

# Incremental and Radical Innovation: Design Research vs. Technology and Meaning Change

Donald A. Norman, Roberto Verganti

## Background

Our work began independently. Norman was one of the originators of the class of design exploration now commonly known as user-centered or human-centered design (HCD).<sup>1</sup> These methods have a common framework: an iterative cycle of investigation—usually characterized by observations, an ideation phase, and rapid prototype and testing. Each iteration builds on the lessons learned from the previous cycle, and the process terminates either when the results are appropriate or when the allotted time has run out.

Norman realized that this continual process of checking with the intended users would indeed lead to incremental enhancements of the product; he also realized that it actually was a form of hill climbing—a well-known mathematical procedure for finding local optimization. In hill climbing's application to design, consider a multi-dimensional hill where position on one dimension—height along the vertical axis—represents product quality; and where position along the other dimensions, represents choices among various design parameters. This image is usually illustrated with just two axes: product quality along the vertical axis and design parameters along the horizontal, as shown in Figure 1. Hill-climbing is used in situations, such as design, where the shape of the hill cannot be known in advance. Therefore, one makes tiny movements along all the design dimensions and selects the one that yields an increase in height, repeating until satisfied. This movement is precisely what the repeated rapid prototyping and testing is doing in HCD. Think of a blindfolded person trying to reach the top of a hill by feeling the ground in all directions around the current position and then moving to the highest position, repeating until the “ground” in all directions is lower than the current one: This position would be the top of the hill.

Although the hill-climbing procedure guarantees continual improvement, with eventual termination at the peak of the hill, it has a well-known limit: “Climbers” have no way of knowing whether even higher hills might be scaled in some other part of the design space. Hill-climbing methods get trapped in local maxima.


---

<sup>1</sup> Donald A. Norman and Stephen W. Draper, *Centered System Design: New Perspectives on Human-Computer Interaction* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1986); Donald A. Norman, “Human-Centered Product Development,” Chapter 10 in *The Invisible Computer: Why Good Products Can Fail, the Personal Computer Is So Complex, and Information Appliances Are the Solution* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1998), 128-37.

Figure 1

*The hill-climbing paradigm applied to incremental and radical innovation.*

A given product might start off at "A." Through Human-Centered Design and Design Research (HCD & DR), the product undergoes a series of incremental innovations, eventually bringing it to its maximum quality for this part of the design space, point "B." To move to a different hill, one with a higher potential, requires radical innovation, and this comes about through either technology or meaning change, leading to point "C" on a larger hill. Note that the initial outcome is often inferior to that previously reached ("B"), and so HCD and DR are required to make the necessary incremental innovations to reach maximum potential. To make matters more complex, when the product is at point "C," there is no way of knowing if indeed there is a superior level ("D") or if this is an inferior spot in the design space.



Incremental innovation tries to reach the highest point on the current hill. Radical innovation seeks the highest hill. The implication for design is clear: Because HCD is a form of hill-climbing, it is only suited for incremental innovation.

Norman was bothered by his analysis and tried to find examples that refuted this conclusion; he failed. Every radical innovation he investigated was done without design research, without careful analysis of a person's or even a society's needs. The list of such innovations starts out long before design research existed, with such technologies as indoor plumbing, electric lighting in homes, the automobile and airplane, radio and television. But even today, radical innovations, such as Facebook's and Twitter's development of social networks, have come about simply because their inventors thought they were interesting things to try. Norman was unable to find any example of radical innovation that resulted from the HCD process. HCD, he stated, was only suitable for incremental innovation. Norman argued that radical innovations were driven by technology changes, without any design research or formal analysis of needs. Once the radical innovation had been developed, however, HCD was invaluable as a way of improving the product and enhancing its appeal—good examples being the way that Google, Facebook, and Twitter have modified themselves since their initial introduction, or how automobile manufacturers slowly and continuously modify their offerings.

Norman presented his results at the IASDR (International Association of Societies of Design Research) conference in Seoul,<sup>2</sup> at IIT's (Illinois Institute of Technology) Design Research Conference, DRC 2010,<sup>3</sup> and in the ACM (Association for Computing Machinery) magazine, *Interactions*.<sup>4</sup> During this process, Norman came across Verganti's book, *Design-Driven Innovation*,<sup>5</sup> and his Harvard Business School blog,<sup>6</sup> which made very similar

- 2 Donald A. Norman, "Science and Design," (paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Association of Societies of Design Research, Seoul, S. Korea, October 18-22, 2009).
- 3 Donald A. Norman, "The Research-Practice Gulf," (paper presented at the IIT Institute of Design, Design Research Conference, Chicago, IL, May 10-12, 2010).
- 4 Donald A. Norman, "Technology First, Needs Last: The Research-Product Gulf," *Interactions* 17, no. 2 (2010): 38-42.
- 5 Roberto Verganti, *Design-Driven Innovation: Changing the Rules of Competition by Radically Innovating What Things Mean* (Boston: Harvard Business Press, 2009).
- 6 Roberto Verganti, "User-Centered Innovation Is Not Sustainable," *Harvard Business Review Blogs*, [http://blogs.hbr.org/cs/2010/03/user-centered\\_innovation\\_is\\_no.html](http://blogs.hbr.org/cs/2010/03/user-centered_innovation_is_no.html) (accessed March 19, 2010).

arguments to what Norman was proposing. That these two lines of thought articulated separately by Norman and Verganti should be combined seemed clear—a task undertaken by Norman in his DRC 2010 conference presentation.

Verganti, a scholar of innovation management, had come to design after conducting research on the management of technological innovation. In search of a definition of design that could clarify and distinguish from other drivers (e.g., technology or market) design's contribution to innovation, he rooted his investigation in the definition of design as “making sense of things,” as described by Klaus Krippendorff and John Heskett (also in personal communication with Norman):

The etymology of design goes back to the Latin *de + signare* and means making something, distinguishing it by a sign, giving it significance, designating its relation to other things, owners, users, or gods. Based on this original meaning, one could say: Design is making sense (of things).<sup>7</sup>

Design: The deliberate and reasoned shaping and making of our environment in ways that satisfy our needs and give meaning to our lives.<sup>8</sup>

Verganti's views were similar to those of Norman. The two agreed regarding the importance of HCD for incremental innovation and its weakness in radical innovation. They agreed regarding the importance of technology change in driving radical innovation. But Verganti went one step further: He demonstrated that radical innovation could also come about through changes in meaning. Once the two discovered one another's works, they collaborated on a talk for the “Designing Pleasurable Products and Interactions” conference in Milan in 2011<sup>9</sup>—much to the dismay of audience members, who expected the two to battle one another about the importance of human-centered design. This paper grew out of that talk.

Our observations convince us that the need has emerged for a better understanding of design research and design innovation and how they are linked. In our discussion, we consider design as the process of “making sense of things.” Hence, our questions turn more precisely into the following ones: What type of research is conducted on the meaning of things? And to what types of innovative output can this research lead? How are the two concepts, design research and design innovation, related?

In answering these questions, our purpose is not to provide specific tools and steps, which are already well developed in other studies, and whose description would require a larger space than what can be done within an article. (For these tools we therefore refer readers to the existing theories and publications.) Rather, we

---

7 Klaus Krippendorff, “On the Essential Contexts of Artifacts or on the Proposition that ‘Design is Making Sense (of Things),’” *Design Issues* 5, no. 2 (1989): 9–38.

8 John Heskett, *Toothpicks & Logos: Design in Everyday Life* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).

9 Donald A. Norman and Roberto Verganti, “Innovation and Design Research,” (lecture presented at the *Designing Pleasurable Products and Interfaces* Conference, Milan, June 23–24, 2011).

answer the questions posed by addressing the fundamental decision any innovation player has to make before moving into the use of specific tools: What general approach should be used to address an innovation challenge? What set of theories, processes, and tools should be considered?

The purpose of this paper is to provide a theoretical framework for distinguishing between the procedures of incremental and radical innovation and to address the fundamental activities of innovation. For this purpose, we provide three different ways of treating innovation: as the attempt to find the maxima in a hilly terrain whose topology is unknown and novel, as movements in the product space defined by the two axes of “technology change” and “meaning change,” and as a design research quadrangle based on Stokes’s two dimensions of “advances in understanding” and “consideration of practicality.”

We start the paper by suggesting that radical product innovation is driven by either advances in technology or a deliberate change in the meaning of the product, rather than being driven by the human-centered design philosophy widely used in product design. In our examination of both existing products and the literature on innovation, we were unable to find any contrary evidence. Incremental innovation was performed as a result of a deliberate design research strategy or through a series of mutual adaptations by the product developers and the use community to bring the two into better alignment. In contrast, radical product introductions could always be traced to the introduction of a new technology that provided new affordances to the designers or to a new meaning assigned to the product and its uses, allowing for radical changes using existing technologies. Of course, some radical change incorporated both new technologies and meaning changes.

Note that our observations and interpretations are neutral with respect to the ongoing debate between the relative importance of technical or social determinism. One could interpret technology-driven radical innovation as an example of technological determinism; meaning-driven radical innovation as an example of social determinism; and human-centered incremental innovation as either technological or social determinism, depending on the theoretical biases involved. We subscribe to the belief that factors related to both technical and social determinism are always in play.

