	firm’s plan to redefine its offer and digital strategy.	new employee experience journey.	new strategy to reach a younger generation.
<b>Technological context</b>	Launch of Generative Pre-trained Transformer (GPT) 4 - a multimodal large language model created by OpenAI - on March 14, 2023.	Use of a more stable version of ChatGPT 4.	Launch of the GPT store (+ tools to build customized GPTs) in January 2024
<b>Use of GenAI in the project</b>	Discovering GenAI capabilities by using ChatGPT as a team member, managed by a co-facilitator, in the DS.	Furthering the use of GenAI (ChatGPT) as a support tool helping to execute certain tasks within the DS.	Standardizing the use of GenAI through the creation of reusable GPTs targeted at generic tasks, called “jobs to be done”, within the sprint.

### 3.2 The Design Sprint Framework Used in the Projects

The DS methodology used in the projects spanned one to two weeks and was structured into six main phases, categorized into a problem and a solution space. The **problem space** is dedicated to exploring and defining the project’s challenge, while the **solution space** focuses on imagining, prioritizing, and validating a solution to the problem. This process is often depicted through a “double diamond” diagram (Figure 1), illustrating repeated episodes of divergence and convergence in both spaces.




Figure 1. Overarching design sprint framework used in the three innovation projects

This framework slightly differs from the original design sprint model by Jake Knapp at Google Ventures by emphasizing activities leading to the problem definition. Recognizing that effectively scoping the problem is a critical challenge in decision-making and innovation (Root-Bernstein, 2003), this approach dedicates more time to the problem space. This framework is thus closer to the design sprint 3.0 method (Vetan, 2018), focusing more on problem exploration and definition.

In the three projects, the goal in the **problem space** was to define a *zone of opportunities* characterized by articulating a precise problem statement (“how could we...”). This process was composed of three stages:

- Framing the project: The facilitator researched the organization’s context, including its mission and business goals, and gathered team members’ insights through surveys, meetings, or a workshop. The focus was on understanding the problem in relation to user needs and business objectives, and on defining the success criteria for the sprint.
- Understanding the user: Follow-up meetings were organized to refine and consolidate team members’ perspectives, thus facilitating a clearer understanding of the several opportunities at their intersection of business and user needs.
- Defining the problem: An alignment workshop was held to consolidate these perspectives into a common understanding of potential opportunities at the intersection of business and user needs. The session concluded with team members voting on the underlying opportunity areas to explore within the larger predefined opportunity space.

In the **solution** space, the team transitioned to crafting a testable *prototyped solution*:

- Imagining solutions: Team members individually brainstormed ideas on how to tackle the defined problem, focusing on creativity and exploration without limitations.
- Prioritizing a solution: The brainstormed ideas were collectively refined, organized, evaluated, and reduced based on feasibility, impact, and alignment with user needs.
- Validating the solution: The collaborative process culminated in selecting the most promising solution and developing it into a storyboard to direct subsequent prototyping and testing.

### 3.3 Application and Highlights from the Projects

#### **Project #1: Discovering ChatGPT’s Capabilities**

The first project took place at a creativity school engaged in democratizing the creative process for industry professionals. The aim was to find an innovative way to better showcase the school’s educational programs. The team included seven human participants, one fewer than usual, and introduced ChatGPT as an additional participant named J.A.K.E.—short for Jovial, Analytical, Knowledgeable, Eloquent—inspired by Jake Knapp, the creator of the DS methodology. The role of J.A.K.E. was that of a guest contributor rather than a decision-maker, and it was excluded from tasks that required deep contextual understanding. A human facilitator prompted ChatGPT, ensuring that J.A.K.E.’s contributions aligned with the project’s main objectives.

In this project, the first week was focused on **project framing**, which involved a full-day workshop to capture client needs and organizational challenges. J.A.K.E. was used to synthesize these insights into a summary document, simplifying a typically labor-intensive process for the facilitator. Subsequently, a six-hour workshop was held to introduce J.A.K.E. to the team, share the insights from the framing phase, and facilitate collaborative exercises to help the team develop a unified **understanding** of the context, the problem, and the desired outcomes. The results of these two phases were synthesized into text in a “Framing and Understanding” document. At the beginning of the second week, a three-hour alignment workshop was held to **define the problem** more precisely. This included asking the team to generate multiple “how might we...?” questions to explore potential zones of opportunities to focus on. J.A.K.E. helped organize team members’ inputs into thematic clusters, easing the categorization burden for team members and saving their

energy for the next ideation phase. The session concluded with a human vote on the most promising area to pursue in the subsequent solution space. Although the human team made the final decision, it was interesting to observe that J.A.K.E., when prompted, aligned closely with the team's choice. It suggested that "the problem is that our product offering is complicated to understand", which mirrored the team's selection: "We need to be careful about the lack of clarity with our offer."

In the three-hour **ideating** workshop, J.A.K.E. initiated the session with baseline ideas tailored to the chosen business opportunity, steering the team towards more innovative solutions. In the subsequent three-hour **prioritizing** workshop, J.A.K.E. assisted in refining the ideas generated by the team for greater clarity and reduced redundancy. It also helped identify patterns and connections among these ideas, meanwhile ensuring that each team member's contributions were equally considered. The team then voted on the top ideas to prioritize. In the final **validation** phase, the team reviewed these ideas and selected one, formulated testing hypotheses, and set success criteria. This was done through another three-hour workshop in which J.A.K.E. assisted again by synthesizing, refining, and organizing the team's inputs to support their storyboard design. The content generated by the team during this workshop served as a precious input for the creation (by the facilitator) of the prototype for user testing.

**Learnings from Project #1** - The client organization viewed this initial experiment of integrating GenAI into the innovation process as successful, particularly praising J.A.K.E. for its neutrality and ability to clarify and synthesize information and provide inspiration.

*"J.A.K.E. really knocked it out of the park with how it perfectly pulled together all that we were trying to say, making sure we don't forget anything and helping us cope with information overload" (Project 1, participant #1) ... "J.A.K.E does not have the emotional baggage we have, it is not influenced by local politics, and it contributes to variety, which we know is a key ingredient to creativity" (Project #1, participant #2)*

Despite undeniable benefits, the DS faced several challenges. It generated a large amount of textual data, and managing it in real-time with ChatGPT prompts during the workshops proved logistically cumbersome and increased the cognitive load on the facilitator. The organization of this data needed enhancement. Additionally, it was uncertain whether using GenAI as an anthropomorphized participant was the most effective approach.

*"ChatGPT's great strength is synthesis. No matter how much data you give it, it synthesizes beautifully using the keywords you provide. However, handling all that data in real-time was a headache, and honestly, trying to make the AI seem more human just felt weird to me. It's like we're trying to force it to be something it's not, and I'm not sure we're getting the best out of it that way." (Project #1, facilitator)*

## **Project #2: Further engaging with ChatGPT as a support tool**

In the second project, the DS was held at a local municipality to develop an innovative onboarding experience for new employees. The role of GenAI evolved in two main ways. First, instead of taking the place of a team member, ChatGPT served strictly as a supportive tool for the facilitator in the innovation process. This shift was driven by a desire to capture as much contextual



input from humans as possible to feed to both the collective and the artificial intelligence. Secondly, the role of GenAI became more structured. The facilitator developed a Google document repertoire of prompts, organized by sprint phase, for easier access and reuse. He also focused on improving data quality by creating specialized prompts to process, clean, and format text data into a structured output. GenAI was thus used both to support the innovation activities and to structure the data to be efficiently used as inputs. The goal of these changes was to both enhance prompt effectiveness and streamline sprint activities.

