



**This version of the article is stored in the institutional repository DHanken**

## **Business experimentation for a circular economy - Learning in the front end of innovation**

Aminoff, Anna; Pihlajmaa, Matti

*Published in:*  
Journal of Cleaner Production

*DOI:*  
[10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.124051](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.124051)

*Publication date:*  
2020

*Document Version*  
Peer reviewed version, als known as post-print

[Link to publication](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Aminoff, A., & Pihlajmaa, M. (2020). Business experimentation for a circular economy - Learning in the front end of innovation. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 275, Article 124051. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.124051>

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in Haris/DHanken are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from Haris/DHanken for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in DHanken ?

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will investigate your claim.

# Journal of Cleaner Production

## Business experimentation for a circular economy - Learning in the front end of innovation

--Manuscript Draft--

<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	JCLEPRO-D-19-04833R4
<b>Article Type:</b>	VSI:Business experiment
<b>Keywords:</b>	Business experimentation; Innovation; Circular economy; recycling; Orgnizational learning
<b>Corresponding Author:</b>	Anna Aminoff, D Sc (Tech) Supply Chain Management and Social Responsibility Helsinki, FINLAND
<b>First Author:</b>	Anna Aminoff, D Sc (Tech)
<b>Order of Authors:</b>	Anna Aminoff, D Sc (Tech) Matti Pihlajamaa, D Sc (Tech)
<b>Abstract:</b>	<p>Business experimentation has been recognized as an important means for accelerating transitions towards a circular economy (CE). This paper aims to develop a new understanding of how learning from business experiments at the front end of innovation may help develop ideas and concepts that can advance a CE. The study adopts a case study approach and investigates four experiments conducted by a single organization in the context of recycling. The learning outcomes of these experiments are examined by using the lens of learning loops. Single loop learning refers to detecting and correcting errors in existing policies. In double loop learning underlying assumptions are questioned and new policies are formulated. In triple loop learning, entirely new processes and methodologies for problem solving are devised. We conclude that incremental ideas associated with single loop learning may be insufficient for a CE. While radical ideas associated with double loop learning may be critical for a CE, double loop learning may require designing the experiments to address CE innovation challenges. We propose that focusing on triple loop learning may be the answer, and by examining the relationships between the different forms of learning and CE innovation challenges, we determine which type of learning was best suited to overcoming these challenges. Further, this study elaborates the concept of learning loops in the context of front end of CE innovation by identifying 11 forms of learning from experiments. For managers, the study offers insights on how the experimentation process should be developed to overcome the barriers to CE innovation.</p>

Dear Ilka

Many thanks for the opportunity to revise our paper. We have carefully considered the comments by the reviewers, and modified the text accordingly, shortened the paper and ensure clarity and consistency of terminology used.

Please find attached slightly modified highlights – as I don't find a place for them in the manuscript system

Best regards

Anna Aminoff and Matti Pihlajamaa

#### Highlights

- Investigates learning from circular business experiments in the front of innovation
- Adopts the concept of learning loops for analysing the outcomes of the experiments.
- Identifies 11 distinct forms of learning that are categorized into three groups: single, double, and triple loop learning.
- Explains the roles of learning loops in advancing a CE.
- Gives practical insights on how to design business experiments to overcome CE innovation challenges.

## **Response to reviewers: Business experimentation for a circular economy - Learning in the front end of innovation**

The authors would like to thank the reviewers for their valuable comments on how to improve our manuscript. We have considered each comment carefully and revised the manuscript accordingly.

Thank you for the opportunity to improve our research.

Dear authors,

Thank you for submitting this substantially improved manuscript. We are happy to let you know that this requires minor revisions and, in particular, we ask you to ensure clarity and consistency of terminology used. As second point, please ensure that the manuscript does not exceed 9500 words, already 1500 words over the limit mentioned in the author guidelines. I was very surprised to see the word count well above 10,000, especially after previously referring you to author guidance and explicitly mentioning the 8000 words MAXIMUM word limit for research articles.

Please submit the final version of the article in 3 weeks time [i.e. by 23 August 2020].

With kind regards,

Ilka Weissbrod, also on behalf of fellow guest editors Nancy Bocken and Maria Antikainen

*Authors' response:*

*Many thanks for the opportunity to revise our paper. We have carefully considered the comments by the reviewers, and modified the text accordingly, shortened the paper and ensure clarity and consistency of terminology used.*

### **Reviewer #1: Dear authors,**

Thanks for reviewing the manuscript, which is now well structured and more solid. I enjoyed reading it and was glad to find radical improvements from the previous version, based on the provided feedback. I recommend an additional round of minor revision before the article can be published. This is mostly related to minor issues, and importantly, to the discussion section, which in my view is not up to mark yet. To this end, please find my comments below.

*Authors' response:*

*Many thanks for the valuable feedback and recommendations during the process.*

### **ABSTRACT**

Please explain what single, double and triple loop means otherwise readers might struggle to understand the contribution of the paper.

*Authors' response:*

*We have modified the abstract and added the explanation of single, double and triple loops.*

### **INTRODUCTION**

Thank you for improving this section, which is now sharp and to the point. I suggest to:

- At the end of paragraph 3 you state that learning in the front end is likely to be different from the later phases. I find this somehow vague. Please clearly explain how that is different and why it is problematic.

*Authors' response:*

*We have clarified this issue by stating that "Learning in this front-end phase is, however, likely to be different from the later phases as it addresses the generation of new ideas whose potential and feasibility may be difficult to evaluate". We also emphasize the 'fuzzy' and 'chaotic' nature of the front end phase which makes the generation of especially radical ideas difficult to manage.*

- At the beginning of paragraph 4 of the intro there is a mistake. "The research gap that our study addresses is that (THERE) despite the value..." Please proofread the document and make sure that it is free of such mistakes. While reading the text I found more typos (e.g. Reis 2011, instead of Ries in section 2.2) and mistakes showing that, despite repeated comments on the issue, the paper has not been properly proofread yet. Please proofread the document thoroughly in order to make it publishable.

*Authors' response:*

*We are sorry for these mistakes. The paper was carefully proofread by the professional in the previous round (after the review round 2), but there have been modifications after that. The latest version manuscript has now been thoroughly proofread.*

- In paragraph 4, the sentence where you state the gap needs referencing. Furthermore, I strongly recommend adding a couple more sentences elaborating on the gap. This will improve the positioning of your relevant paper.

*Authors' response:*

*We have revised paragraph 4 by including material from the previous paragraph that elaborates the gap and supports it with references.*

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Thank you for improving this section. I suggest to:

- In 2.1 you state that literature on CE experimentation is still very narrow, citing the work of key authors, including Bocken, Weissbrod and Antikainen. While I agree that this stream of literature is still in its infancy and therefore narrow, I am also aware of many more scholars working in this space, next to those you already mention. I suggest to refer to their work as a way to acknowledge their efforts and more importantly to add more diversity in your sources, ultimately showing that you have thoroughly reviewed this literature stream.

*Authors' response:*

*This is a valid point. We have added a few more references to CE and business experimentation, including Aagaard et forthcoming), al Konietzko et al (forthcoming), Buhl et al. (2019); Andries et al (2013).*

*Comment:*

- 2.2 repeats many things that have already been said in 2.1, including many sources about CE experimentation. I saw the comment of the other reviewer concerning the need of deepening your review on organizational learning and agree with him. Therefore, I suggest to focus this section more on organizational learning, while making it more concise and merging it with 2.2.1, which is where you provide the insights that are most relevant for your work.

*Authors' response:*

*We also noticed that there was some repetition. We have reorganised the section 2 to make it less repetitive.*

*Comment:*

- I suggest to have 2.1 and 2.2 more or less equal in length, to display a comparable level of depth in the two areas of your review.

*Authors' response:*

*To increase clarity, we divided the literature review into subsections, and these are more or less equal in length.*

## METHOD

This section is now clear and well structured. Agree that a figure is not strictly needed. While I leave the choice of adding a simple figure up to you, please consider that visualizing would help for the reader to move quicker through the section.

*Authors' response:*

*We agree that a figure could be beneficial, but as the manuscript is already overly lengthy, we decided not to add new material in the method section.*

## RESULTS

Thanks for improving this section, which is not more clear, therefore insightful. Below some minor suggestions to improve it further.

- Table 1 could be moved up front, between section 4 and 4.1, as way to anticipate to the reader what is coming. This will improve readability. Also I suggest to format in bold (or italic or underscore) the 11 categories inside the table to further increase its readability.

*Authors' response:*

*We followed this suggestion and moved the Table between sections 4 and 4.1 and formatted the 11 categories in italic.*

*Comment:*

- In 4.4 you talk about key challenges, that are also summarized and presented in figure 2. I find this a very interesting part of your results. Yet, you do not mention it at all in the abstract. I suggest to incorporate these insights in the abstract to hook readers into your paper and increase the impact of your work. For the same reason, I would explicitly state your contributions to theory and implications for practice in the abstract.

*Authors' response:*

*We have added both the CE challenges as well as implications to the theory and practice to the abstract.*

## DISCUSSION

This section has improved, however additional improvements would make your paper more relevant. Please consider the comments below:

- Splitting the section in "5.1 contributions CE experimentation theory" and "5.2. implications for CE experimentation practice" would be helpful to walk readers more effectively through your contributions.

*Authors' response:*

*We split the discussion into two subsections to distinguish between our theoretical and practical contributions. To avoid repetition, we also combined the discussion and conclusions sections and added subsection 5.3 Limitations and future research.*

- The contributions to theory could be sharpened. In the current version of the paper I find many repetitions of things that have already been said. My suggestion would be to make it a bit more concise and at the same time incorporate some reflections related to the challenges identified in figure 2. This is a very relevant part of your results and it is not sufficiently discussed. Doing so, would increase the relevance of your contribution. Figure 3 would benefit from improvement as well, incorporating these thoughts in the visual to increase its relevance and level of insight.

*Authors' response:*

*The discussion is now more concise and compact, and repetition is removed.*

*Moreover, we have fine-tuned figure 3 and added figure 4 which focuses on how to overcome the CE innovation challenges.*

- I appreciate your advice to managers. In line with my previous comment, I suggest to sharpen it a little bit, elaborating on how they can overcome the challenges identified in figure 2.

*Authors' response:*

*We added a section that refers to figure 4 and suggests how it may inform managers to overcome CE innovation challenges by adjusting their experiment designs.*

## CONCLUSION

- Limitations are properly identified and directions for future research are suggested. The latter could be improved by making them more aligned with the research gap you identified. It would be great if you could suggest future research directions more specifically related to learning. This would help other scholars to use and build upon your work.

*Authors' response:*

*We have strengthened the learning aspect in our discussion of future research opportunities, as you advised.*

*Comment:*

Reviewer #4: Thank you for this much improved paper!

Many of my comments have been resolved and the work has become much more digestible.

Below I highlight my outstanding revisions.

*Authors' response:*

*Many thanks for the valuable feedback and recommendations during the process.*

*Comment:*

Method:

3.1: add the timing of data collection and whether and why it was decided to anonymise the case.