### **Types of Design Research**

The concept of research takes two different forms in design. One perspective sees research as exploration and experimentation that leads to the advancement of knowledge, the development of theories, and the application of theories. This perspective has been the subject of reflections, definitions, and effective classifications by design theorists. For example, Frayling’s well-known, three-part classification of design research includes research into design,

research through design, and research for design.<sup>10</sup> See also Cross,<sup>11</sup> Friedman,<sup>12</sup> and Feast and Melles.<sup>13</sup> These definitions all share an epistemological base aimed at advancing knowledge.

The other perspective sees research as any activity of collection and analysis of data for a better understanding of a topic (which therefore includes the research a student at an elementary school conducts to write a paper on what tigers eat). This perspective is used by practitioners to indicate their research activities. For example, they might use ethnographic research or observations on people's activities as a means to understand user needs, product research as a means to identify possible solutions, market research as shedding light on the kinds of products people would buy and their price sensitivity, and usability research as indicating the interaction between people and products. In this second perspective, design research focuses on how to improve both products and sales. In this paper we concentrate on this second perspective of design research.

### Two Types of Innovation: Incremental and Radical

We can identify many kinds of innovation, and classification might vary according to the object of innovation. For example, categories include innovation of socio-cultural systems, of ecosystems, of business models, of products, of services, of processes, of organizations, of institutional arrangements, etc. Classifications might also vary according to the drivers of innovation (technologies, markets, design, users, etc.), or to the intensity of innovation. In this paper we focus on two categories of innovation for products or services:

- *Incremental innovation*: improvements within a given frame of solutions (i.e., "doing better what we already do"); and
- *Radical innovation*: a change of frame (i.e., "doing what we did not do before").

The major difference between the two is whether the innovation is perceived as a continuous modification of previously accepted practices or whether it is new, unique, and discontinuous. Dahlin and Behrens suggest three criteria for identifying an innovation as radical:<sup>14</sup>

- *Criterion 1*: The invention must be novel: It needs to be dissimilar from prior inventions.
- *Criterion 2*: The invention must be unique: It needs to be dissimilar from current inventions.
- *Criterion 3*: The invention must be adopted: It needs to influence the content of future inventions.

- 
- 10 Christopher Frayling, "Research in Art and Design," *Royal College of Art Research Papers* 1, no. 1 (1993): 1–5.
- 11 Nigel Cross, "Design Research: A Disciplined Conversation," *Design Issues* 15, no. 2 (1999): 5–10.
- 12 Ken Friedman, "Theory Construction in Design Research: Criteria, Approaches and Methods," *Design Studies* 24, no. 6 (2003): 507–22.
- 13 Luke Feast and Gavin Melles, "Epistemological Positions in Design Research: A Brief Review of the Literature" (paper presented at Connected 2010: 2nd International Conference on Design Education, University of South Wales, Sidney, Australia, June 28–July 1, 2010).
- 14 Kristina B. Dahlin and Dean M. Behrens, "When Is an Invention Really Radical? Defining and Measuring Technological Radicalness," *Research Policy* 34 (2005): 717–37.

The first two criteria define radicalness; the third, success. Although Criteria 1 and 2 can occur at any time, Criterion 3 only occurs if the sociological, market, and cultural forces are in appropriate alignment. Here is where social determinism plays a major role. The correct idea at the wrong time will fail. Examples are Apple's introduction of the QuickTake digital camera and the Newton personal digital assistant in the early 1990s: Despite fulfilling Criteria 1 and 2, both failed in the marketplace, thus failing at Criterion 3. Although the reasons for the failures are complex, Norman, who was an Apple executive at the time, believes these failures would make wonderful case histories for believers in social determinism.

Much of the writing on innovation in the design and management communities focuses on radical innovation. It is often characterized as disruptive or competence destroying, or as breakthrough, with all these labels sharing the same concept that radical innovation implies a discontinuity with the past.<sup>15</sup> Radical innovation has been the center of attention of innovation studies for a number of decades now.<sup>16</sup> It is taught in design and business schools, and has recently been advocated by people discussing innovation and "design thinking." Although radical innovation is what everyone wants given its significant potential to differentiate, successful radical innovation is surprisingly rare, and most attempts at it fail.<sup>17</sup> In fact, Larry Keeley, President of the Doblin Group, estimates the failure rate to be 96%.<sup>18</sup> Successful radical innovation occurs infrequently in any particular area—perhaps once every five to ten years.

Most radical innovations take considerable time to become accepted (i.e., to fulfill Dahlin and Behrens's third criterion). Moreover, a completely novel innovation is impossible: All ideas have predecessors and are always based on previous work—sometimes through refinement, sometimes through a novel combination of several pre-existing ideas. As Apple's introduction of gesture-based cell phones illustrates, ideas do not spring out of thin air. Apple's development of multi-touch interfaces and their associated gestures to control hand-held and desktop systems is one of today's radical innovations. However, Apple did not invent either multi-touch interfaces or gestural control. Multi-touch systems had been in computer and design laboratories for more than 20 years, and gestures also had a long history. Moreover, several other companies had products on the market using multi-touch before Apple did.<sup>19</sup> Although Apple's ideas were not radical to the scientific community, they did come as a major shift in the world of products and how people interact with them and give meaning to them.

Edison's development of the electric light bulb was similar, resulting in a radical, major revolution in home and business. However, Edison did not invent the light bulb; he improved the

15 Rosanna Garcia and Roger Calantone, "A Critical Look at Technological Innovation Typology and Innovativeness," *The Journal of Product Innovation Management* 19, no. 2 (2002): 110–32.

16 William J. Abernathy and Kim B. Clark, "Innovation: Mapping the Winds of Creative Destruction," *Research Policy* 14 (1985): 3–22; Michael L. Tushman and Philip Anderson, "Technological Discontinuities and Organizational Environments," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 31, no. 3 (1986): 439–65; James M. Utterback, *Mastering the Dynamics of Innovation* (Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1994); Clayton M. Christensen, *The Innovator's Dilemma: When New Technologies Cause Great Firms to Fail* (Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1997); Henry Chesbrough, "Assembling the Elephant: A Review of Empirical Studies on the Impact of Technical Change upon Incumbent Firms," in *Comparative Studies of Technological Evolution*, Robert A. Burgelman and Henry Chesbrough, ed. (Oxford: Elsevier, 2001), 1–36.

17 Birgitta Sandberg, *Managing and Marketing Radical Innovations* (New York: Routledge, 2011).

18 Bruce Nussbaum, "Get Creative: How to Build Effective Companies," *Bloomberg Business Week*, [www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/05\\_31/b3945401.htm](http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/05_31/b3945401.htm) (accessed August 1, 2012).

19 Bill Buxton, "Multi-Touch Systems that I Have Known and Loved," [www.billbuxton.com/multitouchOverview.html](http://www.billbuxton.com/multitouchOverview.html) (accessed March 11, 2012).

existing bulbs by extending bulb life and, equally important, he recognized the importance of providing all the necessary infrastructures. Edison brought into view all the system requirements of generation plants, distribution systems, and even indoor wiring and sockets to hold the bulbs. Thus, his efforts revolutionized the product space and the living and working patterns of households and businesses.

Incremental product innovation refers to the small changes in a product that help to improve its performance, lower its costs, and enhance its desirability, or simply result in a new model release. Most successful products undergo continual incremental innovation, intended to lower their costs and enhance effectiveness. This dominant form of innovation is not as exciting as radical innovation, but it is just as important. Radical innovations seldom live up to their potential when they are first introduced. At first, they are often difficult to use, expensive, and limited in capability. Incremental innovations, meanwhile, are necessary to transform the radical idea into a form that is acceptable to the consumers who follow the early adopters. The bottom line is that both forms of innovation are necessary. Radical innovation brings new domains and new paradigms, and it creates a potential for major changes. Incremental innovation is how the value of that potential is captured. Without radical innovation, incremental innovation reaches a limit. Without incremental innovation, the potential enabled by radical change is not captured.

### **Technology and Meaning-Driven Innovation**

Having introduced some basic concepts of design, research, and innovation, we can now connect these concepts. We start by mapping the relationships between technology, meaning, and innovation—both incremental and radical. We examine how the two drivers of innovation, technology change and meaning change, combine to track innovation. And we illustrate the movement of products in the space defined by the two dimensions of technology and meaning for two different domains: video game consoles and watches.


#### *Video Games*

Figure 2 shows how the two independent dimensions of technology change and meaning change track innovation. Early commercial video games were deployed on specialized game consoles and home computers. In this example, we focus only on specialized consoles. Our story starts after the successful introduction of game consoles for the home, soon dominated by three major players: Sony, with its PlayStation; Microsoft, with its Xbox; and Nintendo, with its GameCube. Playing with a game console provided the opportunity to enter into a new, virtual world—one to which entrance was a privilege granted only to those who were adept.