As a result, work within the problem space evolved significantly. While **project framing** still involved research and surveys, the traditional six-hour workshop for **understanding** was eliminated. Instead, a highly focused ten-question survey was sent to team members, followed by an individual meeting with each of them to delve deeper into their responses, which were consolidated with the help of ChatGPT. These meetings helped to refine the creation of a focal persona and contribute to a comprehensive “project context document.” Additionally, these sessions served to introduce GenAI tools to be used in the sprint through practical examples, address any concerns, and foster acceptance among the team. The subsequent alignment workshop (**defining**) was maintained to engage team members in activities that helped them assimilate the collective results and agree on a shared perspective on the challenge to solve.

The **imagining** and **prioritizing** stages were similar to project #1, with ChatGPT used during the workshops to propose a set of initial ideas, and to help collective sensemaking by rearticulating human-generated ideas that lacked precision and classifying them. This could be executed more effectively thanks to the use of the prompt repertoire together with the “project context document”. Once team members voted on the solution to further develop, ChatGPT helped craft the user test flow<sup>1</sup>, providing the key elements to include in a coherent storyboard. Concretely, it generated detailed scripts that depicted the user journey, showing step-by-step how the chosen solution could be tested with users against the identified success criteria (**validating**).

**Learnings from Project #2** – The use of ChatGPT in this second project underscored some of the advantages discovered by the facilitator and participants from the first project, such as clarification, consolidation, and inspiration. Additionally, the value-cocreation process became more evident, with GenAI playing a key role in refining team members’ thoughts, while team members also actively revised GenAI outputs as needed.

*“ChatGPT just nailed it every time. It helped us to phrase our thinking adequately... what we wanted to say. It was concise and often ended up being the go-to choice. Plus, the ability to tweak and fine-tune things as we went was reassuring. We knew right from the start not to just take it at face value. Sometimes, it would focus onto details that were insignificant to us (...) Sometimes we needed less general synthesis and more personalized input” (Project 2, Participant 1)*

*“I believe that information from a person is invaluable. Adding one more person in this sprint brought new ideas and information and contributed to the synergy for the project. Therefore,*

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://aj-smart.teachable.com/courses/307155/lectures/4728857>

*it was worth adding someone to have more diversity around the table. (...) ChatGPT's great strength is synthesis and standardizing the quality of human participants' inputs. No matter how much data you give it, it synthesizes beautifully using the keywords you provide.”*  
(Project 2, Facilitator)

Despite a better-structured process for using GenAI, managing the large volumes of data and diverse prompts during various workshop activities remained challenging. Continuously updating and maintaining data quality throughout the sprint also posed difficulties. These challenges highlighted the need for a new method to integrate contextual inputs more seamlessly and systematically during the design sprints.

### **Project #3: Building and testing reusable capabilities through GPTs**

The third innovation project took place at a public television company focused on educational and cultural content, intending to develop a new digital experience for young consumers. This sprint demonstrated the most significant evolution among the three projects. In January 2024, a few weeks before the start of the sprint, the GPT store was launched, offering the ability to create customized Large Language Models<sup>2</sup>. This was an opportunity to further standardize the use of GenAI by creating reusable GPTs for generic tasks within the sprint, moving away from a prompt bank in a GoogleDoc. The facilitator aimed to use GPTs both in direct interactions during workshops and in background activities between sessions. This approach was intended to reduce his mental load and decrease errors from manually handling prompt templates and data.

To optimize his use of GPTs, the facilitator developed a *dynamic* “project context document” — a structured compilation of information created by both participants and GenAI throughout the sprint. This document acted as a collective memory, cataloging key information like business objectives, user requirements, success criteria, opportunity areas, and solutions. It was regularly updated with new inputs from workshop exercises to ensure GenAI outputs remained relevant and well-aligned with the sprint’s progress. In parallel, the facilitator worked on the transparency of GenAI-generated content by tagging each piece of information presented to the team with its origin—human or machine—and categorized as 1. Untouched, 2. Reformulated by AI, or 3. Generated by AI. This practice was intended to maintain trust and acceptance by clearly indicating the source of inputs and level of AI involvement in the sprint.

**Project framing** continued to be carried out through research and surveys, and the traditional six-hour workshop for **understanding** was not reinstated. Instead, one-on-one meetings with team members were conducted, followed by the alignment workshop (**defining**), in which a fine-tuned and streamlined approach was adopted. The GoogleDoc prompts repertoire used in the previous project was transformed into specialized GPTs. Each GPT was tailored to a specific task within the sprint. For example, one of them, named “Them-inator”, was tasked with extracting themes from a large set of human inputs. The output could then be used in “affinity clustering” exercises, where team members work on how diverse ideas are associated, developing a deeper understanding of the problem.

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://openai.com/index/introducing-the-gpt-store/>

The **imagining** and **prioritizing** stages mirrored those of Project #2. However, a notable enhancement was using a new GenAI tool, Dall-E, during early ideation to generate visual representations of possible solutions. These visuals served to inspire participants and stimulate creativity. The **validating** phase was the most significantly transformed. Here, specialized GPTs were instrumental in formulating clear hypotheses, designing the storyboard, user journey, and creating questions for user testing. After an entire morning of brainstorming and prioritizing, team members typically experience fatigue at this point of the sprint. GenAI was employed to partially automate these tasks by drawing from a vast repository of user journey examples. This approach helped conserve the team's energy and maximize productivity before prototyping. Indeed, team members must synthesize a considerable amount of information and convert it into draft mockups such as a web platform, mobile application, or narratives. After the team selected one scenario for prototype development (in this case, it was the one entirely generated by a GPT), the facilitator used GenAI to create a wireframe prototype. Team members then reviewed it individually, providing feedback within a day. This feedback led to a revised version, again generated by GenAI with help from a GPT that structured the inputs for Dall-E. This led to the final prototype being tested on users, with post-user test interviews focusing on the six validation questions developed prior. These interviews were recorded and automatically transcribed using a speech-to-text tool, and cleaned with another GPT. Finally, a “classifier” GPT helped standardize, organize, and synthesize the data to communicate the results to the team.

**Learnings from Project #3** – The integration of GenAI in this third project confirmed its efficacy from previous applications and showcased its transformative impact on storyboarding, prototyping, and user-test data analysis. By leveraging GenAI, participants were better able to visualize potential solutions, which enhanced idea generation and accelerated the convergence phases.

*“The facilitator used GenAI to generate images to illustrate the concepts. We have UX designers or a digital art director; they could have done it. But quickly testing an idea allowed us to save time and efficiency. (...) It also allowed us to quickly test [the prototype] with our target population, in this case, young people, and get quality feedback” (Project #3, Participant 1).*

Importantly, transparent and controlled use of GenAI bolstered team members' confidence in the process.