End of section 3.1 - Sentence starting with: The research team followed... Would end with something like this:

.. "but did not have an active role in the development or roll-out of the experiments". This in response to my former comment asking whether the authors had an active role in the experiment set up and roll out.

*Authors' response:*

*Thank you for the suggestion. We have added these statements.*

**Results:**

I stumbled particularly over Section 4.4. Figure 2 (suggests to make it an easily formatted Table) is difficult to navigate and the text in this section must be made much more succinct to convey the key messages.

*Authors' response:*

*We have modified the text to make it easier to navigate, and also marked some pieces of text as italics to help to see the connection between text and Figure 2. Also, we have modified figure 2 to make it easier to read. We decided, however, not to radically shorten the text nor reduce the information from the figure, as reviewer 1 finds both the figure and text important.*

**Discussion:**

Mentions that there are 2 key contributions but Figure 3 seems to show 3 contributions. Please check/improve.

Also the '3rd contribution' in Fig. 3 is confusing : "Contributes to double loop learning via insights on experimentation process and methodologies. Helps overcome CE innovation challenges." - why is it positioned next to triple loop learning if it talks about double loop learning? Please improve figure 3 + descriptions, arrows and contributions for clarity.

*Authors' response:*

*We have clarified the text and Figure 3 in the following ways:*

- *We modified the text so that the number of main contributions (2) that is mentioned does not directly refer to Figure 3.*
- *We rewrote the description of the box next to triple loop learning.*
- *We added a new description box that explains the arrow from triple loop learning to double loop learning. The point that we wish to make is that triple loop learning is beneficial for a CE in that it helps manager design such experiments that acknowledge CE innovation challenges. This, in turn, makes double loop learning possible..*

*Comment:*

Overall, the Discussion can be made more succinct and also better leverage the older learning literature: so what are the expected and unexpected results here?

Single loop learning is probably more naturally linked to incrementalism but this is hardly surprising from older literature. I would frame the discussion (and also earlier text in the literature background) more as follows: what is expected from the learning literature (links between these learning types and CE; in Literature background) and what are the new and surprising findings, and confirming findings here?

(Discussion) I don't expect hypotheses in the beginning of the paper, but rather a better feel throughout of how learning and experimenting may be linked (which you partly do in Section 2) which would allow for a Discussion that goes a little deeper than the present one. So this probably indicates a few clarifying sentences need to be added to 2.2.1, perhaps at the end, while at the same time trying to make it all more succinct (a challenge!). This is more about finesse and making your paper more effective and convincing to the reader.

*Authors' response:*



*In the last paragraph of the Literature review, we draw from the organizational learning literature to explain what single, double and triple loop learning could mean in the context of experimentation. In short, we associate single loop learning with incremental innovation, double loop learning with radical innovation, and triple loop learning with the institutionalization of innovation management within an organization.*

*As explained with more clarity in the revised (and more succinct) discussion section, the ideas about single and double loop learning are confirmed. When it comes to triple loop learning, we contribute by emphasizing how it may address experiment design and provide insights on how experiment design may be used to overcome CE innovation challenges. This contrasts the older learning literature, where triple loop learning is associated with overcoming organizational barriers to innovation and experimentation.*

*Comment:*

*Conclusion:*

Line 38: "The study concludes that incremental ideas..." This conclusion is rather unsurprising and confirms probably the oldest learning literature. Would add something like this and also emphasise somewhere in the conclusions what the real unexpected / new findings were.

*Authors' response:*

*To save space, we have combined the conclusions with the discussion section.*

*Comment:*

*Figures & Tables:*

- Figure 1: needs a source/ sources to the relevant works it builds on

- Figure 2: is way too busy and would suggest formatting it more simply, also with less text, as a table

*Length:*

The paper is way too lengthy. Please try and make some reductions, in the busy figures/ tables (e.g. Fig 2), the Literature review and the Results (section 4) to improve readability and stay within normal journal article sizes.

*Authors' response:*

*We have significantly shortened the article, especially the literature review, discussion and conclusions sections. Reviewer #1 emphasizes the value of section 4.4. and Figure 2 and while we have shortened those parts, we have been careful not to omit key information from them.*

*Figure 1 builds on Cooper (2013) that is mentioned in the title of the figure: "Figure 1. Learning from experiments in different phases of the innovation process (modified from Cooper (2013))."*

# Business experimentation for a circular economy - Learning in the front end of innovation

Anna Aminoff<sup>1\*</sup>, Matti Pihlajamaa<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Hanken School of Economics, Department of Marketing, Supply Chain Management & Social Responsibility, Arkadiankatu 22, 00101 Helsinki, Finland.

[Firstname.lastname@hanken.fi](mailto:Firstname.lastname@hanken.fi), <sup>2</sup>VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland, P.O. Box 1000, FI-02044 VTT, Finland [Firstname.lastname@vtt.fi](mailto:Firstname.lastname@vtt.fi)

\*) corresponding author

## Abstract

Business experimentation has been recognized as an important means for accelerating transitions towards a circular economy (CE). This paper aims to develop a new understanding of how learning from business experiments at the front end of innovation may help develop ideas and concepts that can advance a CE. The study adopts a case study approach and investigates four experiments conducted by a single organization in the context of recycling. The learning outcomes of these experiments are examined by using the lens of learning loops. Single loop learning refers to detecting and correcting errors in existing policies. In double loop learning underlying assumptions are questioned and new policies are formulated. In triple loop learning, entirely new processes and methodologies for problem solving are devised. We conclude that incremental ideas associated with single loop learning may be insufficient for a CE. While radical ideas associated with double loop learning may be critical for a CE, double loop learning may require designing the experiments to address CE innovation challenges. We propose that focusing on triple loop learning may be the answer, and by examining the relationships between the different forms of learning and CE innovation challenges, we determine which type of learning was best suited to overcoming these challenges. Further, this study elaborates the concept of learning loops in the context of front end of CE innovation by identifying 11 forms of learning from experiments. For managers, the study offers insights on how the experimentation process should be developed to overcome the barriers to CE innovation.

Keywords: Business experimentation; innovation; circular economy; recycling; organizational learning

Word count: 9294 words

## 1. Introduction

As concerns about the growing global population and over-consumption of finite resources increase, it is apparent that today's linear "take, make and dispose" models can no longer be continued. A circular economy (CE) offers an alternative solution to these challenges (Blomsma & Brennan, 2017). The benefits of a CE are relatively well understood, and a CE has the potential to achieve a radically more sustainable society and economic growth (Blomsma & Brennan, 2017). However, there are few concrete examples of successful circular businesses, as CE is often hindered by the complexity of new technologies and the lack of innovations (Tura et al., 2019). Business experimentation has been recognized as an important way of accelerating CE innovation (Bocken et al., 2019; Brown et al. 2019; Buhl et al., 2019), which is defined as "the coordinated activities that integrate CE goals, principles and recovery strategies into technical and market-based innovations" (Brown et al., 2019, p. 18).

The value of business experimentation lies in that it is an effective and efficient method for organizational learning (Huber, 1991). By conducting experiments, organizations may acquire new knowledge that can be used to develop better innovations (McDonald & Eisenhardt, 2020). The process of innovation becomes a serial, iterative process where lessons learned from individual experiments enables organizations to redirect their further development efforts in the right direction (Lynn et al., 1996). Organizational learning is, however, not automatic, but it needs to be managed (McKee, 1992). To be able to manage the learning processes better, it is important to understand what kind of learning takes place in experiments.

In this study, we focus on learning from experiments in a particular phase of the innovation process, the front end of innovation, which refers to the early time period where new opportunities are identified and the potential of ideas is evaluated (Reid & de Brentani, 2004). This phase has great potential, as many decisions that are critical for overcoming barriers to a CE (Brown et al., 2019; Tura et al., 2019), e.g. decisions regarding design, target customers, and availability of resources, are made very early (Smith & Reinertsen, 1991). It is, however, also described as fuzzy and chaotic and difficult to manage – especially so if the aim is to generate radical ideas (Koen et al., 2002).

The research gap that our study addresses is that despite the value of business experiments in the front end for advancing a CE has been acknowledged, there is lack of understanding of what kind of learning takes place in this phase. Whereas most business experiments follow the lean startup approach that focuses on hypothesis testing in the later innovation process phases (Ries, 2011; Blank, 2013), in some cases the scope of business experimentation is extended to include opportunity identification and ideation (see Bocken et al. 2018; Bocken et al. 2013), which suggests that experiments may be valuable also in the front end of innovation. Learning in this front end phase is, however, likely to be different from the later phases as it addresses the generation of new ideas whose potential and feasibility may be difficult to evaluate (Bocken et al., 2018; Cooper, 2013).

Further, radical ideas may be particularly difficult to generate (Reid & de Brentani, 2004; Felin et al., in press). To address this gap, this paper aims to answer to the research question: how to learn from CE business experiments in the front end of innovation?

We adopt a case study approach and examine four experiments conducted by a single organization in the recycling context. To make sense of the data, we examine the learning outcomes of these experiments using the lens of *learning loops*. The idea behind learning loops is that organizational learning can be categorized into three loops (single, double, and triple loop) depending on the degree to which initial assumptions and frameworks are questioned (Gugerell & Zuidema, 2017; Lozano, 2014; McKee, 1992). Single loop learning refers to detecting and correcting errors in existing policies. In double loop learning, underlying assumptions are questioned and new policies are formulated. In triple loop learning, entirely new processes and methodologies for problem solving are devised.

The paper is structured as follows. First, we introduce the relevant literature on organization learning and CE business experimentation, front end of innovation, and learning loops. Then we describe the methods, data and case organization of our empirical study and present the results. Next, we discuss the relevance of the findings for researchers and practitioners. Finally, we describe the study's limitations and make recommendations for further research.

## 2. Literature review

### 2.1 Organizational learning

Previous research contends that experimentation enables organizational learning (McDonald and Eisenhardt, 2020) that is a key process by which companies respond to changes in their environment. The concept of organizational learning draws from the idea that organizational decision-making processes are based on rules, procedures, and routines that are used whether they lead to positive outcomes or not (Cyert & March, 1963). Through the process of organizational learning, the experiences of people within organizations may be translated into new knowledge that has the potential to influence organizations' behaviour. The process includes acquiring new knowledge from experiments, sharing the knowledge within the organization, interpreting and integrating it, and, finally, storing the new knowledge for future use (Huber, 1991). Organizational learning has been considered a key antecedent of innovation as it allows new products and services to be adapted to changing conditions, such as customer needs, technological developments, and regulatory frameworks (Wheelwright & Clark, 1992). It is important to note that learning needs to be managed; organizations need to develop skills and capabilities that ensure that experiments produce learning outcomes (McKee, 1992; Kogut & Zander, 1992). Moreover, different kinds of learning need to be managed differently (March, 1991).