Figure 2

*Viewing innovation in Video Game Consoles along the axes of Technology and Meaning change.*

The early games were played by small numbers of people at a time clustered around a game console. The graphics were crude. Sony and Microsoft followed the technology changes to introduce powerful processors with dramatically enhanced graphics, causing them to dominate the industry. Then, as high-speed internet became possible, they migrated to multi-player games, where up to a million people could be playing the same game even though located all across the world. Nintendo leveraged new sensor technology—accelerometers and infrared imaging—to change the meaning from games for experts to games for everyone, controlled by whole body movements. This revolutionized the video game market. Eventually both Sony and Microsoft were forced to follow along, with Microsoft's Kinect being the most successful.



The user interface required expertise, which took considerable time and practice to acquire. The purpose (meaning) was to allow gamers to enter a virtual world in which they would have never lived otherwise (e.g., a car racing track, a mythical battleground, or a complex maze of paths fraught with dangers, magical objects, and spells). Because reviewers and players of the games all expressed a desire for even better graphics and faster response times, product innovation was directed toward the creation of faster processors and higher quality graphics.

When technical advances in computer chips allowed the manufacturers to provide the requisite computer power, the huge expense of providing this technology led to a technological battle for supremacy between the two largest companies, Microsoft and Sony. The introductions of the Sony PlayStation and the Microsoft Xbox represented a radical innovation in technology that was sufficiently powerful to make possible an entirely new collection of games and to enable these two companies to dominate the market for video game consoles. This developmental path is illustrated in Figure 2 by the movement of the early games in the lower left-hand corner upward along the technology change dimension, where the change was the development of faster processors and better displays. Nintendo, meanwhile, decided to follow a different path.

A related change was the introduction of the capacity for massive numbers of gamers to play simultaneously, connected via the Internet; these genres are known as Massively Multiplayer Online Games (MMOLG) and Massively Multiplayer Online Role-Playing Games (MMORPG). The games, which attracted huge numbers of players, continued even when an individual player logged off the system, which constituted a meaning change shown by the shift to the right in Figure 2. Although multiple

player games had already existed, this shift to massive numbers of simultaneous players (up to hundreds of thousands of them) constituted a major change in the nature of electronic game playing.

Nintendo declined to engage in the battle along the technology dimension but instead focused on the meaning dimension, developing games that were more playable and enjoyable for less expert players. Nintendo took advantage of the arrival of inexpensive sensors, both for acceleration and infra-red imaging, and used these simple, inexpensive technologies to launch a major meaning change: games for everyone. With the introduction of the Nintendo Wii, console games opened up outside the normal, small niche segment of skilled experts and let the entire family play sports, exercise, and interact with one another without requiring expert skills. The Wii redefined the playing field by combining a simple technology shift with a massive meaning shift. Sony and Microsoft struggled to catch up. A few years later, Microsoft responded with its technology advance, the Kinect, which allows complete control of the game environment through body movement and gestures, dispensing with the need for the hand-held wands required by Nintendo's Wii.


Interestingly, the back-story to Nintendo's success in redefining the meaning of the video game is that the other major video console companies rejected the technology that made the new meaning possible. They were so focused on their market of skilled, expert players that they dismissed the sensors as too primitive and irrelevant.

The success of the Nintendo Wii relied on the clever application of MEMS (MicroElectroMechanical Systems) accelerometers and infrared sensors. These components allow the console to sense the speed and orientation of the controller, thereby creating a completely new experience for game players who, for example, can serve tennis balls by moving their arms and body to mimic the real serve of a tennis player. Before the launch of the Wii, MEMS accelerometers were already known to all manufacturers of game consoles, but Microsoft and Sony disregarded their potential because the devices were not helpful in targeting existing user needs. Their design research showed that the niche of expert gamers wanted more sophisticated virtual realities, so Microsoft and Sony invested significant resources to develop even more powerful processors. Nintendo, meanwhile, challenged the existing meaning of game consoles and produced a breakthrough experience—from passive immersion in a virtual world into active, physical engagement in the “real” world. It didn't matter that Wii used inferior processors and relatively low-quality graphics. It (the Wii) completely changed the dynamics of the game, attracting a large audience that consisted not only of expert gamers, but also of people of all ages who did not consider themselves game players.

Figure 3

*The dynamics of innovation in the watch industry.*

Watches were thought of as jewelry, purchased in the jewelry store and passed along the family to sons and daughters. A technology change took place when electronic circuits made it possible to forgo the complex, hand-made mechanical assembly of watches. The first attempts to reproduce watches as jewelry, but using electronics, did not succeed. Then Japanese manufacturers redefined the watch as an instrument for telling time: relatively inexpensive but very accurate and with numerous subsidiary functions. This moved the center for the industry from Switzerland to Japan. Swatch, however, brought watchmaking back to Switzerland by redefining the watch as a fashion accessory. Today, luxury Swiss watchmakers are bringing back the expensive hand-made watch, but defining it as a status symbol.



Now that this meaning has become dominant, competitors are investing in the same direction. The Kinect by Microsoft, for example, enables even more advanced active play through gesture recognition. The evolution of innovation has again turned back to the technology dimension, whereas the meaning has remained unchanged. Figure 2 provides a necessarily simplified view of the progress of video game consoles, moving upward through changes in technology and rightward through changes in meaning.

*Watches*

Before the advent of the electronic watch in the 1970s, watches were considered jewelry; they were mainly sold in jewelry stores and were primarily made in Switzerland. When digital technology emerged, early applications tried to substitute the mechanical movements with the new components, without changing the meaning.

A small number of Japanese companies (primarily Seiko, Citizen, and Casio) used the new electronic technology to transform the watch from an item of jewelry to a tool; they developed inexpensive watches that kept accurate time (usually even better than the more expensive mechanical ones), and added multiple additional functions, such as timers, stop watches, alarms, games, and calculators. With this change in meaning, the Japanese became the world leader in watch production, moving the center from Switzerland to Japan. The traditional, old-fashioned watchmakers in Switzerland suffered enormously (see Figure 3).

The Japanese dominated the watch industry until the Swatch watch company revitalized the Swiss watchmaking industry through yet another radical meaning change: watches as emotion, and watches as fashion.<sup>20</sup> Swatch was marketed as a fashion accessory. Whereas people used to own only a single watch, Swatch encouraged them to own multiple watches, just as they owned multiple shoes, belts, ties, and scarves. They encouraged their customers to change their watches to match their clothes. Note that customers were not asking for fashion watches;

20 Amy Glasmeier, "Technological Discontinuities and Flexible Production Networks: The Case of Switzerland and the World Watch Industry," *Research Policy* 20, no. 5 (1991): 469–85.

indeed, sales for the first release of the Swatch collection were lukewarm. The change in meaning was instituted by Swatch on the basis of a deep understanding of how society was changing in the 1980s toward a more individualized, postmodern culture. (For more detailed reports on the Swatch case, see Taylor,<sup>21</sup> Bouquet and Morrison,<sup>22</sup> and Radov and Tushman.<sup>23</sup>) The Swatch innovation was also accompanied by technological changes, especially in the manufacturing process: Swatch reduced the parts count of watches; used new, inexpensive materials; and developed automated factories for watch assembly, allowing them to create movements at a very low cost. Within ten years, the Swatch Group became the world's leading manufacturer of watches. The success of Swatch's redefinition of the meaning of a watch propelled the Swiss watch industry to recovery.

Today, yet another meaning shift is occurring in the watch industry: The luxury brands are marketing their expensive, hand-made mechanical watches as status symbols, precious in concept and a symbolic connection to a particular lifestyle.

### Human-Centered Design

The two stories of video games and watches provide examples of radical innovations that seem not to come from users. All these companies were of course concerned with the development of products that people would love and purchase, but the innovations were not initiated by design research. This analysis poses a significant challenge to the philosophy of human-centered design.

Human- or user-centered design is a philosophy, not a precise set of methods; but, it tends to assume that innovation should start by getting close to users and observing their activities. We base this simplification on several sources: As previously noted, one of us (Norman) is one of the developers of HCD; the description is consistent with the International Standards Organization's definition (HCD for interactive systems);<sup>24</sup> it is nicely described on the website of the Usability Professionals organization. These sources suggest two critical components of the HCD process:

1. It starts by analyzing user needs and then searches for technologies (or methods) that can better satisfy them or updates product language to respond to existing trends.
2. It then goes through an iterative process of rapid prototyping and testing, each cycle developing a more refined, more complete prototype. This cycle guarantees that user needs are met and that the resulting product is usable and understandable.

21 William Taylor, "Message and Muscle: An Interview with Swatch Titan Nicolas Hayek," *Harvard Business Review* 71, no. 2 (March-April, 1993): 99–110.

22 Cyril Bouquet and Allen Morrison, "Swatch and the Global Watch Industry," Case 9A99M023 (London; Ont., Canada: Richard Ivey School of Business, University of Western, 1999).


23 Daniel B. Radov and Michael L. Tushman, "Rebirth of the Swiss Watch Industry, 1980–1992(A)," Case 9-400-087 (Boston, MA: Harvard Business School, 2000).

24 ISO, International Organization for Standardization, "ISO 9241-210:2010: Ergonomics of Human-System Interaction—Part 210: Human-Centred Design for Interactive Systems," (March 3, 2010).