*“I really appreciated the transparency, both for the text and the images. If that had not been the case and we had selected an AI-generated idea during the decision phase, I think my trust would have been affected. (...) The visuals, if I hadn't been told they were AI-generated, would have bothered me less, but if it was about central ideas, I would have found it unfortunate.” (Project #3, Participant 1)*

*“For exploratory phases, I don't see a problem with AI. It would even be well-regarded. However, for pivotal phases like making decisions or voting on something important like a success factor, there would be rejection if we relied solely on AI to determine what is important. We are better positioned to know. We are the employees who will execute the final solution.” (Project #3, Participant 1)*

Furthermore, the “project context document” reinforced its role as a key reference point and collective memory, where all information and ideas are dynamically gathered, refined, and organized. This document served as a foundation for team alignment and shared understanding, helping to prevent deviations from agreed-upon problems and decisions.

*“Sometimes we had a lot of ideas, and the AI summarized them into a concise text. This allowed us to wrap our heads around it. It gave us a base; there were many fragmented ideas that everyone had contributed, and now we had a text on which we all agreed. This way, we started from the same base to move forward. We could always refer to that” (Project #3, Participant 1).*

Figure 2 illustrates the progressive evolution in the facilitator’s application of GenAI across the three sprints. Project #1 was a rudimentary exploration of ChatGPT4’s capabilities, targeting a limited number of tasks (e.g., clarifying, synthesizing, inspiring). The contextual information was based uniquely on phases 1 and 2 of the DS. By Project #2, efforts were made to introduce more structure, reduce the cognitive load associated with processing data in real-time during workshops, and consolidate the information into the project context document. Project #3 marked yet another evolution in practice, with the deployment of multiple GPTs assigned to specific “jobs to be done” within the sprint. These GPTs were designed to support both information management and processing tasks, ensuring continuous alignment between workshop activities and previously generated data.




Figure 2. Summary architecture of GenAI’s use across projects

#### 4. Recommendations

The insights gained from our research led us to outline four key recommendations for effectively integrating GenAI into collaborative, human-centered innovation processes. These

recommendations, summarized in Table 2, are supported by a set of rationales, associated with enabling actions, and illustrated by elements from our study.

#### 4.1 Establish a Collaborative Intelligence Value Loop with GenAI

Integrating GenAI in a human-centered innovation process like design sprints demands a deep understanding of how to co-create value by harnessing both human and AI capabilities. Practitioners must thus recognize the synergies that emerge from a well-defined division of labor that optimizes both human and AI strengths and unique contributions (Table 2).

Table 2. Suggested task repartition between GenAI and human actors

<b>GenAI tools</b>		<b>Humans</b>	
-Classifying	-Structuring	-Providing and actualizing project context information	-Sensemaking
-Summarizing	-Cleaning	-Labeling information	-Validating
-Categorizing	-Conserving memory	-Discussing	-Prioritizing and selecting
-Reformulating			-Decision making

<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Rationale</b>	<b>Enabling actions</b>	<b>Illustration in our study</b>
<p><b><u>1. Value Loop</u></b></p> <p>Establish a collaborative intelligence value loop with GenAI</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GenAI and humans have complementary capabilities.</li> <li>- GenAI helps automate routine tasks, allowing participants to focus on value-added tasks.</li> <li>- GenAI contributions lead to more informed and confident decision-making.</li> <li>- Human intelligence ensures relevance and quality through contextual input and validation.</li> <li>- Including GenAI in the innovation process enhances the ability of humans to better exploit their own capabilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identify the tasks (“jobs to be done”) in the design sprint process where automation brings value to the team’s work.</li> <li>- Clearly define and communicate the roles of GenAI and human participants in the innovation process: Use GenAI for idea generation and routine information-processing tasks, leverage team members’ abilities for contextual understanding, content validation, and decision-making.</li> <li>- Regularly assess whether the use of GenAI enhances the innovation process without undermining human aspects. Ensure that the automation does not diminish the team’s engagement and ownership of the project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Experimenting with GenAI allowed the facilitator to discover the specific tasks when GenAI had the most value for him and team members.</li> <li>- The facilitator clarified that GenAI would never decide during the DS.</li> <li>- GenAI was used as an energy saver for future highly cognitive activities.</li> <li>- The facilitator proposed decision phases that include only the human team.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>2. Team management</u></b></p> <p>Build trust in GenAI</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- AI in general and GenAI in particular are opaque systems, challenging trust in their outputs.</li> <li>- Skepticism can be managed through clear communication about GenAI’s use.</li> <li>- Team members need to be fully engaged in the DS process, and they feel more comfortable when GenAI is used as complementary (not a replacement) to their contributions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clearly explain to team members when, how, and for what purposes GenAI is being used.</li> <li>- Demonstrate the use of GenAI through use cases to familiarize team members with the technology, and illustrate its functioning and capabilities.</li> <li>- Explicitly label all GenAI-generated content. This transparency allows team members to evaluate the information critically and clearly understand its source, fostering trust and clarity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The facilitator held informational sessions to illustrate and demystify GenAI’s role in the process.</li> <li>- Each piece of information was tagged to indicate its origin—human or machine—and categorized into three levels: 1. Untouched, 2. Reformulated by AI, or 3. Generated by AI.</li> </ul>

Recommendations	Rationale	Enabling actions	Illustration in our study
<p><b><u>3. Data management</u></b></p> <p>Develop robust data collection and curation workflows</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A human-centered innovation method like design sprints is intensely information-driven.</li> <li>- High-quality data inputs into GenAI result in much better outputs.</li> <li>- Tight alignment between GenAI outputs and team/project requirements needs to be maintained throughout the innovation process.</li> <li>- Regular updates to the project context document, informed by human inputs, ensure timely and relevant insights.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Collect detailed and relevant contextual and human-generated data through surveys, interviews, and market research.</li> <li>- Develop a “living document” that continuously captures all pertinent data, consistently updated to integrate new insights and information.</li> <li>- Create a repertoire of predefined tasks and workflows that GenAI can perform efficiently, including prompt templates and output models, or more usable and reusable capabilities like GPTs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The facilitator developed a project context document, which which became a critical tool for ensuring alignment within the design sprints.</li> <li>- The facilitator focused on refining data management techniques throughout the project, including the use of a prompts repertoire (Project #2) and various sets of GPTs (Project #3).</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>4. Mindset</u></b></p> <p>Cultivate a craftsmanship mindset</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No strict template exists for design sprint automation.</li> <li>- GenAI’s affordances constantly evolve, so it is important to keep up with the progress to fully benefit from potential value gains.</li> <li>- Each project has its specificities, providing unique constraints as well as opportunities for exploring with GenAI.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Build a culture of continuous improvement where practitioners regularly update datasets, refine prompts, and adapt strategies based on the evolving situation and capabilities of GenAI tools.</li> <li>- Treat the integration of GenAI as a craft. Invest time in honing skills, staying updated with the latest developments in GenAI, and approaching challenges with creativity and problem-solving.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The facilitator continuously refined prompts and stayed current with new GenAI’s capabilities, such as exploring the GPT store and builder platform right upon its release.</li> <li>- The design thinking process was adjusted based on lessons learned from the projects experiences and on advancements in ChatGPT’s capabilities.</li> <li>- The facilitator’s ability to effectively leverage GenAI evolved as well, leading to new applications in each design sprint.</li> </ul>

Consistent with emerging research at the intersection of AI and individual knowledge work (Alavi & Westerman, 2023; Coombs et al., 2020; Richardson, 2020), our findings suggest that GenAI effectively handles foundational information tasks such as reformulating, summarizing, and categorizing, all critical in collaborative innovation. It also enhances idea generation and brainstorming by encouraging teams to expand on a wide range of initial possibilities. By assigning these tasks to GenAI, participants can focus more on high-value activities (Jia et al., 2024), like discussing and evaluating ideas, leading to more informed and confident decisions. In our research, we found GenAI could support 80% of the effort in the convergence phases of the DS, and only 20% in the divergence phases.