## 2.2 Circular economy business experimentation

1 Experimentation has been recognized as an important way of accelerating the transition towards a CE  
2 (Antikainen & Bocken 2019; Bocken et al., 2018; Konietzko et al., 2020). CE business experimentation theory  
3 is rooted in more general business experimentation research (Chesbrough, 2010; McGrath, 2010; Ries, 2011).  
4 The purpose of business experimentation is to test assumptions about future business and to build its legitimacy  
5 among stakeholders with low resources and low costs (Aagaard et al., In press; Bocken et al., 2019; Buhl et  
6 al., 2019;). While experiments may vary, some common elements can be identified. First, experiments are a  
7 method for learning (Andries et al., 2013; Lynn et al., 1996). Second, experiments are relatively small in size  
8 and scope (Berkhout et al., 2010; Brown & Vergragt, 2008). Third, experiments can help engage potential  
9 customers and other stakeholders (Bojovic et al., 2018, Bocken et al., 2019). This is important as sustainable  
10 value and circularity can be achieved only in collaboration with actors from the value chain and the wider  
11 system (Aalgaard et al., In press; Buhl et al., 2019).  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 Perhaps the most widely-diffused practitioner approach to experimentation is the so-called “lean startup” (Ries,  
22 2011; Blank, 2013). In the lean startup approach, experimentation is understood as an iterative process to  
23 reduce uncertainties, engage stakeholders and promote collective learning (Bocken & Snihur, in press). It  
24 proceeds via build-measure-learn loops where an experiment is designed, its effects are measured, and the  
25 outcomes are reflected and internalized (Ries, 2011). The key elements of such learning are that it is deliberate  
26 and collective. Deliberation refers to having a learning focus while conducting experiments, typically by  
27 testing predefined hypotheses (Bocken et al., 2018). Collectiveness concerns the involvement of potential  
28 customers and other stakeholders to support learning (Bojovic et al., 2018, Bocken et al., 2019). Felin et al.  
29 (in press) criticize this approach in that it promotes incremental experiments that are insufficient for a CE,  
30 which requires radical departures from existing systems (Bocken et al., 2018; Weissbrod & Bocken, 2017). To  
31 promote a CE, business experiments should aim for outcomes that go beyond the existing dominant logics for  
32 developing new business (Bessant et al., 2014). Some authors, however, propose that experiments can be an  
33 effective method of searching for radically new solutions as they enable bounded environments for exploration  
34 that are not determined by organizations’ existing competence endowments and path dependence (Bocken &  
35 Snihur, in press; Brown et al., 2019). Further, Weissbrod and Bocken (2017), emphasize that unplanned action-  
36 based learning from experiments in addition to deliberate learning is important.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

## 2.3 Front end of innovation

48 In this paper, we choose to focus on learning in a particular phase of the innovation process: the front end of  
49 innovation, which refers to the early time period where new opportunities are identified, the potential of ideas  
50 is evaluated and ideas are developed into concepts and hypotheses (Reid & de Brentani, 2004). It is often  
51 characterized as fuzzy: chaotic, unpredictable, and unstructured (Koen et al. 2002). Smith and Reinertsen  
52 (1991) argue that the innovation process improvements that target the front end have the greatest potential for  
53 improving innovation outcomes for two reasons. First, many critical decisions regarding target customers,  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 availability of resources, and alignment with corporate strategy are made very early. Second, the front end  
2 phase is often neglected by managers.

3  
4 Lean startup implies a focus on the later innovation process phases (Bocken & Snihur, in press) as illustrated  
5 in Figure 1. However, some previous studies on business experimentation address the front end phase.  
6 Weissbrod and Bocken (2017) suggest that flawed idea generation processes may reduce organizations' ability  
7 to break the status quo. Bocken et al. (2017) report that workshops with diverse external stakeholders may be  
8 organized to generate and cluster radical ideas. Bocken et al. (2018) observe that experiments in the early  
9 phases of the innovation process require fewer resources than later on and can be conducted internally as  
10 opposed to in a real-life context. Furthermore, Bocken et al. (2011, 2013) propose tools to facilitate the  
11 generation of radical product and process ideas and sustainable value propositions. Brown et al. (2019) mention  
12 that a CE innovation process begins with the identification of a current system failure or a shared problem that  
13 helps stakeholders align visions and assess minimum viable capabilities for designing experiments.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 There is, however, limited understanding about what kind of learning takes place in CE business experiments  
22 in the front end of innovation, which makes the management of such learning difficult. Learning from  
23 experiments in the front end phase is likely to be different from these later innovation process phases where  
24 the focus is on developing existing ideas into hypotheses and testing them (Bocken et al., 2018). Early on,  
25 experiments may focus on gaining an understanding of which ideas are worth pursuing and what specific needs  
26 are to be fulfilled.  
27  
28  
29  
30

## 31 2.4 Learning loops

32 To guide our investigation of learning from CE business experiments in the front end of innovation, we adopt  
33 the concept of *learning loops*, which have been related to experimentation but not specifically to business  
34 experiments. The idea of learning loops, first proposed by Argyris and Schön (1974), is useful for analysing  
35 whether learning is contained within well-established logics or if new logics and new solutions are being  
36 explored. The founders of the concept consider the detection and correction of error by individuals as the basis  
37 of organizational learning (Argyris & Schön, 1978). When it permits the organization to carry on its present  
38 policies or achieve its present objectives, the learning can be characterized as single loop. Higher-order  
39 learning, namely double and triple loop learning, occurs when an error is detected and corrected in ways that  
40 modify the organization's initial assumptions (Argyris & Schön, 1974; Argyris, 1976; Gugerell & Zuidema,  
41 2017; Lozano, 2014; McKee, 1992).  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 *Single loop learning* is the simplest learning mode, where the results of an experiment are compared to the  
52 previous understanding of the topic to detect and correct errors in existing policies and practices and strengthen  
53 the participants' skills in the domain (Lozano, 2014). Existing norms and technological capabilities guide  
54 single loop learning that is associated with incremental innovation (McKee, 1992). It is the "general mode of  
55 action" where learning supports an organization's present policies and objectives (Argyris, 1978). In *double*  
56 *loop learning*, the participants' underlying assumptions are scrutinized to try to find the root causes of the  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 problems at hand. Double loop learning relies on creative problem solving in which real-world situations are  
2 compared to future goals to identify the actions and changes needed to achieve them (Lozano, 2014). This kind  
3 of learning is associated with radical, revolutionary innovation as it allows organizations to see their  
4 capabilities and environment in new ways, revealing new opportunities (McKee, 1992). Finally, *triple loop*  
5 *learning* is highly reflective and aims to exploit the results of an experiment to build new processes and  
6 methodologies that could be used to address future problems (Lozano, 2014). Sometimes referred to as “meta-  
7 learning”, triple-loop learning helps institutionalize innovation management within an organization and  
8 improve the outcomes of future innovation projects by learning from previous experiences, both successful  
9 and unsuccessful (McKee, 1992).  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18 -----Insert Figure 1 Approximately Here-----  
19

20 Figure 1. Learning from experiments in different phases of the innovation process (modified from Cooper  
21 (2013)).  
22  
23  
24

### 25 3. Methodology

26 We set out to answer the research question: How to learn from CE business experiments in the front end of  
27 innovation? A single case study is an appropriate research approach to address our research question as it  
28 enables us to develop an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon in a real-life context (Yin, 2009) and the  
29 method is widely considered to be an appropriate strategy for exploring novel topics (Eisenhardt, 1989). A  
30 case study also enables us to generate managerially relevant knowledge due to the involvement of managers  
31 (Gibbert et al., 2008).  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

#### 37 3.1 The selected case organization and the experiments

38 For the study, we searched for and selected an organization with a strong interest in developing a CE, and that  
39 has adopted experimentation as a new approach. The selected organization, here called ReCyc, is a publicly  
40 owned organization, which provides recycling and waste management services. A recent priority is to promote  
41 the transition towards a CE. ReCyc started the new practice of experimentation by conducting four distinct  
42 business experiments, (Experiments A-D), aiming to spur innovation in CE and recycling, upcycling in  
43 particular; i.e. aiming to produce higher-quality materials and improved functionality (Lüdeke-Freund et al.,  
44 2018). In the long run, these new solutions could create business opportunities for ReCyc itself, the partner  
45 organizations or totally new actors. The research team followed the preparation, implementation, and aftermath  
46 of the experiments and collected data from each of the four experiments, but did not have an active role in the  
47 development or roll-out of the experiments. The case company was anonymised for confidentiality reasons.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

##### 56 3.1.1 Experiment A: Brainstorming workshop on construction waste rejects

57 The purpose of the experiment was to find feasible applications for construction waste rejects. “Rejects” refers  
58 to construction waste that remains when other parts are reused or recycled, and are initially considered  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

unsuitable for any use. The experiment included a half-day brainstorming workshop, facilitated by a consultant and run face-to-face with the participants, but also used digital tools for gathering and grouping application ideas. A diverse group of participants were invited to the workshop. They were chosen from ReCyc's existing networks and included people working in the construction and waste management industries. Some of them were technical experts on the topic, but not all. The workshop strengthened the participants' understanding of feasible application areas. Most of the ideas were already known; no breakthrough ideas were formed, but a couple of the ideas had some potential.

### 3.1.2 Experiment B: Market dialogue on waste incineration slag

The aim was to map and ideate potential applications for slag that is produced in waste incineration plants. It was hoped that the experiment would provide inputs for an upcoming competitive tendering for the treatment of waste incineration slag. The experiment started with a face-to-face workshop with representatives from companies that were interested in submitting a bid and various experts on the topic such as consultants and researchers. The idea was to engage in market dialogue where ReCyc and the suppliers would exchange knowledge about solutions so ReCyc could formulate a well-specified invitation to tender and receive better offers. The workshop was facilitated by an external service provider. After the workshop, there was an opportunity for the companies to continue discussions in private with a ReCyc representative. The conversation also continued on an online platform to which all participants were invited. In the end, no new applications were identified for the material, but the experiment helped ReCyc understand the topic in more depth. The experiment and its preparation also benefited the tendering, as more time and effort was invested in the process than usual.

### 3.1.3 Experiment C: Ecosystem workshop on waste incineration slag and ash

The experiment aimed to find new applications for waste incineration slag and ash, especially by envisaging radically novel solutions. The experiment comprised a full-day workshop, which was facilitated by an external consultant. The workshop was divided into two main parts. In the first part, the participants engaged in open ideation of new potential applications for slag and ash. The second part focused on building a shared future vision and understanding of the ecosystem that the participants comprise. Most of the participants were companies that had been involved in an earlier collaboration project. In addition, experts from a research centre were involved. Some of the ideas generated in the workshop were already known. They were, however, further developed by focusing on the network perspective and outlining the ecosystem that is needed to implement the ideas. New out-of-the-box ideas were also proposed and discussed, but their feasibility and potential were not considered very high.