Figure 4

*The two dimensions and four types of innovation.*

HCD leads to incremental change, and although it allows for local, linear changes in technology and meaning, basically it keeps the product within the lower left quadrant. Radical changes in technology can lead to radical technology-driven innovation: for example, the introduction of color TV. Radical changes in meaning can lead to radical meaning-driven innovation, as in the switch from watch as tool to watch as fashion accessory. The biggest change comes about when both the technology and meaning change, as when Wii used new technology and new meaning to radically change the space of video games. This dual change is rare and more dangerous: consumers tend to resist massive changes.



Step 1 starts with extensive design research to determine user needs. However, this process unwittingly restricts the potential solutions to incremental innovations because, by its very nature, it focuses on things people already know about. The results illuminate the difficulties and problems of existing products. These difficulties and problems are important to be detected, but addressing them leads to incremental enhancements. Not only do the users of products have difficulty envisioning radical new meanings because of their total immersion in the current context and cultural paradigm, but the more that design researchers immerse themselves in the existing context, the more they, too, are trapped in the current paradigms.

Step 2 is a method of iterative testing, evaluation, and refinement. As such, it is hill-climbing, and as we have already noted, this hill-climbing guarantees continual improvement to the top of the current hill, but it can never lead to another, higher hill, much less to the highest. Step 2, therefore, is fundamentally restricted to incremental change: It cannot lead to radical change.

### The Relationship Between Incremental and Radical Innovation

We have now introduced two ways of understanding innovation. One is to think of HCD as a method of hill-climbing—showing how incremental innovation can lead to product improvement (incremental), but how jumping to a new and potentially higher hill comes about through technology or meaning change, as shown in Figure 1.

The second way of looking at innovation is through the two dimensions of technology and meaning change, as shown in Figure 4.

The framework of Figure 4 connects the two dimensions of innovation (technology and meaning) with the drivers: technology, design, and users (the market). We can use these two dimensions to define four types of innovations:<sup>25</sup>

1. *Technology-push innovation* comes from radical changes in technology without any change in the meaning of products. The invention of color television sets (on top of the existing black and white sets) is an example. Technology push innovation definitely does not come from users.<sup>26</sup>
2. *Meaning-driven innovation* starts from the comprehension of subtle and unspoken dynamics in socio-cultural models and results in radically new meanings and languages—often implying a change in socio-cultural regimes. The invention of the mini-skirt in the 1960s is an example: It was not simply a different skirt, but a radically new symbol of women’s freedom that signaled a radical change in society. No new technology was involved.
3. *Technology epiphanies* bring a radical change in meaning, enabled by the emergence of new technologies or the use of existing technologies in totally new contexts. The Wii video game console and the Swatch watch are examples of this type of innovation. The term “epiphany” is to be interpreted as “a meaning that stands in a superior position” and “a perception of the essential nature or meaning of something.” This superior application of a technology is often not visible at first because it does not satisfy existing needs. It does not come from users. Rather, it is a quiescent meaning that is revealed only when a design challenges the dominant interpretation of what a product is and creates new, unsolicited products that people are not currently seeking.<sup>27</sup>
4. *Market-pull innovation* starts from an analysis of user needs and then develops products to satisfy them. We put both HCD and traditional market-pull methods here: Both start from users to identify directions for innovation.

We are not claiming here that any of these four modes of innovation is unaware of the others. Technology-push innovation requires a deep understanding of market dynamics, and meaning-driven innovation implies analyzing people’s aspirations and exploring new technologies. All successful projects have some aspects of all these dimensions. What is different, however, is the driver—the starting point.

---

25 Roberto Verganti, “Design, Meanings, and Radical Innovation: A Meta-Model and a Research Agenda,” *Journal of Product Innovation Management* 25, no. 5 (2008): 436–56.


26 Giovanni Dosi, “Technological Paradigms and Technological Trajectories. A Suggested Interpretation of the Determinants and Directions of Technical Change,” *Research Policy* 11 (1982): 147–62.

27 Roberto Verganti, “Designing Breakthrough Products,” *Harvard Business Review* 89, no. 10 (2011): 114–20; Roberto Verganti and Åsa Öberg, “Interpreting and Envisioning: A Hermeneutic Framework to Look at Radical Innovation of Meanings,” *Industrial Marketing Management* 42, no. 1 (2013): 86–95.

Figure 5

*The Design Research Quadrangle.*

We can view product research along two dimensions: One is the quest for a novel interpretation of meaning, the other is a consideration of practicality. This analysis is inspired by that of Donald Stokes (1997) who argued that research could be characterized along the two dimensions of the quest for understanding and considerations of use. When someone plays around with a product or a technology with no goal, neither for enhancement of meaning nor for practicality, we call it tinkering. Tinkering, however, can often lead to brilliant insights and new products, but when this happens it is completely accidental.



### The Design Research Quadrangle

We have seen that radical innovation may be associated with a change in either technology or meaning. What is the role of design research in leading to these types of innovation? In the classic study of the relationship between pure and applied research, Donald Stokes argued that research could be characterized along two dimensions: the quest for understanding and the considerations of use.<sup>28</sup> In a similar spirit, we can view product research along the two dimensions: the quest for a novel interpretation of meaning, and the quest for practicality (see Figure 5).

In Figure 5 we use the two dimensions of product research to divide design research into the four quadrants of basic design research, design-driven research, human-centered research, and tinkering:

1. *Basic design research.* Such research is aimed at exploring new meanings, without specific consideration for its use in products. A significant design example is the basic research conducted by Memphis, a collective founded by architect Ettore Sottsass in Milan in 1981, in which he joined with emerging talents, such as Michele De Lucchi, Matteo Thun, Javier Mariscal, and Aldo Cibic. The new collective's mission was to challenge the institutional culture and dominant connotations of "good design," especially in furniture. They pioneered the exploration of postmodern philosophies and languages applied to experimental artifacts. In years of experiments, the circle acted as a laboratory that produced roughly 40 pieces, characterized by a light-hearted and ironic language meant to make an emotional rather than a rational, utilitarian appeal. This activity was pure, basic research; the pieces were not meant for the mass market—they were

28 Donald E. Stokes, *Pasteur's Quadrant: Basic Science and Technological Innovation*, Donald E. Stokes, ed. (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1997).

arguments for discussion by other interpreters. And indeed, eventually, the collective's output, vision, and understanding influenced designers and firms in their developments, and postmodernism, with its emotional drive and its language of symbolic objects, made its way into mainstream markets. Note also that these experiments were developed through the deep and slow dynamics of basic research. Sottsass and his brethren did not consider themselves as a playful, creative team, but as radicals engaged in challenging current paradigms. They were not conducting fast brainstorming (which might perhaps be useful for incremental innovation). Instead, they explored in depth, for seven years, the vision of postmodernism in products.

2. *Design-driven research*. This research process is aimed at envisioning new meanings that are intended to be applied in products.<sup>29</sup> An example is the research project, "Family Follows Fiction," conducted by Italian kitchenware manufacturer Alessi in the early 1990s. This project was aimed at creating new knowledge about meanings, seeking a deep understanding of why people buy products and how one could transform kitchenware into items that people buy for its emotional, playful, and symbolic components as much as for its functional use. The result redefined the meaning of kitchenware, from tools to objects of affection, which had the dual effect of adding to our theoretical understanding while also delivering a new family of products for Alessi. These products were extremely well-received, enabling the company to grow 70% in sales in just three years. They are still on the market today. Alessi thus leveraged the results of its research collaborations with Sottsass on postmodernism and emotion, as well as basic research on meaning conducted by others (in particular, studies by pediatrician and psychoanalyst Donald Winnicott, who investigated the role that objects play in the psychological development of children).
3. *Human-centered research*. This research explores people's current meanings assigned to products and aims at detecting existing meanings and needs to design products that fit those meanings and needs. Because of the focus on current meanings and needs, combined with the iterative, hill-climbing nature of the process, this approach serves to enhance the values of existing

---

29 Verganti, *Design-Driven Innovation*.

categories of products, but not to derive entirely new categories. Applied ethnography and user-centered observation are prime research methods for this approach.

4. *Tinkering*. When someone plays around with a product or a technology with no goal in mind—neither for enhancement of meaning, nor for practicality—we call it tinkering. Tinkering can lead to brilliant insights and new products, but when such results happen, they are completely accidental. Given the lack of a deeper understanding of patterns and models, these ideas are extemporaneous, often not recognized, and difficult to replicate. Sony’s competitors followed this “shotgun” strategy in the 1980s, when they tried to launch products to compete with the Walkman. They tried everything, almost in a random process. Sometimes, they even succeeded with some specific models, but they could never duplicate Sony’s success.<sup>30</sup>

These four types of research are connected to each other. In particular, a pattern often emerges in which basic design research (e.g., the research on postmodern products conducted by Ettore Sottsass in the 1980s) leads to design-driven research (e.g., the “Family Follows Fiction” project conducted by Alessi in the early 1990s), which leads to HCD (e.g., the continuous and improved launch of new products every year by Alessi within the “Family Follows Fiction” family, based on feedback from earlier products).