In parallel, our research underscores the indispensable human contributions in human-centered innovation projects: providing contextual information, validating GenAI outputs, and making final decisions. Humans contribute unique contextual insights, capturing nuances that GenAI is likely to miss. In the framing stage of the DS we studied, team members provided insights about what they thought were the firm's challenges and the client's needs. Without this input, GenAI might generate innovative but irrelevant or inappropriate ideas for the target audience. Additionally, human validation is crucial to ensure the accuracy and applicability of GenAI-generated content, filtering out impractical or less effective solutions. In our projects, GenAI could produce scenarios and prototype drafts to validate the concept, but the team had to elevate and refine these to meet project objectives. Finally, human decision-making is vital for choosing the best ideas and strategies, considering feasibility, ethical implications, and long-term impact. During the convergence phase of the design sprints, only human team members voted on the most promising opportunities, ensuring that decisions aligned with the company's culture and strategic goals.

## 4.2 Build Trust in GenAI

Incorporating GenAI into an innovation process requires helping the team build trust in the AI-augmented process, ensuring they feel secure and confident in the technology's capabilities and use. Transparency is critical in fostering this trust (Glikson & Woolley, 2020; Wanner et al., 2022).

Like many algorithmic technologies, GenAI tools often operate as black boxes (Pasquale, 2015), obscuring the origins and processes behind both the input they receive and the information they generate. Practitioners must clearly communicate when, how, and for what purposes GenAI is being used within the team. This includes providing explicit details about instances of GenAI-generated content use, the tasks it supports, and the outcomes it aims to achieve. For example, in our study, the facilitator met each team member before the start of the DS to explain how GenAI would be used, bringing concrete examples and addressing concerns. This helped demystify the technology and promote informed reliance on GenAI (Teodorescu et al., 2021), reducing potential skepticism and fostering a culture of openness.

Another effective action in building trust through transparency is explicitly labeling AI-generated ideas and content. GenAI-generated content is judged more acceptable during the creative process when clearly acknowledged (Doshi & Hauser, 2023). When team members know certain pieces of content or suggestions are produced by GenAI, they can critically evaluate the information. This practice not only maintains clarity but also prevents mistakenly attributing



human characteristics or intentions to AI outputs. For example, in the studied projects, the facilitator clearly annotated, throughout the entire design process, whether the data was created by humans, reformulated by GenAI, or fully generated by GenAI. This clear understanding of the source of the content avoided confusion. It allowed team members to modify or refine the AI-generated material as necessary, enhancing their engagement with it. Crucially, this also empowered the team to feel more in control of the innovation process

### 4.3 Develop Robust Data Collection and Curation Workflows

Practitioners integrating GenAI into collaborative- human-centered innovation must invest significant effort in data management. Indeed, the old adage “garbage in, garbage out” resonates strongly with the use of GenAI in design sprints (Kilkenny & Robinson, 2018). High-quality data inputs are essential to generating better outputs that enhance the problem-solving process. This became evident in the first project, prompting the facilitator to prioritize the development of a more effective data architecture (see Figure 2).

Effective collection, cleaning, and structuring of contextual and human-generated information are crucial for leveraging GenAI’s capabilities. Specialized prompts designed for processing this data are also essential to maximize GenAI’s potential. In preparation for a design sprint, the facilitator in our projects collected extensive information about the firm’s challenges through surveys and interviews. GenAI was invaluable in synthesizing the diverse perspectives among team members. It is important to note that managing this data also includes manually reviewing and occasionally correcting GenAI outputs to ensure their accuracy and clarity. Our experience in the projects was that about 20% of the information generated by GenAI needed reworking, while the remaining 80% was accurately provided.

Maintaining constant alignment between GenAI and the team is crucial for achieving synergistic outcomes from their interactions (Han et al., 2024). In our study, alignment was facilitated by a “project context document” (projects #2 and #3) that compiled all relevant data. This document was regularly updated and synchronized with inputs from pre-DS surveys and information generated during each DS activity. Such alignment ensures that GenAI’s outputs remain relevant and accurate. The project context document can serve as a living memory of the innovation process and should be integrated into each prompt to provide context for the GenAI tool. Structuring the document with sections and sub-sections, and tagging each piece of information according to its type reduces GenAI’s hallucination rate and facilitates easy retrieval. While creating, updating, and curating this document demands substantial effort, it significantly improves the quality and relevance of GenAI’s tasks during DS activities, and specialized GPTs can assist this task.

The structuring of a data management architecture can take different forms. In our study, a significant progress in that regard was achieved in Project #3 with the development and use of a library of ready-made GPT capabilities together with the output templates and workflows associated with the various activities of the DS. Thus, when determining tasks for GenAI, design sprint facilitators need to consider three essential components: 1) the prompt itself, detailing the task; 2) the contextual data needed from the project context document; and 3) reference data from relevant documents, such as previous examples or output formats.

## 4.4 Cultivate a Craftsman Mindset

A final recommendation for practitioners integrating GenAI into their innovation processes is to adopt a craftsman mindset. GenAI-augmented innovation is a craft demanding “care and ingenuity and requires patience and perseverance” (Sennett, 2008). This approach involves an inclination to learning (continuously honing skills), curiosity (staying updated with the latest technological developments), ingenuity (tackling challenges with a problem-solving mindset), and contextual sensitivity (adaptability).

GenAI’s application in innovation processes is still being explored, and no definitive template exists to standardize these methods fully. As GenAI technology progresses, it is critical for practitioners to continuously refine their approaches, including enhancing prompts and improving data management techniques during and between design sprint workshops. For example, the facilitator in our study regularly updated prompting strategies, explored new use cases, and engaged with advanced techniques like chain-of-thought prompting (Wei et al., 2023) to enhance the usability and utility of GenAI outputs. While this ongoing experimentation may be laborious, it is essential for maximizing the effectiveness of GenAI in the innovation process. GenAI is a flexible technology. As such, its exploration within the context of design sprints, through trial and error, can lead to significant improvements (Schmitz et al., 2016). Therefore, keeping pace with the latest advancements in GenAI technology and discovering its potential applications is crucial for practitioners to fully exploit GenAI’s capabilities in supporting innovation.