### 3.1.4 Experiment D: Innovation camp for a circular economy centre

The aim of the experiment was to create and develop new innovative and feasible ideas for the organization of CE centres. A CE centre is a business park where multiple companies operating in a CE are located in the same place to achieve synergies. A hackathon-style innovation camp was organized with international and



multidisciplinary teams of higher education students as participants. Four groups of three to six students were formed and each of them set out to develop solutions for a specific function of a CE centre. The groups were briefed on the topic and they had 24 hours to develop solutions after which they pitched them to a panel of experts. Their work was supported by innovation tools such as short guides to various design thinking methods. The innovation camp resulted in some improvements to existing CE centre plans and some ideas that were not considered feasible.

### 3.2 Data collection

To acquire a comprehensive understanding of the four experiments, various data sources were used, as synthesized in Table 1. The primary data collection method was semi-structured interviews. The research team, comprising two researchers, interviewed individuals within ReCyc, service providers that were used to facilitate the experiments, and other stakeholders such as external experts and companies that participated in the experiments. The interviewees were selected to form a comprehensive set of stakeholders with an active role in an experiment. The interviews were conducted after the experiments to be able to explore what has been learned from the experiments. The interviews were complemented with other data sources, such as feedback surveys, internal documents and presentations, data from digital platforms, and observation and informal discussions before the experiments. The interviews followed a general thematic guide that included the following topics: the interviewee's profile and role, description of the experiment and its methods, the experiment's goals, the composition of participants, stakeholders' incentives, and the links between the experiment and the organization's innovation process. The interviews were conducted in May-October 2018. The interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim.

Table 1. Data collection

Experiment	Data sources
Experiment A: Brainstorming workshop on construction waste rejects	5 interviews: ReCyc (3), service provider (2), companies (2) Participatory observation Summary report Discussion data from the online platform Feedback questionnaire results
Experiment B: Market dialogue on waste incineration slag	7 interviews: ReCyc (3), experts and consultants (3), company (1) Discussion data from the online platform Participatory observation Presentations
Experiment C: Ecosystem workshop on waste incineration slag and ash	3 interviews: ReCyc (1), workshop moderator (1), participant, recycling expert (1) Participatory observation Summary report
Experiment D: Innovation camp for a circular economy centre	2 interviews: ReCyc (2) Feedback report (feedback from participants) Handbook for the innovation camp Final report of the camp

### 3.3. Data coding and analysis

The transcribed data was coded by two researchers using NVivo. The research followed an abductive process of inquiry, where empirical findings may reveal the need to redirect the existing theoretical model and

1 theoretical insights may guide data collection and analysis (Dubois & Gadde, 2002). Overall, the coding and  
2 analysis process was iterative and included frequent face-to-face discussions where the emerging codes and  
3 findings were discussed and critically challenged until an “intersubjective consensus” was reached (Miles et  
4 al. 2014, p. 13).  
5

6  
7 The process started with getting to know the data, i.e. both researchers individually read all interview  
8 transcripts and additional data. This phase included initial coding (Saldaña, 2009), i.e. breaking down the data  
9 into parts, examining and comparing similarities and differences, as well as notes and analytic memos (Miles  
10 et al., 2014) related to connections between different observations and data sections. The different data sources  
11 presented in Table 1 were complementary in building a rich picture. Initial coding provided an inventory of  
12 topics and connections between them that guided us in the next steps. This process also triggered a literature  
13 search to identify a theory that could help explain the emerging insights (c.f. Dubois & Gadde, 2002), and the  
14 concept of learning loops (Argyris, 1976; Gugerell & Zuidema, 2017; Lozano, 2014; McKee, 1992) was  
15 considered fitting to advance the understanding of learning from experiments.  
16  
17

18  
19 In the second cycle of coding, we focused on learning and CE innovation challenges. First, having adopted a  
20 learning perspective, we re-coded all the transcribed data from that viewpoint. This process resulted in 11 types  
21 of learning, which were further clustered according to the concepts of single, double and triple loop learning  
22 that were derived from theory. Here, we contrasted the emerging findings from the data with insights from the  
23 literature on learning loops. This abductive analytical strategy allowed us to revise and refine emerging data-  
24 driven observations with theory-driven insights and strengthen the theoretical relevance of the findings, as the  
25 findings were connected to the theory already in this phase of the research process (Dubois & Gadde, 2002).  
26 Next, we focused on the challenges of a CE innovation and used focused coding, i.e. categorizing coded data  
27 based on thematic similarity (Saldaña, 2009), to cluster the initial codes. As a result, we created six categories  
28 of CE innovation challenges, as presented in section 4.4 and Appendix.  
29  
30

31  
32 We compared these identified challenges of CE innovation with the identified 11 types of learning and  
33 searched for connections that could help us understand how learning may promote CE innovation. This was  
34 done by drawing various mind maps and with help of data matrix, i.e. by arranging the vast array of material  
35 into an “at-a-glance” format, which enabled reflection, verification and conclusion drawing (Miles et al., 2014).  
36 We noticed that single and double loop learnings connections to the CE innovation challenges were modest,  
37 but found that several triple loop learnings can aid in answering these challenges. We contrasted and validated  
38 these findings by going iteratively back to the data, as also suggested by Miles et al. (2014).  
39

40  
41 The quality of the research was improved by involving both researchers in the data collection and analysis and  
42 using multiple data sources (Yin, 2009). The results were presented to the main contact persons at ReCyc to  
43 ensure the validity of the findings (Yin, 2009).  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## 4. Results

In this section, we elaborate what kind of learning takes place in the experiments in the front of innovation and present 11 identified forms of learning, categorized according to the classification of single, double, and triple loop learning. Table 2 summarizes the main learning outcomes of the experiments. We further report how learning from the experiments is connected to CE innovation challenges.

Table 2. Main learning areas in the experiments

Learning loop	Experiment A	Experiment B	Experiment C	Experiment D
Single loop	<p><i>Confirmation</i> of known solutions mainly related to earthworks, construction foundations, etc.</p> <p><i>Prioritization</i> of known solutions.</p> <p><i>Exclusion</i> of ideas that are known not to work.</p>	<p><i>Confirmation</i> of a set of well-known traditional solutions.</p> <p><i>Development</i> of existing ideas by elaborating their implementation and requirements.</p> <p><i>Prioritization</i> of known solutions.</p> <p><i>Exclusion</i> of several proposed ideas.</p>	<p><i>Confirmation</i> of ideas that were already known before the workshop.</p> <p><i>Development</i> of existing ideas and understanding of the ecosystem that is needed to implement them.</p> <p><i>Prioritization</i> of known solutions.</p> <p><i>Exclusion</i> of several proposed ideas.</p>	<p><i>Confirmation</i> and <i>development</i> of existing ideas, most importantly of a circular economy showroom.</p>
Double loop	No breakthroughs, <i>out-of-the-box ideas</i> with unknown feasibility	No breakthroughs, <i>out-of-the-box ideas</i> with unknown feasibility. A new idea was tested with no significant results.	No breakthroughs, some <i>out-of-the-box ideas</i> with unknown feasibility	No breakthroughs
Triple loop	<p>Ambiguity in <i>challenge design</i> leads to lack of focus in ideation.</p> <p>Difficulties in combining participants' perspectives.</p> <p>IT-supported brainstorming <i>tools</i> suitable for open-ended ideation.</p>	<p>Competitive tension among participants hinders discussion.</p> <p>Online platform is suitable for engaging and documenting in-depth discussions.</p> <p>Difficulties in maintaining <i>participants'</i> <i>motivation</i> over time.</p> <p>A facilitator is also required for online discussions.</p>	<p>Involving the "usual suspects" directs ideation to known sectors.</p> <p>Ecosystem mapping is an effective tool for stimulating systemic thinking.</p> <p>Value of having a facilitator with expertise in the subject.</p>	<p>Multi-disciplinarity balances creativity and feasibility.</p> <p>Pre-reading material ensures that all participants have sufficient background knowledge.</p> <p>Learning new ideation <i>tools</i> is time-consuming.</p>

### 4.1 Single loop learning

Four forms of single loop learning were found in the experiments: confirmation, development, prioritization, and exclusion. These are categorized as single loop learning because they increase understanding and skills related to existing policies and methods, but do not result in the questioning of fundamental assumptions. At the front end of innovation, single loop learning can be interpreted as the exploration of an existing opportunity space without challenging the underlying paradigms of what is possible and where to look for solutions (Bessant et al., 2014).

1 **Confirmation.** Confirmation of existing beliefs was the most prevalent form of single loop learning.  
2 Confirmation strengthens existing ideas and understanding; support for them comes from multiple sources and  
3 in different forms. According to the interviewees, most of the identified solutions were already known before  
4 the experiments. This is true for all four experiments. One apparent mode of learning was strengthening  
5 existing beliefs about the available solutions. A ReCyc representative summarized the outcome of Experiment  
6 A by saying, “It supported our earlier understanding that there are no new breakthroughs. The solutions that  
7 were discussed in the event were the traditional ones. I was left with the impression that the situation is similar  
8 both when it comes to processing the material and finding applications for it”.

9  
10  
11 **Development.** The experiments also enabled the further *development* of previously known ideas: existing ideas  
12 were extended and re-evaluated, resulting in richer and more mature versions of them. Regarding Experiment  
13 C, a ReCyc representative said that the participants saw the experiment as an opportunity “to refine their idea  
14 further and promote it”. In addition, the workshop strengthened the participants’ knowledge of the  
15 interdependencies between organizations and the future vision of the field. In Experiment D, the participants  
16 were given lots of briefing material on the status quo of various CE centres and each team was assigned to  
17 work on a specific function, such as material processing or sorting. This can be seen as a way to guide the  
18 participants to develop further the rough ideas proposed by the organizers at ReCyc. In Experiment B, the  
19 online platform enabled in-depth discussions on the proposed ideas. Consequently, idea development could be  
20 continued after the single face-to-face event.

21  
22  
23 **Prioritization.** Prioritization is a form of single loop learning where existing ideas are compared with each  
24 other to understand their relative strengths. In Experiment A, and to a smaller extent in the other experiments  
25 as well, there was an element of *prioritization* involved. The proposed ideas were evaluated by the participants  
26 and the best ones were identified. The collective efforts induced learning about the relative value of alternative  
27 solutions.

28  
29  
30 **Exclusion.** Finally, learning was achieved by means of *exclusion*. Exclusion means rejecting proposed ideas  
31 and thus gaining a more comprehensive view of the opportunity space. By inviting experts to present their  
32 ideas, such as in Experiments A, B, and C, the organizers learned of ideas that did not match their current  
33 needs. Consequently, they acquired a well-informed view that there are no obvious solutions that they should  
34 be aware of. As an external expert involved in Experiment B pointed out, “Well, it is also a result that we have  
35 searched and didn’t find anything very surprising”.

## 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 4.2 Double loop learning

52 Three forms of double loop learning were identified: out-of-the-box ideas, mental model changes, and  
53 widespread change. Here, new perspectives are adopted and existing policies and methods are questioned. At  
54 the front end of innovation, double loop learning corresponds to the exploration of a new opportunity space  
55 (Bessant et al., 2014).  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
**Out-of-the-box ideas.** The organizers at ReCyc hoped that the participants would adopt new cognitive frames in their ideation and generate out-of-the-box ideas that do not rely on existing solutions and their underlying logics. The outcomes were, however, modest in this respect. According to an external expert in Experiment B, “The big goal was to find some genuinely novel applications for the material and apparently that won’t be fulfilled”. Similar results were observed in all experiments.