### **Can Design Research Lead to Radical Product Innovation?**

The purpose of this paper is to reframe the discussions of product innovation in the world of design and management around the techniques used to support each type of innovation research. We provide three different conceptual tools with which to understand the differences among these types. The first tool is to examine the topology of product space, envisioning each product opportunity as a hill. We show that HCD methods are a method of hill-climbing, getting to the top of the current hill, and thereby are well suited for continuous incremental improvements, but incapable of radical innovation—finding the highest hill. Radical innovation, finding a higher hill, comes about only through meaning or technology change. The second conceptual tool is thus to consider the two dimensions of meaning change and technology change and to examine how products move through the resulting space. Third, we show how innovation might be viewed as lying in the space formed by the two dimensions of research: The first one aimed at enhancing general knowledge and the second one aimed at applying research to practice.

---

30 Susan Sanderson and Mustafa Uzumeri, “Managing Product Families: The Case of the Sony-Walkman,” *Research Policy* 24, no. 5 (1995): 761–82.

Incremental innovation is already well served in the literature and practice. HCD and its many variants serve this process well, as do any number of market- and technology-driven processes. Incremental innovation in manufacturing, distribution, and supply chain processes are also well served by existing methods in operations.

Radical innovation, meanwhile, does not have a history of successful methods, although much has been made of various means for inducing creativity. In this paper, we suggest that radical innovation is driven by two major possibilities: the development of a new enabling technology, or the change in meaning of the object. Note that, by our definition, a technology is not enabling until it has reached the point at which it is available in a reliable, economical form. Sometimes, technologies reach this stage almost immediately after development. Two examples are Bell's telephone and Edison's phonograph, both of which went into commercial production months after their invention. But most of the time, going from the first demonstration of the idea to the state where it is sufficiently robust and inexpensive that it can serve as a platform for development can take decades. Thus, the fax machine took more than 100 years (it was first patented in 1843); the home video conference is still not a standard product, despite being illustrated in Punch's Almanac in 1879; and as we discussed in this paper, multi-finger gestural control of computer displays was in the research laboratories at least 20 years before its current successful introduction in phones and tablets. Even so, the technological path to radical innovation is reasonably well understood, even if most such innovations fail at first introduction.

Meaning has not been well studied as an approach to innovation. Research on this issue is still in its embryonic phase.<sup>31</sup> However, early insights and evidence are emerging. One example is the process that led Alessi to radically change the meaning of kitchenware in its "Family Follows Fiction" project.<sup>32</sup> Another example is the process that led Philips to radically change the meaning of medical imaging systems (e.g., CT scanners), in its Ambient Experience for Healthcare project. CT scanners had a problem. Normal scanners required a relatively long exposure, which meant the patient had to remain still. The technology-driven solution being followed by providers of such equipment was to increase the power of the imaging source and the sensitivity of the detectors in an attempt to require shorter exposure time, although at the cost of a higher radiation dosage. Philips decided to change the meaning of the experience from that of a threatening, noisy, and uncomfortable medical procedure to a pleasant, relaxing experience. Instead of modifying the technical equipment, Philips modified the hospital environment before, during, and after the scanning procedure. Its redefinition allowed them to focus on the patient's emotional

---

31 Verganti, "Design, Meanings, and Radical Innovation: A Meta-Model and a Research Agenda," *Journal of Product Innovation Management* 25, no. 5 (2008): 436–56.

32 Roberto Verganti, "Innovating Through Design," *Harvard Business Review* 84, No. 12 (2006): 114–22; Verganti, *Design-Driven Innovation*; Sisse Tanderup, "The George Jensen and Alessi Design: A Comparative Analysis Focusing on the Use of Memory," *Analecta Romana-Institututi Danici* 34 (2009): 19–39.

state, rather than on the technology. This approach proved successful and ushered in a revolution in the design of these normally threatening machines.

Philips' radical reinterpretation was not the result of fast, user-led creative processes, but rather of years of design research, involving experts (interpreters) from far flung fields who helped the Philips design team interpret user needs and behaviors from new perspectives. This process is described in detail in an article by Verganti.<sup>33</sup>

Can design research ever lead to radical product innovation? The answer is yes, but it is unlikely to occur through the methods of HCD. Generating technology-driven radical innovation differs from generating meaning-driven innovation. Design research has far more potential in the space of meaning.

Radical innovation driven by technology often results from the explorations and dreams of inventors, engineers, and others who have an inner vision, often driven through self-observation, of what might be possible. They are not driven by formal studies or analyses. They usually do capture a need identified by the inventor, but the need might be real or imagined. Moreover, the potential utility of the idea is seldom examined, but the work is pursued simply because it can be pursued, or because it is an attractive challenge that puzzles the mind of inventors in the science commons.<sup>34</sup> Norman described this perspective as "Technology First, Needs Last."<sup>35</sup> Note that this refusal to do market research is usually a good thing: Many very successful radical innovations are known to have been rejected by marketing experts. (Examples are common: Consider Chester Carlson's invention of the Xerographic copier, which was turned down by multiple companies but today is known as the Xerox copier, and Hewlett-Packard's development of the electronic calculator, which was rejected by the marketing experts at HP and was built only because Hewlett and Packard—the H and P of HP—wanted it.)

The more that researchers study existing human behavior, activities, and products, the more they get trapped into existing paradigms. These studies lead to incremental improvements, enabling people to do better what they already do, but not to radical change that would enable them to do what they currently do not do.

Radical innovation driven by meaning change can also be design-driven through a better understanding of potential patterns of meanings. This understanding can emerge through research and observations rooted in more general socio-cultural changes, as an understanding of how society and culture are changing. The search for new, breakthrough meaning must avoid becoming trapped by the prevalence of existing products and use.

---

33 Verganti, "Designing Breakthrough Products," 114-20.

34 Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1962).

35 Norman, "Technology First, Needs Last."

Of course, innovation often results from unpredictable events. So user-led innovation—sometimes called “lead user” innovation<sup>36</sup>—sometimes can serve as an insightful research tool to lead designers to radical innovation. Simply watching the results of the do-it-yourself (DIY) or hacking communities and the workarounds and “hacks” that people use to make sense of their existing world can do so as well.<sup>37</sup> Accidental developments and findings can lead designers to explore radical new areas of the design space, thereby occasionally leading to radical product innovation. This innovation might also happen accidentally, by tinkering or by user-centered innovation. However, really building a new paradigm, “a new hill,” in the space of solutions with a breakthrough result requires a vision that comes from a deep re-interpretation of the meaning of a product. This should be the goal of design research.

One promising direction in the development of radical innovation is to modify the HCD process to require simultaneous development of multiple ideas and prototypes. Forcing the design team to simultaneously disperse into multiple directions enhances the possibility that some of these attempts will start off in a different design space—one that might allow for a successful, new product. In the words of hill climbing, this dispersal might lead one to a higher, more productive hill. This technique is a standard one in computer hill-climbing searches: starting off at random locations to see if the hills encountered are different or higher than the one currently under study.<sup>38</sup> Of course, having found a unique new product niche does not mean that it will be recognized as fruitful: Witness the struggles of Carlson to get his xerographic copier accepted. Again, recognizing the potential for a new higher hill requires an explicit act of interpretation of patterns, rather than just random creativity.

Hence, the answer to our question is that design-driven research can indeed lead to radical innovation of meanings. To do so, the research must be directed toward new interpretations of what could be meaningful to people. Traditional ideation processes and other creative methods fail to emphasize the importance of interpretation processes, although the procedures could be modified appropriately. Research based on interpretation processes is capable of leading to radical change that is recognizable and replicable.<sup>39</sup>

---

36 Eric von Hippel, *The Sources of Innovation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988).

37 Donald A. Norman, “Workarounds and Hacks: The Leading Edge of Innovation,” *Interactions* 15, no. 4 (2008): 47–48, <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1374489.1374500> (Accessed September 1, 2012).

38 See Steven P. Dow, Alana Glassco, Jonathan Kass, Melissa Schwarz, Daniel L. Schwartz, and Scott R. Klemmer, “Parallel Prototyping Leads to Better Design Results, More Divergence, and Increased Self-Efficacy,” *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interactions* 17, no. 4 (2010): Article 18, 1-24.

39 Roberto Verganti and Åsa Öberg, “Interpreting and Envisioning: A Hermeneutic Framework to Look at Radical Innovation of Meanings,” *Industrial Marketing Management* 42, no. 1, (2013): 86-95.