Practitioners must recognize the value GenAI can bring to innovation processes but also be discerning about its appropriateness in specific contexts. Each organizational and team setting varies, requiring personalized approaches to the integration of technology. The team shapes and may ultimately adopt the final solution, necessitating a flexible mindset to meet its specific needs. For instance, while GenAI’s assessments might align well with team’s important choices during the sprint (e.g., selecting the problem to solve or the solution to design), as we observed in our projects, limiting its use might still be wise to ensure team members maintain ownership of the chosen problem or solution. In other words, despite GenAI’s impressive automation capabilities, they may not always be suitable or desired in every scenario.

## 5. Final Reflections: Practical Applicability and Future Developments

We expect our four recommendations for integrating GenAI into design sprints to be applicable across organizational environments—from startups to multinational corporations. They should also be compatible with different innovation approaches, including Agile, Lean, and various adaptations of the Sprint method. Certain factors may, however, either facilitate or hinder the effective deployment of these recommendations. Moreover, when it comes to GenAI capabilities for innovation, it is clear that we are still in the early stages. Thus, we now discuss applicability constraints as well as what comes next at the intersections of innovation, creativity, and GenAI.

### 5.1 How Does this Apply to Your Context?

It is well-established that an *organization’s culture* significantly influences its ability to innovate. Organizations that cultivate a culture of experimentation (Thomke, 2020) and agility (Rigby et al.,

2016) are typically better positioned to adopt new approaches and technologies within their operations (Naranjo-Valencia et al., 2011). In contrast, organizations with more rigid cultures may face greater challenges, requiring more time and effort to overcome resistance to change. Interestingly, our research contrasts with these traditional views. We examined projects at three organizations, varying in their appetite for innovation. The first was a small private entity deeply immersed in a culture of innovation and creativity, making it an ideal setting for exploring GenAI's capabilities in design sprints. The other two projects took place in environments much less inherently tied to an innovation culture: one within a major metropolitan municipality and the other at a national public media organization. Despite this difference, we did not observe any significant barriers as a result of organizational culture. All team members actively and positively engaged with the new approach, suggesting that GenAI can be effectively applied within innovation processes across a broad range of organizational contexts.

One factor that we expect to more fundamentally influence the successful implementation of our recommendations is *an organization's ability to source an effective facilitator*. Prior research, such as that by Gotlar and Hutley (2024), suggests that this individual should ideally be external to the team or organization. Our findings also underscore the importance of this role, but further highlight key traits such as empathy, innovativeness, meta-knowledge, and ambidexterity. *Empathy* is about understanding (Ventura, 2018, p. 201). It is both cognitive (i.e., the ability to understand others' perspective) and emotional (sharing feelings) (Montonen et al., 2014). Our facilitators excelled in empathetically communicating the benefits and risks of GenAI, dynamically responding to team members' concerns. This was crucial for nurturing trust and psychological safety within the teams, both essential components in the high-pressure environment of a design sprint (Clark, 2022). *Innovativeness* relates to using digital tools in novel ways to enhance task performance. The importance of individual innovativeness in facilitating IT-based innovations is well-documented (Abubakre et al., 2020; Jackson et al., 2013; Yi et al., 2006). The facilitator in our study continually challenged their use of GenAI, restructuring workshop activities and testing new practices, which significantly advanced data management architecture and task distribution. "*Meta knowledge*" involves understanding the synergies between GenAI and human team members (Fugener et al. 2022). This knowledge is essential for identifying opportunities and avoiding pitfalls within the "collaborative value loop". The facilitator in our projects also excelled in this area, skilfully navigating which tasks ("jobs to be done") were best suited for himself, the AI, the team, or a combination thereof. *Ambidexterity*, defined as the ability to exploit existing competencies and explore new opportunities simultaneously (March, 1991; Raisch et al., 2009), is another vital trait for facilitators working with GenAI in innovation projects. Facilitators face challenging decisions in allocating resources (time and attention) between exploitation, which refines existing processes, and exploration, which seeks new possibilities. It is essential to maintain a balance, fostering incremental improvements while also investigating more transformative opportunities (O'Reilly & Tushman, 2004; Tushman & O'Reilly, 2002). In our study, the facilitator adeptly managed this balance. He refined his experimental data management architecture to maximize its potential, while also staying alert to opportunities that entirely new architectures could offer (e.g., GPTs). This dual focus allowed him to enhance his data management efforts effectively, leveraging both established (exploitation) and innovative (exploration) approaches.

Finally, we expect our practical recommendations to be largely adaptable to various *innovation format*. Design sprints offer a flexible framework that can be operationalized with more or less focus on different phases of the process. Our research shows that GenAI can significantly enhance all phases, from problem framing and ideation to prioritization and validation. However, it also highlights that GenAI’s effectiveness is contingent upon possessing substantial contextual knowledge about the problem at hand, in other words, training the AI (Gotlar and Hutley 2024). Therefore, shorter sprint formats, which may skimp on extensive project framing and the gathering of contextual data, could see diminished benefits from GenAI integration. Moreover, while our study primarily focuses on design sprints, the insights and recommendations are also applicable to other innovation methodologies, such as Agile or Lean. These methodologies prioritize rapid iteration, customer feedback, and a data-driven approach to decision-making (Rigby 2016). For instance, Project #3, demonstrated that GenAI proved beneficial to rapid prototyping.

## 5.2 What Comes Next in Research and Practice?

Several intriguing questions remain at the intersection of GenAI, creativity, and human-AI team dynamics and collaboration. To explore them, we suggest five promising avenues.

Data generation and prompt engineering in our projects have primarily focused on text-based inputs, reflecting the current trend in GenAI applications. However, the evolution toward *multimodal GenAI*, which integrates diverse types of inputs such as text, images, videos, and audio, is expected to gain prominence shortly (Boston Consulting Group, 2023). These multimodal systems convert different types of inputs into outputs that could be text, images, videos, or audio. Leveraging multimodality is expected to offer new opportunities for dynamic, mutually reinforcing creative cycles (Benbya et al. 2024; Eapen et al. 2023). In our third project, we briefly experimented with this multimodality by using text outputs from ChatGPT as prompts for Dall-E, which then generated image outputs. This initial exploration suggests significant potential, and we encourage both practitioners and researchers to delve deeper into the capabilities and applications of multimodal GenAI to push the boundaries of creativity.

Our research builds on the premise that creativity goes beyond *individual idea generation*, though ideas themselves remain crucial. Recent studies probe the nuances of idea generation and quality. For instance, Doshi and Hauser (2023) noted that GenAI-generated ideas tend to be more homogeneous than those created by humans. Gotlar and Hutley (2024) found that GenAI-assisted idea generation led humans to avoid poor ideas but also to propose more average ideas, suggesting that individuals may become overconfident in their problem solving abilities when using GenAI. In our view, these findings highlight the need for practitioners and researchers to concentrate on the broader process of innovation, particularly on the synchronization of GenAI and human capabilities, a strategy of assisted augmentation (Holmström & Carroll, 2024). This includes exploring how GenAI can assist in evaluating creativity dimensions such as novelty, feasibility, and impact, as proposed by Eapen et al. (2023).