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
In contrast to the organizers’ impressions, some of the interviewees reported highly novel ideas being proposed. These out-of-the-box solution proposals were considered unrealistic, however, as they were thought to have no business potential or practical feasibility. According to a critical view by a company representative in Experiment B, “Those who lack understanding and competencies present ideas that have already been tried ten times before”.

66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000  
1001  
1002  
1003  
1004  
1005  
1006  
1007  
1008  
1009  
1010  
1011  
1012  
1013  
1014  
1015  
1016  
1017  
1018  
1019  
1020  
1021  
1022  
1023  
1024  
1025  
1026  
1027  
1028  
1029  
1030  
1031  
1032  
1033  
1034  
1035  
1036  
1037  
1038  
1039  
1040  
1041  
1042  
1043  
1044  
1045  
1046  
1047  
1048  
1049  
1050  
1051  
1052  
1053  
1054  
1055  
1056  
1057  
1058  
1059  
1060  
1061  
1062  
1063  
1064  
1065  
1066  
1067  
1068  
1069  
1070  
1071  
1072  
1073  
1074  
1075  
1076  
1077  
1078  
1079  
1080  
1081  
1082  
1083  
1084  
1085  
1086  
1087  
1088  
1089  
1090  
1091  
1092  
1093  
1094  
1095  
1096  
1097  
1098  
1099  
1100  
1101  
1102  
1103  
1104  
1105  
1106  
1107  
1108  
1109  
1110  
1111  
1112  
1113  
1114  
1115  
1116  
1117  
1118  
1119  
1120  
1121  
1122  
1123  
1124  
1125  
1126  
1127  
1128  
1129  
1130  
1131  
1132  
1133  
1134  
1135  
1136  
1137  
1138  
1139  
1140  
1141  
1142  
1143  
1144  
1145  
1146  
1147  
1148  
1149  
1150  
1151  
1152  
1153  
1154  
1155  
1156  
1157  
1158  
1159  
1160  
1161  
1162  
1163  
1164  
1165  
1166  
1167  
1168  
1169  
1170  
1171  
1172  
1173  
1174  
1175  
1176  
1177  
1178  
1179  
1180  
1181  
1182  
1183  
1184  
1185  
1186  
1187  
1188  
1189  
1190  
1191  
1192  
1193  
1194  
1195  
1196  
1197  
1198  
1199  
1200  
1201  
1202  
1203  
1204  
1205  
1206  
1207  
1208  
1209  
1210  
1211  
1212  
1213  
1214  
1215  
1216  
1217  
1218  
1219  
1220  
1221  
1222  
1223  
1224  
1225  
1226  
1227  
1228  
1229  
1230  
1231  
1232  
1233  
1234  
1235  
1236  
1237  
1238  
1239  
1240  
1241  
1242  
1243  
1244  
1245  
1246  
1247  
1248  
1249  
1250  
1251  
1252  
1253  
1254  
1255  
1256  
1257  
1258  
1259  
1260  
1261  
1262  
1263  
1264  
1265  
1266  
1267  
1268  
1269  
1270  
1271  
1272  
1273  
1274  
1275  
1276  
1277  
1278  
1279  
1280  
1281  
1282  
1283  
1284  
1285  
1286  
1287  
1288  
1289  
1290  
1291  
1292  
1293  
1294  
1295  
1296  
1297  
1298  
1299  
1300  
1301  
1302  
1303  
1304  
1305  
1306  
1307  
1308  
1309  
1310  
1311  
1312  
1313  
1314  
1315  
1316  
1317  
1318  
1319  
1320  
1321  
1322  
1323  
1324  
1325  
1326  
1327  
1328  
1329  
1330  
1331  
1332  
1333  
1334  
1335  
1336  
1337  
1338  
1339  
1340  
1341  
1342  
1343  
1344  
1345  
1346  
1347  
1348  
1349  
1350  
1351  
1352  
1353  
1354  
1355  
1356  
1357  
1358  
1359  
1360  
1361  
1362  
1363  
1364  
1365  
1366  
1367  
1368  
1369  
1370  
1371  
1372  
1373  
1374  
1375  
1376  
1377  
1378  
1379  
1380  
1381  
1382  
1383  
1384  
1385  
1386  
1387  
1388  
1389  
1390  
1391  
1392  
1393  
1394  
1395  
1396  
1397  
1398  
1399  
1400  
1401  
1402  
1403  
1404  
1405  
1406  
1407  
1408  
1409  
1410  
1411  
1412  
1413  
1414  
1415  
1416  
1417  
1418  
1419  
1420  
1421  
1422  
1423  
1424  
1425  
1426  
1427  
1428  
1429  
1430  
1431  
1432  
1433  
1434  
1435  
1436  
1437  
1438  
1439  
1440  
1441  
1442  
1443  
1444  
1445  
1446  
1447  
1448  
1449  
1450  
1451  
1452  
1453  
1454  
1455  
1456  
1457  
1458  
1459  
1460  
1461  
1462  
1463  
1464  
1465  
1466  
1467  
1468  
1469  
1470  
1471  
1472  
1473  
1474  
1475  
1476  
1477  
1478  
1479  
1480  
1481  
1482  
1483  
1484  
1485  
1486  
1487  
1488  
1489  
1490  
1491  
1492  
1493  
1494  
1495  
1496  
1497  
1498  
1499  
1500  
1501  
1502  
1503  
1504  
1505  
1506  
1507  
1508  
1509  
1510  
1511  
1512  
1513  
1514  
1515  
1516  
1517  
1518  
1519  
1520  
1521  
1522  
1523  
1524  
1525  
1526  
1527  
1528  
1529  
1530  
1531  
1532  
1533  
1534  
1535  
1536  
1537  
1538  
1539  
1540  
1541  
1542  
1543  
1544  
1545  
1546  
1547  
1548  
1549  
1550  
1551  
1552  
1553  
1554  
1555  
1556  
1557  
1558  
1559  
1560  
1561  
1562  
1563  
1564  
1565  
1566  
1567  
1568  
1569  
1570  
1571  
1572  
1573  
1574  
1575  
1576  
1577  
1578  
1579  
1580  
1581  
1582  
1583  
1584  
1585  
1586  
1587  
1588  
1589  
1590  
1591  
1592  
1593  
1594  
1595  
1596  
1597  
1598  
1599  
1600  
1601  
1602  
1603  
1604  
1605  
1606  
1607  
1608  
1609  
1610  
1611  
1612  
1613  
1614  
1615  
1616  
1617  
1618  
1619  
1620  
1621  
1622  
1623  
1624  
1625  
1626  
1627  
1628  
1629  
1630  
1631  
1632  
1633  
1634  
1635  
1636  
1637  
1638  
1639  
1640  
1641  
1642  
1643  
1644  
1645  
1646  
1647  
1648  
1649  
1650  
1651  
1652  
1653  
1654  
1655  
1656  
1657  
1658  
1659  
1660  
1661  
1662  
1663  
1664  
1665  
1666  
1667  
1668  
1669  
1670  
1671  
1672  
1673  
1674  
1675  
1676  
1677  
1678  
1679  
1680  
1681  
1682  
1683  
1684  
1685  
1686  
1687  
1688  
1689  
1690  
1691  
1692  
1693  
1694  
1695  
1696  
1697  
1698  
1699  
1700  
1701  
1702  
1703  
1704  
1705  
1706  
1707  
1708  
1709  
1710  
1711  
1712  
1713  
1714  
1715  
1716  
1717  
1718  
1719  
1720  
1721  
1722  
1723  
1724  
1725  
1726  
1727  
1728  
1729  
1730  
1731  
1732  
1733  
1734  
1735  
1736  
1737  
1738  
1739  
1740  
1741  
1742  
1743  
1744  
1745  
1746  
1747  
1748  
1749  
1750  
1751  
1752  
1753  
1754  
1755  
1756  
1757  
1758  
1759  
1760  
1761  
1762  
1763  
1764  
1765  
1766  
1767  
1768  
1769  
1770  
1771  
1772  
1773  
1774  
1775  
1776  
1777  
1778  
1779  
1780  
1781  
1782  
1783  
1784  
1785  
1786  
1787  
1788  
1789  
1790  
1791  
1792  
1793  
1794  
1795  
1796  
1797  
1798  
1799  
1800  
1801  
1802  
1803  
1804  
1805  
1806  
1807  
1808  
1809  
1810  
1811  
1812  
1813  
1814  
1815  
1816  
1817  
1818  
1819  
1820  
1821  
1822  
1823  
1824  
1825  
1826  
1827  
1828  
1829  
1830  
1831  
1832  
1833  
1834  
1835  
1836  
1837  
1838  
1839  
1840  
1841  
1842  
1843  
1844  
1845  
1846  
1847  
1848  
1849  
1850  
1851  
1852  
1853  
1854  
1855  
1856  
1857  
1858  
1859  
1860  
1861  
1862  
1863  
1864  
1865  
1866  
1867  
1868  
1869  
1870  
1871  
1872  
1873  
1874  
1875  
1876  
1877  
1878  
1879  
1880  
1881  
1882  
1883  
1884  
1885  
1886  
1887  
1888  
1889  
1890  
1891  
1892  
1893  
1894  
1895  
1896  
1897  
1898  
1899  
1900  
1901  
1902  
1903  
1904  
1905  
1906  
1907  
1908  
1909  
1910  
1911  
1912  
1913  
1914  
1915  
1916  
1917  
1918  
1919  
1920  
1921  
1922  
1923  
1924  
1925  
1926  
1927  
1928  
1929  
1930  
1931  
1932  
1933  
1934  
1935  
1936  
1937  
1938  
1939  
1940  
1941  
1942  
1943  
1944  
1945  
1946  
1947  
1948  
1949  
1950  
1951  
1952  
1953  
1954  
1955  
1956  
1957  
1958  
1959  
1960  
1961  
1962  
1963  
1964  
1965  
1966  
1967  
1968  
1969  
1970  
1971  
1972  
1973  
1974  
1975  
1976  
1977  
1978  
1979  
1980  
1981  
1982  
1983  
1984  
1985  
1986  
1987  
1988  
1989  
1990  
1991  
1992  
1993  
1994  
1995  
1996  
1997  
1998  
1999  
2000  
2001  
2002  
2003  
2004  
2005  
2006  
2007  
2008  
2009  
2010  
2011  
2012  
2013  
2014  
2015  
2016  
2017  
2018  
2019  
2020  
2021  
2022  
2023  
2024  
2025  
2026  
2027  
2028  
2029  
2030  
2031  
2032  
2033  
2034  
2035  
2036  
2037  
2038  
2039  
2040  
2041  
2042  
2043  
2044  
2045  
2046  
2047  
2048  
2049  
2050  
2051  
2052  
2053  
2054  
2055  
2056  
2057  
2058  
2059  
2060  
2061  
2062  
2063  
2064  
2065  
2066  
2067  
2068  
2069  
2070  
2071  
2072  
2073  
2074  
2075  
2076  
2077  
2078  
2079  
2080  
2081  
2082  
2083  
2084  
2085  
2086  
2087  
2088  
2089  
2090  
2091  
2092  
2093  
2094  
2095  
2096  
2097  
2098  
2099  
2100  
2101  
2102  
2103  
2104  
2105  
2106  
2107  
2108  
2109  
2110  
2111  
2112  
2113  
2114  
2115  
2116  
2117  
2118  
2119  
2120  
2121  
2122  
2123  
2124  
2125  
2126  
2127  
2128  
2129  
2130  
2131  
2132  
2133  
2134  
2135  
2136  
2137  
2138  
2139  
2140  
2141  
2142  
2143  
2144  
2145  
2146  
2147  
2148  
2149  
2150  
2151  
2152  
2153  
2154  
2155  
2156  
2157  
2158  
2159  
2160  
2161  
2162  
2163  
2164  
2165  
2166  
2167  
2168  
2169  
2170  
2171  
2172  
2173  
2174  
2175  
2176  
2177  
2178  
2179  
2180  
2181  
2182  
2183  
2184  
2185  
2186  
2187  
2188  
2189  
2190  
2191  
2192  
2193  
2194  
2195  
2196  
2197  
2198  
2199  
2200  
2201  
2202  
2203  
220

1 Experiment A. Challenge design also included background materials and a briefing to inform the participants  
2 about the problem and give them some understanding of current knowledge on the issue.