**This article has been cited by:**

1. Daejung Kim, Jieun Kim. 2021. Is innovation design- or technology-driven? Citation as a measure of innovation pollination. *World Patent Information* **64**, 102010. [[Crossref](#)]
2. Rui Monteiro, Bruno Giesteira, Anne Boddington, Cristina Farinha. Current Issues in Design Policies: Balancing Tensions 561-577. [[Crossref](#)]
3. Roderick Walden, Anton Nemme. Intermediary Interpreters in University-Industry Collaboration to Support Manufacturing SMEs 129-151. [[Crossref](#)]
4. Nonthapat Pulsiri, Ronald Vatananan-Thesenvitz. 2020. Drones in Emergency Medical Services: A Systematic Literature Review with Bibliometric Analysis. *International Journal of Innovation and Technology Management* **92**, 2097001. [[Crossref](#)]
5. Constanza Miranda, Fernando Altermatt, Ignacio Villagrán, Julián Goñi. 2020. Developing an Innovative Medical Training Simulation Device for Peripheral Venous Access: A User-Centered Design Approach. *Healthcare* **8**:4, 420. [[Crossref](#)]
6. Jie Xue, K. Scott Swan. 2020. An investigation of the complementary effects of technology, market, and design capabilities on exploratory and exploitative innovations: Evidence from micro and small-sized tech enterprises in China. *Creativity and Innovation Management* **29**:S1, 27-50. [[Crossref](#)]
7. Dragos-Cristian Vasilescu, Michael Filzmoser. 2020. Machine invention systems: a (r)evolution of the invention process?. *AI & SOCIETY* **39**. . [[Crossref](#)]
8. Jorn Hurtienne, Franzisca Maas, Astrid Carolus, Daniel Reinhardt, Cordula Baur, Carolin Wienrich. 2020. Move&Find: The Value of Kinaesthetic Experience in a Casual Data Representation. *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications* **40**:6, 61-75. [[Crossref](#)]
9. Colin Jones, Kathryn Penaluna, Andy Penaluna. 2020. Value creation in entrepreneurial education: towards a unified approach. *Education + Training* **63**:1, 101-113. [[Crossref](#)]
10. Afshin Jafari, S. Peyman Shariatpanahi, Mohammad Mahdi Zolfagharzadeh, Mahsa Abdollahyar, Maryam Sadeghipour. 2020. From creativity to innovation and the role of competition networks: A cancer inspired two-step evolutionary agent-based model. *Journal of Simulation* **10**, 1-11. [[Crossref](#)]
11. Andrew Penaluna, Kathryn Penaluna. 2020. In search of entrepreneurial competencies: Peripheral vision and multidisciplinary inspiration. *Industry and Higher Education* **80**, 095042222096379. [[Crossref](#)]
12. Shaojie Han, Yibo Lyu, Ruonan Ji, Yuqing Zhu, Jingqin Su, Lining Bao. 2020. Open innovation, network embeddedness and incremental innovation capability. *Management Decision* **58**:12, 2655-2680. [[Crossref](#)]
13. Karim Ben-Slimane, Cédric Diridollou, Karim Hamadache. 2020. The legitimation strategies of early stage disruptive innovation. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* **158**, 120161. [[Crossref](#)]
14. Carolin Baedeker, Julius Piwowar, Philipp Themann, Viktor Grinewitschus, Benjamin Krisemendt, Katja Lepper, Christina Zimmer, Justus von Geibler. 2020. Interactive Design to Encourage Energy Efficiency in Offices: Developing and Testing a User-Centered Building Management System Based on a Living Lab Approach. *Sustainability* **12**:17, 6956. [[Crossref](#)]
15. Sveinung Grimsby. 2020. New novel food regulation and collaboration for innovation. *British Food Journal* **123**:1, 245-259. [[Crossref](#)]
16. Henry Mutebi, Moses Muhwezi, Joseph Mpeera Ntayi, John C. Kigozi Munene. 2020. Organisation size, innovativeness, self-organisation and inter-organisational coordination. *International Journal of Emergency Services* **9**:3, 359-394. [[Crossref](#)]
17. Manuela Celi, Chiara Colombi. 2020. Trends as Future Prompts in the Anticipatory Design Practice. *Futures* **121**, 102564. [[Crossref](#)]
18. Yibo Lyu, Yuqing Zhu, Shaojie Han, Binyuan He, Lining Bao. 2020. Open innovation and innovation "Radicalness"—the moderating effect of network embeddedness. *Technology in Society* **62**, 101292. [[Crossref](#)]
19. Dawid Szutowski. 2020. The impact of eco-innovation on the stock returns of technology-based KIBS: role of eco-innovation type and its degree of novelty. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal* **ahead-of-print**:ahead-of-print. . [[Crossref](#)]

20. Zahid Hussain, Jyoti Mishra, Emanuela Vanacore. 2020. Waste to energy and circular economy: the case of anaerobic digestion. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management* 33:4, 817-838. [[Crossref](#)]
21. Claudio Dell'Era, Stefano Magistretti, Cabirio Cautela, Roberto Verganti, Francesco Zurlo. 2020. Four kinds of design thinking: From ideating to making, engaging, and criticizing. *Creativity and Innovation Management* 29:2, 324-344. [[Crossref](#)]
22. Chuan Li, Pau Rausell Köster. 2020. Exploring the Opportunities and Challenges of European Design Policy to Enable Innovation. The Case of Designscapes Project. *Sustainability* 12:12, 5132. [[Crossref](#)]
23. Gunther Schuh, Paul Zeller RWTH. Methodology Concept for the Determination of the Idea-specific Requirement Space for the Execution of Radical Innovations 1-8. [[Crossref](#)]
24. Laura Barasa, Bethuel Kinyanjui, Joris Knobens, Patrick Vermeulen, Peter Kimuyu. 2020. Innovation and exporting: the case of mediation effects in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Industry and Innovation* 2, 1-23. [[Crossref](#)]
25. A.J. Romera, A.P. Bos, M. Neal, C.R. Eastwood, D. Chapman, W. McWilliam, D. Royds, C. O'Connor, R. Brookes, J. Connolly, P. Hall, P.W. Clinton. 2020. Designing future dairy systems for New Zealand using reflexive interactive design. *Agricultural Systems* 181, 102818. [[Crossref](#)]
26. Roberto Verganti, Luca Vendraminelli, Marco Iansiti. 2020. Innovation and Design in the Age of Artificial Intelligence. *Journal of Product Innovation Management* 37:3, 212-227. [[Crossref](#)]
27. Arindra Nath Mishra, Ashis Kumar Pani. 2020. Business value appropriation roadmap for artificial intelligence. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems* ahead-of-print:ahead-of-print. . [[Crossref](#)]
28. Yinjuan Yang. 2020. On the contingent value of knowledge base for radical innovation capability. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems* ahead-of-print:ahead-of-print. . [[Crossref](#)]
29. Jane Bourke, Stephen Roper, James H. Love. 2020. Innovation in legal services: The practices that influence ideation and codification activities. *Journal of Business Research* 109, 132-147. [[Crossref](#)]
30. Daniel Amann, Ingrid Kihlander, Mats Magnusson. 2020. Affordability Aspects in the Development of Defence Equipment: Case Studies of Concept Generation in the Defence Industry. *Defence and Peace Economics* 22, 1-17. [[Crossref](#)]
31. Jorge Sanz-Llopis, Matthias Ostermann. 2020. Innovation in project management through framing and challenge redefinition. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business* 13:4, 745-766. [[Crossref](#)]
32. Siti Salwa Isa, Andre Liem. 2020. Exploring the role of physical prototypes during co-creation activities at LEGO company using case study validation. *CoDesign* 53, 1-25. [[Crossref](#)]
33. Luca Tricarico, Andrea Galimberti, Ausilia Campanaro, Chiara Magoni, Massimo Labra. 2020. Experimenting with RRI tools to Drive Sustainable Agri-Food Research: The SASS Case Study from Sub-Saharan Africa. *Sustainability* 12:3, 827. [[Crossref](#)]
34. Gregorio Sánchez-Marín, María Pemartín, Joaquín Monreal-Pérez. 2020. The influence of family involvement and generational stage on learning-by-exporting among family firms. *Review of Managerial Science* 14:1, 311-334. [[Crossref](#)]
35. Jeanne Liedtka, Awais Sheikh, Cynthia Gilmer, Marilyn Kupetz, Lynette Wilcox. 2020. The Use of Design Thinking in the U.S. Federal Government. *Public Performance & Management Review* 43:1, 157-179. [[Crossref](#)]
36. Byungsoo Kim, Sharon Joines. The Role of Design in Technology Driven Ergonomics Product Development 3-14. [[Crossref](#)]
37. Felix van de Sand, Anna-Katharina Frison, Pamela Zotz, Andreas Riener, Katharina Holl. UXi Validation: How to Evaluate if Brand Values Can Be Experienced by Users 151-166. [[Crossref](#)]
38. Louise Moody, Andrew J. Cobby. MATUROLIFE: Using Advanced Material Science to Develop the Future of Assistive Technology 189-202. [[Crossref](#)]
39. Louise Moody, Paul Magee, Dimitar Stefanov. Development of a Wheelchair Stability Assessment System: Design Tools and Approaches 235-256. [[Crossref](#)]
40. Paulo Colaço, Demétrio Matos. Design(ers) Beyond Industrial. From Dissociation to Reassociation Through Craft 357-367. [[Crossref](#)]