At the *team level*, further exploration into the optimal configurations of human-AI collaborative patterns—referred to as “*superminds*” (Malone, 2018) or “*super teams*”—is essential. Our research has demonstrated the versatility of GenAI as a value-adding collaborator in innovation teams,

where it has taken on traditional human roles (Shanahan et al., 2023). For instance, GenAI has functioned as a participant generating ideas, a curator organizing and prioritizing those ideas, an editor refining and presenting content, a back-office assistant handling administrative tasks, a sounding board for testing and iterating concepts, and even a provocateur challenging conventional thinking. Over time, we observed GenAI evolving as a hyperspecialized, yet nonautonomous *counterpart* within the innovation team (Anthony, 2023). The integration of specialized GPTs or multimodal GenAI agents, used throughout the innovation process with autonomous triggers for their activation and coordination, seems increasingly feasible. However, this potential raises significant considerations: Who sets the goals for these systems? What exactly are these goals? And crucially, how do we ensure control measures are in place to prevent autonomous agents from making decisions independently? Addressing these questions is critical as we continue to integrate more advanced AI capabilities into team dynamics, ensuring that they complement rather than compromise human input and control.

Beyond individual and team creativity, future work could expand the focus on the *scaling up of creativity at the organizational level*. Mikalef and Gupta (2021) have established a connection between a firm’s AI capabilities and its creativity, emphasizing the importance of building capabilities. AI capability is defined as a firm’s ability to select, orchestrate, and leverage AI-specific resources. These capabilities involve resources that are rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable. They include tangible resources such as data technology and basic infrastructure, human resources including technological and business skills, and intangible assets like team coordination, capacity for change, and risk proclivity. Developing these areas for GenAI is likely to be crucial for firms aiming to enhance their creative outputs and innovation processes at the organizational level.

Large language models, trained on vast corpora of text, images, and videos, offer powerful “reservoirs of knowledge” for practitioners. However, these models have limitations — they do not inherently grasp contextual knowledge or the specific norms and culture of an organization during the innovation process (Gotlar and Hutley, 2024). They are also imperfect models of human culture (Colas, 2022), mirroring the norms and values prevalent in their training data, which predominantly originate from Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic (WEIRD) societies (Atari et al., 2023). This can skew the content used in mediating the human idea generation process, team collaboration, and solution construction. Such nuances necessitate further research into how biases in GenAI shape creativity and innovation trajectories. This exploration into the darker side of GenAI becomes particularly relevant as GenAI tools’ direct utilization by innovation team members—briefly trialed in Project #3—suggests a potential to democratize innovation (Eapen et al., 2023), prompting new inquiries into the attribution of creativity (Rafner et al., 2023).

## 6. Conclusion

Our research reveals the extensive potential of integrating GenAI into innovation processes, beyond mere idea generation. Over the course of a year, we examined three innovation projects and found that GenAI can greatly enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of both divergence and convergence tasks—including problem framing, data synthesis, prioritization, and prototyping. The practical implications of our findings are clear: when cleverly integrated, GenAI can

significantly reduce the cognitive efforts of human participants, enabling them to focus on aspects of innovation where human contributions are essential. It intensifies activities requiring contextual knowledge and accelerates clerical work, resulting in a more streamlined innovation process. Successfully integrating GenAI into a collaborative, human-centered innovation processes is transformative yet challenging, demanding a craftsman mindset, thoughtful role allocation, significant time investment in data management, and a committed effort to building trust in the technology within teams.

## References

- Abubakre, M., Zhou, Y., & Zhou, Z. (2020). The impact of information technology culture and personal innovativeness in information technology on digital entrepreneurship success. *Information Technology & People*, 35(1), 204–231. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ITP-01-2020-0002>
- Alavi, M., & Westerman, G. (2023, November 7). How Generative AI Will Transform Knowledge Work. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2023/11/how-generative-ai-will-transform-knowledge-work>
- Anthony, C., Bechky, B. A., & Fayard, A.-L. (2023). “Collaborating” with AI: Taking a system view to explore the future of work. *Organization Science*, 34(5), 1672–1694. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2022.1651>
- Atari, M., Xue, M. J., Park, P. S., Blasi, D., & Henrich, J. (2023). *Which Humans?* OSF. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/5b26t>
- Bancel, S., Shah, A., Brewer, R., Hieronimus, N., Wat, J., Ibrahim, M., Galan, I., & Nooyi, I. (2022, November 1). The Ideas That Inspire Us. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2022/11/the-ideas-that-inspire-us>
- Benbya, H., Strich, F., & Tamm, T. (2024). Navigating Generative Artificial Intelligence Promises and Perils for Knowledge and Creative Work. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 25(1), 23–36. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00861>
- Boston Consulting Group. (2023, December 19). *Will Multimodal GenAI Be a Gamechanger for Industry?* BCG Global. <https://www.bcg.com/publications/2023/will-multimodal-genai-be-a-gamechanger-for-the-future>
- Brown, T. (2008). Design Thinking. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2008/06/design-thinking>
- Chui, M., Hazan, E., Roberts, R., Singla, A., Smaje, K., Sukharevsky, A., & Zimmel, R. (2023). *The Economic Potential of Generative AI: The Next Productivity Frontier*. McKinsey. <https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/mckinsey-digital/our-insights/the-economic-potential-of-generative-AI-the-next-productivity-frontier#introduction>
- Clark, T. R. (2022, February 21). Agile Doesn’t Work Without Psychological Safety. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2022/02/agile-doesnt-work-without-psychological-safety>
- Coombs, C., Hislop, D., Taneva, S. K., & Barnard, S. (2020). The strategic impacts of Intelligent Automation for knowledge and service work: An interdisciplinary review. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 101600. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2020.101600>