3  
4 Learning related to challenge design included the following key takeaways. First, highly technical challenges  
5 should be avoided if all the participants do not have sufficient technical competences. Second, open-ended  
6 challenges may generate ideas with low feasibility. It may be better to rule out some approaches to focus the  
7 ideation efforts on areas of high potential. Third, the organizers need to strike a balance between giving the  
8 participants too much and too little background information. On the one hand, too superficial a briefing may  
9 result in participants misunderstanding the innovation problem and proposing ideas that are already known.  
10 On the other hand, too extensive a briefing may exhaust the participants and guide them to a certain viewpoint,  
11 thus reducing out-of-the-box thinking. Fourth, concrete examples such as material samples could be used to  
12 make the problem more approachable and stimulate creativity. More extensive and detailed background  
13 reading material can also be given beforehand. Finally, the challenge should have direct connections to ongoing  
14 activities in the organization to ensure efficient follow-up and exploitation of the results.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22  
23 **Selection of participants.** Selection of the participants for the experiments determines the available human  
24 capital for solving the chosen challenge. Learning how to choose the most suitable participants is, therefore, a  
25 critical part of running innovation experiments. The participants in Experiments A, B, and C were company  
26 representatives and experts, and Experiment D included higher education students. In the first three  
27 experiments, the participants were chosen from the organizer's existing networks.  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 The experiences generated some thoughts on what to consider when selecting participants for future  
33 experiments. First, the interviewees suggested a trade-off between the breadth and depth of the participants'  
34 expertise. Having (mostly) experts as participants stimulates more profound discussions and enables the  
35 evaluation of idea feasibility but limits the diversity of perspectives and the number of out-of-the-box ideas.  
36  
37 Second, the industry background of the participants matters. The participants selected steer the search for new  
38 application areas toward their respective industries. For a truly open-ended search, participants with diverse  
39 backgrounds are needed. Third, inviting competitors to the same workshop may restrict discussion if the aim  
40 is to develop ideas with short to medium term business potential. Finally, language issues should be considered:  
41 a trade-off between getting the best international experts and ensuring fluent discussions in the participants'  
42 first languages.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49  
50 **Motivation of participants.** Participating in innovation experiments requires time and potentially generates  
51 other costs as well. Stakeholders are not likely to attend if they do not expect the benefits from attendance to  
52 exceed the investments. To ensure the attendance and contributions of the selected participants, the organizers  
53 need to understand how to motivate them. The study revealed the following insights about participant  
54 motivation. Professional interest and networking opportunities were found to form the core motivation for  
55 many company representatives. By linking the experiments to future purchasing needs, the organizers may be  
56 able to attract potential supplier companies. Monetary compensation may be considered for motivating external  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 experts such as researchers and consultants that have rare competences and fresh perspectives. Collaboration  
2 with educational institutions may provide access to students that are motivated by education credits. In general,  
3 it was considered important to explicitly state expectations for each participant: why they were invited and  
4 how they are expected to contribute. Furthermore, using online tools may raise additional issues. It was a  
5 significant challenge to motivate the participants to check and contribute to online discussions on a regular  
6 basis after the initial event in Experiment B.  
7  
8  
9

10 **Tools and resources.** The experiments varied in what kind of ideation and workshop tools and external  
11 (human) resources were used. In Experiments A and B, digital tools were used, whereas Experiments C and D  
12 had no significant digital elements. Experiment A adopted a hybrid approach that combined a face-to-face  
13 workshop with the use of computers in writing down ideas and arranging them. The software used was  
14 considered to increase the efficiency of the experiment: more ideas could be collected in the same amount of  
15 time and no additional effort was needed to document the workshop. Some critical views were expressed about  
16 how the use of computers decreased open discussions and the visualization of ideas by drawing. This would  
17 suggest that there may be a trade-off between the number of ideas (efficiency) and their innovativeness  
18 (effectiveness) and that the digital tool shifted the balance towards the former. Experiment B started with a  
19 face-to-face workshop and continued on a digital platform for a couple of months. The platform allowed in-  
20 depth discussions, as it was possible to contribute more lengthy arguments and materials. The documentation  
21 of the discussions was also automatic.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 Other tools used included the bread and butter of ideation workshops: flip charts and Post-it notes. Beyond  
32 these, in Experiment D the participants were given instructions and materials to conduct various problem-  
33 solving and design exercises, such as SWOT, the five whys, personas, and storyboards. Their use was limited,  
34 however, due to time constraints that restricted the teams' ability to explore new methodologies.  
35  
36  
37

38 All experiments had external facilitators: consultants in Experiments A, B, and C and educators in Experiment  
39 D. There was a wide consensus that a facilitator has a key role in a successful experiment. In two of the  
40 experiments (B and C) the facilitators were also experts in CE, which the interviewees considered helpful in  
41 guiding the discussions in fruitful directions.  
42  
43  
44  
45

#### 46 4.4 Overcoming CE innovation challenges

47 By examining the relationships between the different forms of learning and CE innovation challenges, we  
48 determined which type of learning was best suited to overcoming these challenges (see Appendix for details  
49 of CE innovation challenges), as presented next. The connections were modest for single and double loop  
50 learning. Incremental ideas from single loop learning were associated with already known challenges and no  
51 major advances in overcoming them were observed. Radical ideas from double loop learning aimed to solve  
52 some specific challenges, typically by proposing novel technological solutions or methods for wider  
53 engagement of the ecosystem. Their feasibility was low, however.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 The most significant contributions to overcoming CE innovation challenges originated in triple loop learning  
2 (Figure 2). Hence, triple loop learning may promote CE innovation by enabling the organization to adjust its  
3 experimentation methods and increase its ability to create conditions conducive to double loop learning in the  
4 future. These findings reveal interesting guidelines on how to enhance the effectiveness of innovation  
5 experiments.  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 -----Insert Figure 2 about here-----  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 Figure 2. Main challenges of CE innovation and triple loop learnings from the experiments.  
17  
18  
19

20 The first CE innovation challenge relates to *ecosystem level change*. Our results emphasize both the importance  
21 and the challenge of involving all value chain actors in innovation activities and that of cross-sectoral  
22 collaboration. The value chains are long, and the owner of the waste is often located far from the potential end-  
23 user. Moreover, the owner of the waste does not always have an incentive to search for novel solutions for  
24 upcycling, as they can simply “dump” the waste. Our results reveal some insights about how these challenges  
25 can be considered in designing innovation experiments. *When selecting participants*, it is important to engage  
26 a diversified group of participants representing different stakeholders and different sectors. By conducting  
27 these experiments, ReCyc was able to engage a diversified group of stakeholders and to signal to the wider  
28 group of stakeholders that the organization is looking for new solutions. Also, it seemed to be important that  
29 participants *understand their role* in the wider ecosystem. *When considering tools* for the experiment, it is  
30 important to ensure the interaction between different stakeholder groups.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 Second, *the timespan of the innovation process* is often long and getting returns on the investment is expected  
40 to take a long time, which contradicts the companies’ search for short-term profit, making the commitment to  
41 CE innovation processes difficult. The long timespan also makes the responsibilities in the ecosystem unclear.  
42 To overcome these challenges, it is important to consider *challenge design*, and to include a long term  
43 perspective, for instance by presenting industry trends.  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 The third challenge of CE innovation relates to *organizational inertia*. The interviewees argued that CE  
49 innovation requires ambitious goals and a comprehensive understanding of demand drivers. From a company  
50 perspective, the various drivers for innovation (e.g. environmental and economic) are often in conflict, and  
51 economic drivers are favoured over the others in decision-making. Out-of-the-box thinking is important in the  
52 search for new ideas, but the interviewees perceived this as difficult due to the recycling industry being  
53 traditional and old fashioned. To overcome these challenges it is important *to include participants* that are not  
54 mired in existing constraints and mindsets and *to use tools and facilitators* that can help with out-of-the-box  
55 thinking.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1 The next challenge relates to the *lack of market demand*. The challenge is that instead of market demand the  
2 main driver for innovation is the existence of waste or leftover material. Virgin raw materials are, however,  
3 still relatively cheap and often considered better and safer than recycled material. Finding end-applications for  
4 the waste is a difficult but essential part of the innovation process. The respondents also saw that they need to  
5 search for potential end-applications outside traditional fields. However, the actors might not be willing to  
6 move into new fields. The triple loop learnings provide insights on how to overcome these challenges. First,  
7 *when selecting participants*, it is important to include customers as well as a diversified group of participants  
8 representing different stakeholders and different sectors, as this would aid in identifying potential end-  
9 applications outside the traditional ones. *Challenge design* seems to play an important role, and one should  
10 avoid formulating an overly open-ended challenge so that participants must come up with concrete ideas.  
11 Including background material about the markets might also help. Separating ideation and the evaluation of  
12 idea potential into different phases, as in experiment A, may also be useful.

13 The last challenge relates to the *technological complexity of CE innovations*. The interviewees emphasized the  
14 technological difficulty of new recycling solutions and different kinds of risk and safety aspects. The material  
15 risks are high as the waste material is often poorly known and heterogeneous. It is difficult to find potential  
16 applications where the recycled material would have better qualities than the virgin material it would be  
17 replacing. To overcome these challenges it is important in *challenge design* to match the technological  
18 difficulty level with the participants' level of expertise. Including a briefing about the latest research might  
19 help participants to understand the technological restrictions and possibilities. *When selecting participants*, it  
20 is important to involve top experts from various fields. *When selecting tools*, consider having a tool that  
21 facilitates in-depth discussion.