41. Milica Pavlovic, Sotirios Kotsopoulos, Yihyun Lim, Scott Penman, Sara Colombo, Federico Casalegno. Determining a Framework for the Generation and Evaluation of Ambient Intelligent Agent System Designs 318-333. [[Crossref](#)]
42. Anuradha Tiwari, Tarakeshwar Gupta. Role of IT and Social Media in Democratic Change 294-319. [[Crossref](#)]
43. Brian S. Dixon. 93. [[Crossref](#)]
44. Amir Bahman Radnejad, Michael F. Ziolkowski, Oleksiy Osiyevskyy. 2020. Design thinking and radical innovation: enter the smartwatch. *Journal of Business Strategy* ahead-of-print:ahead-of-print. . [[Crossref](#)]
45. Seyed Mehrshad Parvin Hosseini, Aydin Azizi. An Introduction on Models of Innovation and Analytical Framework 1-11. [[Crossref](#)]
46. Floriana Iannone. It's 'Retro-Mania' 232-246. [[Crossref](#)]
47. Nicolas Frevel, Sascha L. Schmidt, Daniel Beiderbeck, Benjamin Penkert, Brian Subirana. Taxonomy of Sportstech 15-37. [[Crossref](#)]
48. Fábía Esteves, Pedro Quelhas Brito. Electronic Games as a Touristic Promotional Tool 389-418. [[Crossref](#)]
49. Michael Flavin. Whatever Happened to Technology Enhanced Learning? 9-42. [[Crossref](#)]
50. Michael Flavin. Conclusion: Switch It Off, Switch It on Again—Reimagining Technology-Enhanced Learning in Higher Education 145-200. [[Crossref](#)]
51. Michael Flavin. Reboot the Messenger: A Narrative for Technology Enhanced Learning 121-144. [[Crossref](#)]
52. Jin Woo Lee, Shanna R. Daly, Aileen Huang-Saad, Colleen M. Seifert. 2020. Start with Problems or Solutions? Medical Device Design in Industry and Academia. *IEEE Access* 1-1. [[Crossref](#)]
53. S. Vajna, S. Ottosson, S. Rothkötter, J. Stal-Le Cardinal, J. C. Briede-Westermeyer. Integration of Processes and Organizations 439-510. [[Crossref](#)]
54. P. S. Aithal, Shubhrajyotsna Aithal. 2019. Management of ICCT underlying Technologies used for Digital Service Innovation. *International Journal of Management, Technology, and Social Sciences* 110-136. [[Crossref](#)]
55. Stanislav Mamonov, Richard Peterson. 2019. The role of IT in innovation at the individual and group level – a literature review. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development* 26:6/7, 797-810. [[Crossref](#)]
56. Reem Marzouki, Wafa Belkahla. 2019. The impact of lead users on innovation success. *Innovation & Management Review* 17:1, 86-111. [[Crossref](#)]
57. Jie Xue. 2019. An investigation into the effects of product design on incremental and radical innovations from the perspective of consumer perceptions: Evidence from China. *Creativity and Innovation Management* 28:4, 501-518. [[Crossref](#)]
58. Jordan Robert Gamble, Rodney McAdam, Michael Brennan. 2019. How User-centric Innovation is Affecting Stakeholder Marketing Strategies: Exploratory Findings from the Music Industry. *European Management Review* 16:4, 1175-1193. [[Crossref](#)]
59. Janne Dugstad, Tom Eide, ETTY R. Nilsen, Hilde Eide. 2019. Towards successful digital transformation through co-creation: a longitudinal study of a four-year implementation of digital monitoring technology in residential care for persons with dementia. *BMC Health Services Research* 19:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
60. Richard Brophy. 2019. Blockchain and insurance: a review for operations and regulation. *Journal of Financial Regulation and Compliance* 28:2, 215-234. [[Crossref](#)]
61. Gianluca Zanella, Dante B. Castro Solano, Cory R.A. Hallam, Teja Guda. 2019. The role of the organization in the entrepreneur–opportunity nexus. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research* 25:7, 1537-1562. [[Crossref](#)]
62. Thomas Paris, Sihem Ben Mahmoud-Jouini. 2019. The process of creation in creative industries. *Creativity and Innovation Management* 28:3, 403-419. [[Crossref](#)]
63. Heleen De Goey, Per Hilletoft, David Eriksson. 2019. Design-driven innovation: exploring enablers and barriers. *European Business Review* 31:5, 721-743. [[Crossref](#)]
64. Gunther Schuh, Paul Zeller, Philipp Steinmetz. Determination of Radical Innovation Types 1-13. [[Crossref](#)]
65. Christophe Pennetier, Karan Girotra, Jürgen Mihm. 2019. R&D Spending: Dynamic or Persistent?. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management* 21:3, 636-657. [[Crossref](#)]

66. Heekyung Moon, Sung H. Han, Jiyoung Kwahk. 2019. A MORF-Vision Method for Strategic Creation of IoT Solution Opportunities. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction* 35:10, 821-830. [[Crossref](#)]
67. Christoph J. Selig, Guido H. Baltes. Towards an effective management of corporate entrepreneurship activities 1-9. [[Crossref](#)]
68. WenYing Claire Shih, Konstantinos Agrafiotis. 2019. Transmission Mechanisms in the Creative Economy, Fashion Design Processes and Competitiveness: The Case of Progressive Taiwanese Fashion Designers. *Fashion Practice* 11:2, 197-221. [[Crossref](#)]
69. Eli M. Silk, Shanna R. Daly, Kathryn W. Jablowski, Seda McKilligan. 2019. Incremental to radical ideas: paradigm-relatedness metrics for investigating ideation creativity and diversity. *International Journal of Design Creativity and Innovation* 7:1-2, 30-49. [[Crossref](#)]
70. Yang Liu, Yufeng Zhang, Luciano Batista, Ke Rong. 2019. Green operations: what's the role of supply chain flexibility?. *International Journal of Production Economics* . [[Crossref](#)]
71. Anna Holmquist, Mats Magnusson, Mona Livholts. 2019. Reinventing tradition: Exploring the creation of new meaning through innovations involving craft-based design. *Creativity and Innovation Management* 28:1, 124-137. [[Crossref](#)]
72. Mark Bailey, Emmanouil Chatzakis, Nicholas Spencer, Kate Lampitt Adey, Nate Sterling, Neil Smith. 2019. A design-led approach to transforming wicked problems into design situations and opportunities. *Journal of Design, Business & Society* 5:1, 95-127. [[Crossref](#)]
73. Steven Chen. Designing Extraordinary Service Experiences 143-170. [[Crossref](#)]
74. Oronzo Parlangeli, Alessandra Giani, Federico Baccetti, Ilaria Bonanno, Ylenia Iervolino, Marino Todisco, Renzo Ricci, Stefano Guidi. The Evolution of Computed Tomography (CT) and Its User Interface: A Contextual and Comparative Analysis of Some of the Most Used Solutions 478-487. [[Crossref](#)]
75. Munir Abbasi, Joe Cullen, Chuan Li, Francesco Molinari, Nicola Morelli, Pau Rausell, Luca Simeone, Lampros Stergioulas, Ilaria Tosoni, Kirsten Van Dam. A Triplet Under Focus: Innovation, Design and the City 15-41. [[Crossref](#)]
76. Jonathan Romm, Josina Vink. Investigating the "In-betweenness" of Service Design Practitioners in Healthcare 117-135. [[Crossref](#)]
77. Louise Moody, Nicola York, Gulay Ozkan, Andrew Copley. Bringing Assistive Technology Innovation and Material Science Together Through Design 305-315. [[Crossref](#)]
78. Francesca Montagna, Marco Cantamessa. 2019. Unpacking the innovation toolbox for design research and practice. *Design Science* 5. . [[Crossref](#)]
79. Burcu Taşkın, Oya Akin, Husam Barham, Nuri Başoğlu. Design Study of Medical Device 397-417. [[Crossref](#)]
80. Björn Senft, Florian Rittmeier, Holger Fischer, Simon Oberthür. A Value-Centered Approach for Unique and Novel Software Applications 366-384. [[Crossref](#)]
81. Christoph J. Selig, Tim Gasser, Guido H. Baltes. Effects of Internal Corporate Venturing on the Transformation of Established Companies 159-183. [[Crossref](#)]
82. Jing Wang. Design Driven Innovation for Sustainability: An Analysis of 7 Cases 329-342. [[Crossref](#)]
83. Avril Accolla, Francesca Hansstein. Social Footprint. An Exploratory Analysis of Existing Evidence and Opportunities 346-355. [[Crossref](#)]
84. Priya Seshadri, Cole Hatfield Joslyn, Morgan M. Hynes, Tahira Reid. 2019. Compassionate design: considerations that impact the users' dignity, empowerment and sense of security. *Design Science* 5. . [[Crossref](#)]
85. Prashant Bhat, Iaroslav Shcherbatyi, Wolfgang Maass. 2019. Automated Learning of User Preferences for Selection of High Quality 3D Designs. *Procedia CIRP* 84, 814-819. [[Crossref](#)]
86. Petra Merenheimo, Rauno Rusko. Digitalization as Part of Tourism Brand Development 995-1021. [[Crossref](#)]
87. Ilgım Eroğlu. 2018. Ürün Tasarımında Tersine Yenileşim Kavramının Değerlendirilmesi ve Türkiye VOLKICAR Örneğinin Tartışılması. *Tasarım + Kuram* 82-93. [[Crossref](#)]
88. Özge Kandemir. 2018. Tasarım Kavramında Yaşanan Öze Dönük Paradigma Değişimi Ve Mekân Tasarımına Yönelik Açılımları. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sanat & Tasarım Dergisi* . [[Crossref](#)]