- Dell'Acqua, F., McFowland, E., Mollick, E. R., Lifshitz-Assaf, H., Kellogg, K., Rajendran, S., Kraye, L., Candelon, F., & Lakhani, K. R. (2023). *Navigating the Jagged Technological Frontier: Field Experimental Evidence of the Effects of AI on Knowledge Worker Productivity and Quality* (Harvard Business School Technology & Operations Mgt. Unit Working Paper No. 24-013 4573321). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4573321>
- Dell'Era, C., Magistretti, S., Cautela, C., Verganti, R., & Zurlo, F. (2020). Four kinds of design thinking: From ideating to making, engaging, and criticizing. *Creativity and Innovation Management, 29*(2), 324–344. <https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12353>
- Doshi, A. R., & Hauser, O. (2023). *Generative artificial intelligence enhances creativity but reduces the diversity of novel content* (SSRN Scholarly Paper 4535536). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4535536>
- Eapen, T. T., Finkenstadt, D. J., Folk, J., & Venkataswamy, L. (2023, July 1). How Generative AI Can Augment Human Creativity. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2023/07/how-generative-ai-can-augment-human-creativity>
- Edmondson, A. C. (2012). *Teaming: How Organizations Learn, Innovate, and Compete in the Knowledge Economy* (1er édition). Jossey-Bass.
- Gilson, L. L., & Litchfield, R. C. (2017). Idea collections: A link between creativity and innovation. *Innovation, 19*(1), 80–85.
- Glikson, E., & Woolley, A. W. (2020). Human Trust in Artificial Intelligence: Review of Empirical Research. *Academy of Management Annals, 14*(2), 627–660. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0057>
- Gotlar, K., & Hutley, J. (2024, March 1). Don't Let Gen AI Limit Your Team's Creativity. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2024/03/dont-let-gen-ai-limit-your-teams-creativity>
- Gryskiewicz, Sarrazin, H., Voorsanger, C., & Yeon, H. (2018). *How concept sprints can improve customer-experience innovation*. McKinsey. <https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/mckinsey-digital/our-insights/how-concept-sprints-can-improve-customer-experience-innovation>
- Han, Y., Qiu, Z., Cheng, J., & LC, R. (2024). When Teams Embrace AI: Human Collaboration Strategies in Generative Prompting in a Creative Design Task. *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, 1–14*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642133>
- Henreux, E., Noutcha, M., Phan-Ngoc, T., & Suzanne, K. (2021). Design Sprints Integrating Agile and Design Thinking: A Case Study in the Automotive Industry. In N. Stanton (Ed.), *Advances in Human Aspects of Transportation* (pp. 189–195). Springer International Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-80012-3\\_23](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-80012-3_23)
- Holmström, J., & Carroll, N. (2024). How organizations can innovate with generative AI. *Business Horizons*. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0007681324000247>
- Jackson, J. D., Yi, M. Y., & Park, J. S. (2013). An empirical test of three mediation models for the relationship between personal innovativeness and user acceptance of technology. *Information & Management, 50*(4), 154–161. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2013.02.006>

- Jarrahi, M. H. (2018). Artificial intelligence and the future of work: Human-AI symbiosis in organizational decision making. *Business Horizons*, 61(4), 577–586. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2018.03.007>
- Jia, N., Luo, X., Fang, Z., & Liao, C. (2024). When and How Artificial Intelligence Augments Employee Creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 67(1), 5–32. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2022.0426>
- Kerguenne, A., Meisel, M., & Meinel, C. (2023). Opportunities and Limitations of Design Thinking as Strategic Approach for Navigating Digital Transformation in Organizations. In C. Meinel & L. Leifer (Eds.), *Design Thinking Research* (pp. 271–322). Springer Nature Switzerland. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-36103-6\\_14](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-36103-6_14)
- Kilkenny, M. F., & Robinson, K. M. (2018). Data quality: “Garbage in – garbage out.” *Health Information Management Journal*, 47(3), 103–105. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1833358318774357>
- Kinni, T. (2017, June 21). The Critical Difference Between Complex and Complicated. *MIT Sloan Management Review*. <https://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/the-critical-difference-between-complex-and-complicated/>
- Knapp, J., Zeratsky, J., & Kowitz, B. (2016). *Sprint: How to solve big problems and test new ideas in just five days*. Simon and Schuster.
- Liedtka, J. (2018). Why design thinking works. *Harvard Business Review*, 96(5), 72–79.
- Malone, T. W. (2018). How Human-Computer “Superminds” Are Redefining the Future of Work. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 59(4), 34–41.
- Manly, J., Ringel, M., MacDougall, A., Harnoss, J., Wolke-Perten, J., Backler, W., Gjerstad, K., Kimura, R., & Viner, B. (2024). *Most Innovative Companies 2024: Innovation Systems Need a Reboot*. Boston Consulting Group. <https://www.bcg.com/publications/2024/innovation-systems-need-a-reboot>
- March, J. G. (1991). EXPLORATION AND EXPLOITATION IN ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 71–87.
- Martin, R. L. (2009). *The design of business: Why design thinking is the next competitive advantage*. Harvard Business Press.
- Mikalef, P., & Gupta, M. (2021). Artificial intelligence capability: Conceptualization, measurement calibration, and empirical study on its impact on organizational creativity and firm performance. *Information & Management*, 58(3), 103434. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2021.103434>
- Montonen, T., Eriksson, P., Asikainen, I., & Lehtimäki, H. (2014). Innovation empathy: A framework for customer-oriented lean innovation. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management*, 18(5/6), 368. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJEIM.2014.064719>
- Naranjo-Valencia, J. C., Jiménez-Jiménez, D., & Sanz-Valle, R. (2011). Innovation or imitation? The role of organizational culture. *Management Decision*, 49(1), 55–72. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00251741111094437>
- Norman, D. A. (2004). *Emotional Design: Why We Love (or Hate) Everyday Things*. Basic Books.



- Noy, S., & Zhang, W. (2023). Experimental evidence on the productivity effects of generative artificial intelligence. *Science*, 381(6654), 187–192. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adh2586>
- O'Reilly, C. A., & Tushman, M. L. (2004). The ambidextrous organization. *Harvard Business Review*, 82(4), 74–81, 140.
- Osterwalder, A., & Pigneur, Y. (2010). *Business Model Generation: A Handbook for Visionaries, Game Changers, and Challengers*. Wiley.
- Osterwalder, A., Pigneur, Y., Bernarda, G., Smith, A., & Papadakos, T. (2014). *Value Proposition Design: How to Create Products and Services Customers Want*. Wiley. <http://ca.wiley.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-1118968050.html>
- Pasquale, F. (2015). *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information*. Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674736061>
- Pisano, G. P. (2015, June 1). You Need an Innovation Strategy. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2015/06/you-need-an-innovation-strategy>
- Rafner, J., Beaty, R. E., Kaufman, J. C., Lubart, T., & Sherson, J. (2023). Creativity in the age of generative AI. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 7(11), 1836–1838.
- Raisch, S., Birkinshaw, J., Probst, G., & Tushman, M. L. (2009). Organizational Ambidexterity: Balancing Exploitation and Exploration for Sustained Performance. *Organization Science*, 20(4), 685–695. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1090.0428>
- Richardson, S. (2020). Cognitive automation: A new era of knowledge work? *Business Information Review*, 37(4), 182–189. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266382120974601>
- Rigby, D., Sutherland, J., & Takeuchi, H. (2016, May 1). Embracing Agile. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2016/05/embracing-agile>
- Root-Bernstein, R. (2003). Problem generation and innovation. *The International Handbook on Innovation*, 1, 170–179.
- Schmitz, K., Teng, J., & Webb, K. (2016). Capturing the Complexity of Malleable IT Use: Adaptive Structuration Theory for Individuals. *MIS Quarterly*, 40(4).
- Sennett, R. (2008). *The Craftsman*. Yale University Press.
- Shanahan, M., McDonell, K., & Reynolds, L. (2023). Role play with large language models. *Nature*, 623(7987), 493–498. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06647-8>
- Teodorescu, M. H. M., Morse, L., Awwad, Y., & Kane, G. C. (2021). Failures of Fairness in Automation of Human-MI Augmentation. *Mis Quarterly*, 45(3), 1483–1500. <https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2021/16535>
- Thomke, S. (2020). Building a culture of experimentation. *Harvard Business Review*, 98(2), 40–47.
- Tushman, M., & O'Reilly, C. A. (2002). *Winning through innovation: A practical guide to leading organizational change and renewal*. Harvard Business Press. <https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=CvEpILBTN3QC&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&ots=2yXyYFu4QJ&sig=fG-7KGwHRGwfbMdfNlcoYMQUSQg>
- van der Bijl-Brouwer, M., & Dorst, K. (2017). Advancing the strategic impact of human-centred design. *Design Studies*, 53, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.destud.2017.06.003>