## 22 5. Discussion

### 23 5.1 Theoretical contributions

24 This study has two main theoretical contributions. First, our findings outline how learning from experiments  
25 in the front end of innovation may help develop ideas and concepts that can advance a CE (Figure 3). According  
26 to the experiences of ReCyc, single loop learning focused on refining existing solutions was considered to  
27 have limited outcomes, as existing solutions are unable to address the CE innovation challenges that prevent  
28 organizations from implementing CE principles (cf. Tura et al., 2019). To develop CE innovations, these  
29 challenges must be acknowledged in the front end phase so that feasible ideas and concepts may be generated.  
30 Double loop learning that goes beyond existing solutions is needed. Generating suitable radical ideas may,  
31 however, be difficult if the experiments are not designed to take CE innovation challenges into account. We  
32 propose that, in such situations, focusing on triple loop learning may be the answer. When exposed to deep  
33 reflection, experiments may lead to insights on how the experimentation process should be developed (Lozano,  
34 2014) to overcome the barriers to CE innovation. Triple loop learning may help organizations enhance their  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 radical innovation capability by helping them choose suitable experiment designs and hence facilitating the  
2 exploration of a new opportunity space in the front end phase (Bocken et al., 2018).

3  
4 Second, this study elaborates the concept of learning loops – single, double and triple loop learning – (Argyris,  
5 1976; Argyris & Schon 1974; 1978; Gugerell and Zuidema, 2017; Lozano, 2014; McKee, 1992) in the context  
6 of front end of CE innovation. We identify 11 forms of learning from experiments and conceptualize that, in  
7 this context, the difference between single and double loop learning may be understood through the idea of  
8 opportunity spaces: available domains in which potential ideas are searched for and selected (Bessant et al.,  
9 2014). Existing spaces are defined by incumbent business models, product architectures and value networks  
10 within which a local search for new opportunities takes place via incremental learning forms such as  
11 confirmation, development, prioritization and exclusion. For radical ideas, the exploration needs to go beyond  
12 the existing frames, which introduces significant uncertainty (Bessant et al., 2014). Here double loop learning  
13 may produce out-of-the-box ideas, mental model changes and widespread change in the industry, and lead to  
14 radical innovations (McKee, 1992). The organizational learning literature suggests that the transition from  
15 single to double loop learning is difficult due to peer and supervisor pressure, risk avoidance and bureaucracy  
16 that generate organizational inertia (e.g. Argyris, 1976; McKee, 1992). Our findings highlight that before such  
17 organizational issues become relevant, managers need to ensure that the experiments yield relevant outcomes.  
18 We propose that triple loop learning may fuel a gradual transition to double loop learning. At the core of triple  
19 loop learning is the exploration of the experimentation activities themselves, leading to insights on how  
20 efficient and effective experiments should be conducted in terms of challenge design, participant selection and  
21 motivation, and tools and resources to enhance the capability to achieve double loop learning.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 -----INSERT FIGURE 3 APPROXIMATELY HERE-----  
35

36  
37 Figure 3. Synthesis of the results.  
38

## 39 5.2 Practical implications

40 Beyond its theoretical contributions, this study has some important *practical implications for managers* who  
41 wish to make the transition towards a CE. Knowledge of the 11 forms of learning may be used to design  
42 business experiments that address specific needs and to facilitate structured reflection after the experiments.  
43 Particularly for managers with limited experience in conducting business experimentation, it is important to  
44 understand that while experimenting with difficult CE problems may not immediately generate radical  
45 solutions it may be valuable in developing experimentation and innovation capabilities. The importance of  
46 experimentation capabilities is also emphasized by Weissbrod and Bocken (2017), who point to fast learning  
47 through project experiments. In line with previous studies (Weissbrod & Bocken, 2017; Bocken et al., 2018),  
48 our results support the learning-by-doing approach in developing such competences.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 Our results related to triple loop learning suggest practical guidelines for managers planning circular economy  
57 business experiments at the front end of innovation. Figure 4 illustrates how managers may attempt to  
58 overcome identified CE innovation challenges by paying attention to specific aspects in designing experiments.  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 For example, to promote systemic change, experiments should promote interactions among a diversified group  
2 of participants and include a reflection of each participant’s role in the wider ecosystem.

3  
4 On a more general level, it appears that the organizers should choose whether to emphasize the breadth or  
5 depth of the potential contributions. For a focus on breadth, one should propose an open-ended challenge,  
6 attract a diverse group of participants with multiple perspectives, and use methods that facilitate the efficient  
7 input and documentation of all ideas. In contrast, a focus on depth would require a more specific challenge,  
8 experts in a particular technology and/or industry, and methods for more lengthy discussions and evaluation  
9 of ideas. Mixing these two foci may create tensions, as the participants may experience conflicting goals and  
10 feel unable to use their expertise to its full capacity, and it may be beneficial to conduct separate experiments  
11 for i) open ideation and ii) idea assessment and development.

12 -----INSERT FIGURE 4 APPROXIMATELY HERE-----

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20 Figure 4 Business experimentation design elements to overcome CE innovation challenges.

### 21 22 5.3 Limitations and future research

23 Our study has several limitations that point to opportunities for future research. First, we investigate a specific  
24 CE context – recycling, which has special characteristics, e.g. it requires particular knowledge in several areas  
25 such as material sciences and the ability to deal with the particular physical and chemical properties of a large  
26 variety of materials. Further, the business is often driven by the availability of waste material, instead of  
27 identified market demand. As for future research, other CE contexts could provide a more varied view of  
28 learning from business experiments at the front end of innovation. The experiments we studied were the first  
29 four conducted by the case organization. While they revealed various learning outcomes, future research could  
30 investigate organizations with more experience, as it is likely that they would produce different learnings and  
31 provide new insights about how the experiments should be implemented and what can be learned from them.  
32 While focusing on a specific innovation process phase may produce in-depth insights, we also encourage future  
33 studies to adopt a longitudinal perspective to deliberate learning and follow how different experiments are used  
34 in succession from ideation to hypothesis testing to large-scale pilots. Particularly interesting is how to transfer  
35 and integrate the learnings from experiments in the front end to the mainstream organization and the value  
36 chain. Our study touched upon topics that we did not investigate more deeply, such as using intermediaries in  
37 locating participants, crowdsourcing ideas from a larger number of contributors, and the applicability of  
38 various ideation methods (e.g. design thinking methodologies) in stimulating ideation. The applicability of  
39 these innovation management approaches to various CE contexts merits further attention.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

### 56 Acknowledgements

57  
58 We wish to acknowledge the financial support provided by the Finnish Foundation for Economic Education,  
59 Business Finland, and the Strategic Research Council at the Academy of Finland (grant no. 327161).  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## References

- 1  
2 Aagaard, A., Saari, U.A., Mäkinen, S.J., In press. Mapping the types of business experimentation in creating  
3 sustainable value: A case study of cleantech start-ups, *J. Clean. Prod.*
- 4 Andries, P., Debackere, K., van Looy, B. 2013. Simultaneous experimentation as a learning strategy: Business  
5 model development under uncertainty: New ventures' business model development under uncertainty.  
6 *Strateg. Entrep. J.* 7(4), 288–310.
- 7 Antikainen, M., Bocken, N. 2019. Experimenting with Circular Business Models—A Process-Oriented  
8 Approach, in Bocken, N.M.P., Ritala, P., Albareda, L. and Verburg, R. (Eds.), *Innovation for*  
9 *Sustainability*. 353-374. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham
- 10 Argyris, C., 1976. Single-Loop and Double-Loop Models in Research on Decision Making. *Admin. Sci. Quart.*  
11 21(3), 363–375.
- 12 Argyris, C. and Schön, D.A., 1974. *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. Jossey-Bass  
13 Publishers.
- 14 Argyris, C. and Schön, D.A., 1978. *Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective*, Addison-  
15 Wesley Publishing Company.
- 16 Berkhout, F., Verbong, G., Wieczorek, A.J., Raven, R., Lebel, L., Bai, X., 2010. Sustainability experiments in  
17 Asia: innovations shaping alternative development pathways? *Environ. Sci. Policy* 13, 261–271.
- 18 Bessant, J., Öberg, C., Trifilova, A., 2014. Framing problems in radical innovation. *Ind. Mark. Manag.* 43,  
19 1284–1292.
- 20 Blank, S (2013). *The Four Steps to the Epiphany*, K&S Ranch
- 21 Blomsma, F. and Brennan, G., 2017. The Emergence of Circular Economy: A New Framing Around  
22 Prolonging Resource Productivity. *J. of Ind. Ecol.* 21(3), 603–614.
- 23 Bocken, N.M.P., Allwood, J.M., Willey, A.R., King, J.M.H., 2011. Development of an eco-ideation tool to  
24 identify stepwise greenhouse gas emissions reduction options for consumer goods. *J. Clean. Prod.* 19,  
25 1279–1287.
- 26 Bocken, N., Boons, F., Baldassarre, B., 2019. Sustainable business model experimentation by understanding  
27 ecologies of business models. *J. Clean. Prod.* 208, 1498–1512.
- 28 Bocken, N., Schuit, C.S.C., Kraaijenhagen, C., 2018. Experimenting with a circular business model: Lessons  
29 from eight cases. *Environ. Innov. Soc. Transitions* 28, 79–95.
- 30 Bocken, N.M.P., Miller, K., Weissbrod, I., Holgado, M., Evans, S. 2017. Business model experimentation for  
31 circularity: Driving sustainability in a large international clothing retailer. *Econ. and Pol. of Energy and*  
32 *the Environ.* 1, 85–122.
- 33 Bocken, N., Short, S.W., Rana, P., Evans, S., 2013. A value mapping tool for sustainable business modelling.  
34 *Corporate Governance* 13, 482–497.
- 35 Bocken, N., Snihur, Y. In press. Lean Startup and the business model: Experimenting for novelty  
36 and impact. *Long Range Plann.*
- 37 Bojovic, N., Genet, C., Sabatier, V., 2018. Learning, signaling, and convincing: The role of experimentation  
38 in the business modeling process. *Long Range Plann* 51, 141–157.
- 39 Brown, H.S., Vergragt, P.J., 2008. Bounded socio-technical experiments as agents of systemic change: The  
40 case of a zero-energy residential building. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change* 75, 107–130.
- 41 Brown, P., Bocken, N., Balkenende, R., 2019. Why Do Companies Pursue Collaborative Circular Oriented  
42 Innovation? *Sustainability* 11, 635.
- 43 Buhl, A., Schmidt-Keilich, M., Muster, V., Blazejewski, S., Schrader, U., Harrach, C., Schäfer, M., Süßbauer,  
44 E. 2019. Design thinking for sustainability: Why and how design thinking can foster sustainability-  
45 oriented innovation development. *J. Clean. Prod.*, 231, 1248–1257.
- 46 Chesbrough, H., 2010. Business Model Innovation: Opportunities and Barriers. *Long Range Plann.* 43, 354–  
47 363. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2009.07.010>
- 48 Cooper, R.G., 2013. Where Are All the Breakthrough New Products?: Using Portfolio Management to Boost  
49 Innovation. *Res. Manag.* 56, 25–33. <https://doi.org/10.5437/08956308x5605123>
- 50 Cyert, R.M., and March, J.G. 1963. *A behavioral theory of the firm*. Prentice Hall, NJ.
- 51 Dubois, A. Gadde, L.-E., 2002. Systematic combining: an abductive approach to case research: *J. of Busin.*  
52 *Res.* 55, 553–560.
- 53 Eisenhardt, K.M., 1989 Building Theories from Case Study Research: *The Acad. of Manag. Rev.*, 14,532–  
54 550.
- 55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1 Felin, T., Gambardella, A., Stern, S., Zenger, T., In press. Lean startup and the business model:  
2 Experimentation revisited. *Long Range Plann.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2019.06.002>
- 3 Gibbert, M., Ruigrok, W., & Wicki, B., 2008. What passes as a rigorous case study? *Strat. Manag. J.*, 29,  
4 1465–1474
- 5 Gugerell, K., Zuidema, C., 2017. Gaming for the energy transition. Experimenting and learning in co-designing  
6 a serious game prototype. *J. Clean. Prod.* 169, 105–116.
- 7 Huber, G.P., 1991. Organizational Learning: The Contributing Processes and the Literatures. *Organ. Sci.* 2,  
8 88–115.
- 9 Koen, P., Ajamian, G., Boyce, S., Clamen, A., Fisher, E., Fountoulakis, S., Johnson, A., Pushpinder, P.,  
10 Seibert, R., 2002. Fuzzy Front End: Effective Methods, Tools, and Techniques, in: Belliveau, P., Griffin,  
11 A., Somermeyer, S. (Eds.), *The PDMA Toolbook 1 of New Product Development*. John Wiley & Sons,  
12 New York, pp. 5–35.
- 13 Kogut, B., Zander, U., 1992. Knowledge of the Firm, Combinative Capabilities, and the Replication of  
14 Technology. *Organ. Sci.* 3, 383–397.
- 15 Konietzko, J., Baldassarre, B., Brown, P., Bocken, N., Hultink, E.J. 2020, “Circular business model  
16 experimentation: Demystifying assumptions”, *J. Clean. Prod.* 277, 122596.
- 17 Lozano, R., 2014. Creativity and Organizational Learning as Means to Foster Sustainability. *Sustain. Dev.* 22,  
18 205–216.
- 19 Lüdeke-Freund, F., Gold, S., Bocken, N.M.P., 2018. A Review and Typology of Circular Economy Business  
20 Model Patterns. *J. Ind. Ecol.* 23, 36–61.
- 21 Lynn, G.S., Morone, J.G., Paulson, A.S. 1996. Marketing and Discontinuous Innovation: The Probe and Learn  
22 Process. *Calif. Manage. Rev.* 38, 8–37.
- 23 March, J.G., 1991. Exploration and Exploitation in Organizational Learning. *Organ. Sci.* 2, 71–87.
- 24 McDonald, R.M., Eisenhardt, K.M. 2020. Parallel Play: Startups, Nascent Markets, and Effective Business-  
25 model Design. *Admin. Sci. Quart.* 65, 483–523.
- 26 McGrath, R.G., 2010. Business Models: A Discovery Driven Approach. *Long Range Plann.* 43, 247–261.  
27 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2009.07.005>
- 28 McKee, D., 1992. An Organizational Learning Approach to Product Innovation. *J. Prod. Innovat. Manag.* 9,  
29 232–245.
- 30 Miles, M., Huberman, M., Saldaña, J., 2014. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*. 3rd edition.  
31 Sage Publications, Inc, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- 32 Reid, S.E., de Brentani, U., 2004. The Fuzzy Front End of New Product Development for Discontinuous  
33 Innovations: A Theoretical Model. *J. Prod. Innov. Manag.* 21, 170–184.
- 34 Ries, E., 2011. *The Lean Startup: How Today's Entrepreneurs Use Continuous Innovation to Create Radically*  
35 *Successful Businesses* Penguin Books, London, UK.
- 36 Saldaña, J., 2013. *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. London, Sage.
- 37 Smith, P.G., Reinertsen, D.G., 1991. *Developing Products in Half the Time*. Van Nostrand Reinhold, New  
38 York.
- 39 Tura, N., Hanski, J., Ahola, T., Ståhle, M., Piiparinen, S., Valkokari, P., 2019. Unlocking circular business: A  
40 framework of barriers and drivers. *J. Clean. Prod.* 212, 90–98.
- 41 Weissbrod, I., Bocken, N., 2017. Developing sustainable business experimentation capability – A case study.  
42 *J. Clean. Prod.* 142, 2663–2676.
- 43 Wheelwright, S.C., Clark, K.B. 1992. *Revolutionizing product development: quantum leaps in speed,*  
44 *efficiency, and quality*. The Free Press, New York.
- 45 Yin, D., 2009. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* 4th ed. Sage Publications, Inc.
- 46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Appendix: CE innovation challenges

CE innovation challenge category	Details
<b>Ecosystem</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Systemic approach is needed (<i>All experiments</i>).</li> <li>● The owner of the waste is often far away from the end-user (<i>Experiments A, B and C</i>).</li> <li>● The owner does not always have an incentive to search for novel solutions for upcycling, as they can simply “dump” the waste (<i>Experiment A and B</i>).</li> <li>● Difficult to find an organization that would actively drive the development of an innovation (<i>All experiments</i>).</li> <li>● The engagement of the whole value chain is needed (<i>All experiments</i>).</li> <li>● Cross-sectoral collaboration and new actors are needed (<i>All experiments</i>).</li> <li>● A common motivation or goal shared by the different actors is needed (<i>All experiments</i>).</li> </ul>
<b>The timespan of the innovation process</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The timespan of the innovation process is often long (<i>Experiments A, B and C</i>).</li> <li>● Getting returns on the investment is expected to take a long time (<i>Experiments A, B and C</i>).</li> <li>● The long timespan of the innovation process conflicts with the companies’ search for short-term profit (<i>Experiments A, B and C</i>).</li> <li>● The long timespan makes the responsibilities in the ecosystem unclear (<i>Experiments A, B and C</i>).</li> </ul>
<b>Technological characteristics</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The needed solutions are often technologically complex (<i>Experiments A, B and C</i>).</li> <li>● The innovative CE solutions are subject to different kinds of risks: safety risks and material risks, as the waste material is often poorly known and not of uniform quality. The long-term effects of new solutions are difficult to assess, and solutions might have totally unexpected consequences. (<i>Experiments A, B and C</i>).</li> <li>● Involvement of experts from various fields in the innovation process is required (<i>Experiments A, B and C</i>).</li> <li>● Totally new approaches are needed: existing technologies not sufficient (<i>Experiments A, B and C</i>).</li> <li>● Recovery of materials from products that are based on secondary raw materials needs to be taken into consideration (<i>Experiments C</i>).</li> <li>● Recycled material should have better qualities than the virgin material it would be replacing. This is often difficult (<i>Experiments A, B and C</i>).</li> </ul>
<b>Market</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Currently no real market demand for most proposed solutions (<i>Experiments A, B and C</i>).</li> <li>● It is challenging to develop good value propositions as ideation starts with excess material or waste, not existing market demand (<i>Experiments A, B and C</i>).</li> <li>● Finding applications for the recycled material is challenging (<i>Experiments A, B and C</i>).</li> <li>● The volumes of waste and the market for the recycled material need to be on the same scale (<i>Experiments A, B and C</i>).</li> </ul>
<b>Organizational</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The profit margins of new businesses are often low (<i>Experiments A, B and C</i>).</li> <li>● Risk-averse companies (<i>Experiments A, B and C</i>).</li> <li>● The environmental and economic drivers are often in conflict (<i>All experiments</i>).</li> <li>● Comprehensive understanding of various demand drivers needed (<i>All experiments</i>).</li> <li>● Ability to do out-of-the-box thinking is required (<i>All experiments</i>).</li> <li>● Organizations should have ambitious goals (<i>All experiments</i>).</li> </ul>
<b>Regulatory</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Current regulation related to the solutions is unclear (<i>Experiments A, B and C</i>).</li> <li>● Regulation may change during the lifecycle of a recycled product (<i>Experiments A, B and C</i>).</li> </ul>

Figure 1. Learning from experiments in different phases of the innovation process (modified from Cooper (2013)).






Figure 2. Main challenges of CE innovation and triple loop learnings from the experiments.

## CE innovation challenges

### Ecosystem level change:

Systemic change required.

The owner of the waste is often far from the end-users

Difficult to find a driver organization for innovation.

#### Requirements

- Engagement of the whole value chain
- Motivation and goal shared by involved actors
- Cross-sectoral collaboration and new actors



### Long timespan

Timespan of innovation process is often long.

Getting returns on the investment is expected to take a long time, which conflicts with the search for short term profit.

Long timespan makes the responsibilities unclear.



### Organizational inertia

Companies are risk-averse and stuck in their current business.

Conflict between environmental and economic drivers for innovation

#### Requirements

- Out of the box thinking and ambitious goals
- Understanding of various demand drivers



### Lack of market demand

No real market demand for innovations.

Ideation is based on material, not on market demand.

Finding end-applications for the recycled material is challenging.

Volumes of waste and market for recycled material need to be on the same scale.



### Technological

Solutions are often technologically complex.

Innovations are subject to risks, such as safety risks and material risks.

#### Requirements

- In-depth knowledge from various fields
- Novel approaches
- Recovery of materials from products that are based on secondary raw materials
- Recycled material should have better qualities than the virgin material it would be replacing



## Triple loop learnings to overcome the CE challenges

### Selection of participants:

- Engage a diversified group of participants representing different stakeholders and sectors

### Motivation of participants

- Make sure that participants understand their role in the wider ecosystem

### Tools and resources

- Ensure interactions between different stakeholder groups to promote systemic thinking

### Challenge design

- Multiple experiments
- Include a long term perspective, for instance, start the experiment by presenting (mega) trends

### Selection of participants

- Include participants that are not mired in existing constraints and mindsets.

### Tools and resources

- Use tools that helps in out-of-the-box thinking.

### Selection of participants

- Form a diversified group of participants representing different stakeholders and sectors to identify new end-application
- Include potential customers

### Challenge design

- Avoid too open-ended challenges, so that the participants have to propose concrete ideas.
- Include background material

### Tools and resources

- Two-part experiments that separate ideation and evaluation of their potential.

### Challenge design

- Match the technological difficulty level with the participants' level of expertise.
- Include briefing about latest research.

### Selection of participants

- Involve top experts from various fields
- Involving experts from abroad might cause language issues if the discussion is not in the participants' first language.

### Tools and resources

- Use tools that enable in-depth discussion

Figure 3. Synthesis of the results.




Figure 4. Business experimentation design elements to overcome CE innovation challenges.