- Ventura, M. (2018). *Applied Empathy: The New Language of Leadership*. Simon and Schuster.
- Vetan, J. (2018, January 8). *Design Sprint 3.0*. <https://www.designsprint.academy/blog/design-sprint-3-0>
- Wangsa, K., Chugh, R., Karim, S., & Sandu, R. (2022). A comparative study between design thinking, agile, and design sprint methodologies. *International Journal of Agile Systems and Management*, 15(2), 225–242. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJASM.2022.124916>
- Wanner, J., Herm, L.-V., Heinrich, K., & Janiesch, C. (2022). The effect of transparency and trust on intelligent system acceptance: Evidence from a user-based study. *Electronic Markets*, 32(4), 2079–2102. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-022-00593-5>
- Wei, J., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., Bosma, M., Ichter, B., Xia, F., Chi, E., Le, Q., & Zhou, D. (2023). *Chain-of-Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models* (arXiv:2201.11903). arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2201.11903>
- Yi, M. Y., Fiedler, K. D., & Park, J. S. (2006). Understanding the Role of Individual Innovativeness in the Acceptance of IT-Based Innovations: Comparative Analyses of Models and Measures\*. *Decision Sciences*, 37(3), 393–426. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5414.2006.00132.x>
- Zeratsky, J. (2016, March 15). Sprints Are the Secret to Getting More Done. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2016/03/sprints-are-the-secret-to-getting-more-done>
- Zuboff, S. (1988). *In the Age of the Smart Machine*. Basic Books.

## Appendix A : Research Design

Reflecting our commitment to explore the integration of GenAI with innovation "in and for practice," our field study adopted a *collaborative practice research methodology* (Mathiassen et al. 2002). This methodology fostered a dynamic partnership between the practitioner, who designed and facilitating the GenAI-augmented design sprints, and a team of four academic researchers. These researchers acted as a sounding board, providing critical feedback and documenting the processes in light of theoretical insights from the scientific and practitioner literature.

Within this broader framework, we focused on the *revelatory* context of an early adopter scenario. The innovation practitioner was among the first to integrate GenAI into design sprints when the technology became available in early 2023, a practice that was (and continues to be) largely unexplored. Furthermore, we adopted a *longitudinal* approach, tracking the evolution of this practice over a year through sequential innovation projects in three distinct organizations. Our focus on design sprints was intentional, as each task within this methodology plays a critical role in problem-solving. This allowed us to thoroughly explore how GenAI was employed at different stages of the innovation process and how this progressed over time, allowing us to capture a granular and dynamic view of its integration and impact in real-world settings.

The *primary data* for our study consisted of 17 video-recorded and transcribed online meetings, totaling over 18 hours. Twelve of these meetings were discussions between the academic researchers and the practitioner, spanning from May 2023 to March 2024. These discussions

provided insights into GenAI's use across three projects, focusing on the key phases of divergence and convergence, and the overarching sensemaking processes. Additionally, five semi-structured interviews with design sprint participants allowed for tailored questions specific to each context, focusing on descriptive, perceptual, and sensemaking aspects to capture individual experiences and triangulate data, further illuminating human responses to GenAI in innovation work.

To enhance the robustness and validity of our findings, we supplemented our primary data with *secondary* sources. These included project-specific documentation and articles, presentations, and demonstrations that detailed the capabilities of the technology. This approach helped us to corroborate and enrich the insights gained from the discussions and interviews.

In our *analysis* (Figure 1), we meticulously examined the innovation *process* by dissecting the design sprints (e.g., distribution of roles and effort, value, challenges, turning points). The same overarching design sprint framework was used in the three projects, allowing for clear comparisons and differentiation in the use of GenAI to facilitate divergence and convergence across the problem and the solution space.




Figure 1. Data analysis process

We performed within-project and cross-project analyses, engaging in sensemaking activities through data reduction (e.g., abstracting from interview transcripts) and visualization (e.g., through matrixes) (Miles and Huberman 1994). Our focus was on (1) examining innovation work (all individual and team-based activities, with and without GenAI) within each project, and (2) abstracting the situated learnings associated with each project into actionable guidelines for

innovation practitioners. These activities were not conducted sequentially or in isolation; we constantly moved between them to ensure that the outcome (the recommendations) was faithful to the lessons learned in each project. Our analytical approach was thus interpretive (Klein and Myers 1999), involving an iterative process of moving back and forth between the collected data, emerging insights, and the latest research. This literature included, among others, studies on human-AI collaboration (e.g., Seeber et al. 2020; Anthony et al. 2023), GenAI and intelligence augmentation/knowledge work (e.g., Zhou et al. 2021; Benbya et al. 2024), GenAI and innovation (e.g., Holmström and Carroll 2024), and GenAI and creativity (Eapen et al. 2023; Gotlar and Hutley 2024).

### **Appendix References**

Anthony, C., Bechky, B. A., & Fayard, A.-L. (2023). “Collaborating” with AI: Taking a system view to explore the future of work. *Organization Science*, 34(5), 1672–1694. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2022.1651>

Benbya, H., Strich, F., & Tamm, T. (2024). Navigating Generative Artificial Intelligence Promises and Perils for Knowledge and Creative Work. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 25(1), 23–36. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00861>

Eapen, T. T., Finkenstadt, D. J., Folk, J., & Venkataswamy, L. (2023, July 1). How Generative AI Can Augment Human Creativity. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2023/07/how-generative-ai-can-augment-human-creativity>

Gotlar, K., & Hutley, J. (2024, March 1). Don’t Let Gen AI Limit Your Team’s Creativity. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2024/03/dont-let-gen-ai-limit-your-teams-creativity>

Holmström, J., & Carroll, N. (2024). How organizations can innovate with generative AI. *Business Horizons*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2024.02.010>

Klein, H. K., & Myers, M. D. (1999). A set of principles for conducting and evaluating interpretive field studies in information systems. *MIS Quarterly*, 67–93.

Mathiassen, L. (2002). Collaborative practice research. *Information Technology & People*, 15(4), 321–345.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*, 2nd ed (pp. xiv, 338). Sage Publications, Inc.

Seeber, I., Bittner, E., Briggs, R. O., de Vreede, T., de Vreede, G.-J., Elkins, A., Maier, R., Merz, A. B., Oeste-Reiß, S., Randrup, N., Schwabe, G., & Söllner, M. (2020). Machines as teammates: A research agenda on AI in team collaboration. *Information & Management*, 57(2), 103174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2019.103174>

Zhou, L., Paul, S., Demirkan, H., Yuan, L., Spohrer, J., Zhou, M., & Basu, J. (2021). Intelligence Augmentation: Towards Building Human-Machine Symbiotic Relationship. *AIS Transactions on Human-Computer Interaction*, 13(2), 243–264. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1thci.00149>