89. Fatma İNCE. 2018. TEKNOLOJİNİN ÖRGÜTSEL DEĞİŞİMDEKİ ROLÜ: TAKI TASARIMI İNCELEMESİ. *Sosyal Araştırmalar ve Yönetim Dergisi* :1, 57-67. [[Crossref](#)]
90. Paola Bertola, Jose Teunissen. 2018. Fashion 4.0. Innovating fashion industry through digital transformation. *Research Journal of Textile and Apparel* **22**:4, 352-369. [[Crossref](#)]
91. Muhammad Tauqeer, Knut Bang. 2018. Servitization: A Model for the Transformation of Products into Services through a Utility-Driven Approach. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity* **4**:4, 60. [[Crossref](#)]
92. J. Douglas Storey, Stella O. Babalola, Emily E. Ricotta, Kathleen A. Fox, Michael Toso, Nan Lewicky, Hannah Koenker. 2018. Associations between ideational variables and bed net use in Madagascar, Mali, and Nigeria. *BMC Public Health* **18**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
93. Steven Chen, Ray Benedictus, Yuna Kim, Eric Shih. 2018. Teaching Design Thinking in Marketing: Linking Product Design and Marketing Strategy in a Product Development Class. *Journal of Marketing Education* **40**:3, 176-187. [[Crossref](#)]
94. Rowan Page. 2018. Integrating The User Into The Formative Stages of Medical Device Usability Design: A Speculative and Collaborative Approach. *The Design Journal* **21**:6, 863-872. [[Crossref](#)]
95. Luis Enrique Valdez-Juárez, Omar Javier Solano-Rodríguez, Dominique Philippe Martin. 2018. Modes of learning and profitability in Colombian and Mexican SMEs. *The Journal of High Technology Management Research* **29**:2, 193-203. [[Crossref](#)]
96. Maria Sääksjärvi, Milene Gonçalves. 2018. Creativity and meaning: including meaning as a component of creative solutions. *Artificial Intelligence for Engineering Design, Analysis and Manufacturing* **32**:4, 365-379. [[Crossref](#)]
97. Stefano Andreani, Matteo Kalchschmidt, Roberto Pinto, Allen Sayegh. 2018. Reframing technologically enhanced urban scenarios: A design research model towards human centered smart cities. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* . [[Crossref](#)]
98. Wan-Lin Hu, Tahira Reid. 2018. The Effects of Designers' Contextual Experience on the Ideation Process and Design Outcomes. *Journal of Mechanical Design* **140**:10. . [[Crossref](#)]
99. Jonas Lundberg, Mattias Arvola, Carl Westin, Stefan Holmlid, Mathias Nordvall, Billy Josefsson. 2018. Cognitive work analysis in the conceptual design of first-of-a-kind systems – designing urban air traffic management. *Behaviour & Information Technology* **37**:9, 904-925. [[Crossref](#)]
100. Bradley Camburn, Kristin Wood. 2018. Principles of maker and DIY fabrication: Enabling design prototypes at low cost. *Design Studies* **58**, 63-88. [[Crossref](#)]
101. Tahseen Arshi, Paul Burns. 2018. Entrepreneurial Architecture. *The Journal of Entrepreneurship* **27**:2, 151-179. [[Crossref](#)]
102. Mir Dost, Muhammad Arshad, Bilal Afsar. 2018. The Influence of Entrepreneurial Orientation on Types of Process Innovation Capabilities and Moderating Role of Social Capital. *Entrepreneurship Research Journal* **8**:4. . [[Crossref](#)]
103. Soe-Tsyr Daphne Yuan, Ching-Fang Hsieh. 2018. An impactful crowdsourcing intermediary design - a case of a service imagery crowdsourcing system. *Information Systems Frontiers* **20**:4, 841-862. [[Crossref](#)]
104. İlgin Eroğlu. 2018. Analysis of Student Admission Methods of Two Industrial Product Design Departments in Turkey and Innovation Capabilities: A Conceptual Framework. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Güzel Sanatlar Fakültesi Dergisi* :20, 53-61. [[Crossref](#)]
105. Marianna Nigra, Branka Dimitrijevic. 2018. Is radical innovation in architecture crucial to sustainability? Lessons from three Scottish contemporary buildings. *Architectural Engineering and Design Management* **14**:4, 272-291. [[Crossref](#)]
106. Faisal Rasool, Pisut Koomsap, Bilal Afsar, Babrak Ali Panezai. 2018. A framework for disruptive innovation. *Foresight* **20**:3, 252-270. [[Crossref](#)]
107. Mónica Edwards-Schachter. 2018. The nature and variety of innovation. *International Journal of Innovation Studies* **2**:2, 65-79. [[Crossref](#)]

108. TUGBA GURCAYLILAR-YENIDOGAN, SAFAK AKSOY. 2018. APPLYING ANSOFF'S GROWTH STRATEGY MATRIX TO INNOVATION CLASSIFICATION. *International Journal of Innovation Management* 22:04, 1850039. [[Crossref](#)]
109. Dan-Ling Zheng. 2018. Design thinking is ambidextrous. *Management Decision* 56:4, 736-756. [[Crossref](#)]
110. Ludovic Temple, Danielle Barret, Genowefa Blundo Canto, Marie-Hélène Dabat, Agathe Devaux-Spatarakis, Guy Faure, Etienne Hainzelin, Syndhia Mathé, Aurelie Toillier, Bernard Triomphe. 2018. Assessing impacts of agricultural research for development: A systemic model focusing on outcomes. *Research Evaluation* 27:2, 157-170. [[Crossref](#)]
111. Luca Simeone, Giustina Secundo, Giovanni Schiuma. 2018. Arts and design as translational mechanisms for academic entrepreneurship: The metaLAB at Harvard case study. *Journal of Business Research* 85, 434-443. [[Crossref](#)]
112. Mary Tate, Ivano Bongiovanni, Marek Kowalkiewicz, Peter Townson. 2018. Managing the "Fuzzy front end" of open digital service innovation in the public sector: A methodology. *International Journal of Information Management* 39, 186-198. [[Crossref](#)]
113. Beth-Anne Schuelke-Leech. 2018. A model for understanding the orders of magnitude of disruptive technologies. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 129, 261-274. [[Crossref](#)]
114. Rodrigo Magalhães. 2018. Human-Centred Organization Design. *The Design Journal* 21:2, 227-246. [[Crossref](#)]
115. Luis Enrique Valdez-Juárez, Domingo García-Pérez-de-Lema, Gonzalo Maldonado-Guzmán. 2018. ICT and KM, Drivers of Innovation and Profitability in SMEs. *Journal of Information & Knowledge Management* 17:01, 1850007. [[Crossref](#)]
116. Cory Hallam, Carlos Alberto Dorantes Dosamantes, Gianluca Zanella. 2018. Culture and social capital network effects on the survival and performance of high-tech micro and small firms. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development* 25:1, 81-106. [[Crossref](#)]
117. Tiia-Maria Tenhunen, Oldouz Moslemian, Kari Kammiovirta, Ali Harlin, Pirjo Kääriäinen, Monika Österberg, Tekla Tammelin, Hannes Orelma. 2018. Surface tailoring and design-driven prototyping of fabrics with 3D-printing: An all-cellulose approach. *Materials & Design* 140, 409-419. [[Crossref](#)]
118. Jakob Trischler, Simon J. Pervan, Stephen J. Kelly, Don R. Scott. 2018. The Value of Codesign. *Journal of Service Research* 21:1, 75-100. [[Crossref](#)]
119. Sylvia Xihui Liu, Huirong Liu, Yanmin Zhang. 2018. The New Role of Design in Innovation: A Policy Perspective from China. *The Design Journal* 21:1, 37-58. [[Crossref](#)]
120. Jamie Brassett, John O'Reilly. Collisions, Design and the Swerve 71-98. [[Crossref](#)]
121. Hye Park, Seda McKilligan. A Systematic Literature Review for Human-Computer Interaction and Design Thinking Process Integration 725-740. [[Crossref](#)]
122. Barbara Millet. UX Research Methods for Designing Interactive Media 85-113. [[Crossref](#)]
123. Ricardo J. Hernández, Rachel Cooper, Bruce Tether, Emma Murphy. 2018. Design, the Language of Innovation: A Review of the Design Studies Literature. *She Ji: The Journal of Design, Economics, and Innovation* 4:3, 249-274. [[Crossref](#)]
124. Gerard H. Th. Bruijl. 2018. The Concept of Innovation Concerning Multinationals and Small-and-Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs) in a Competitive Environment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
125. Chi Nung Chu. A Web Accessibility Study Between the Degradation of Cognitive Perceptions and Physiology for the Aging People 847-851. [[Crossref](#)]
126. Dylan Wallace, Brian Barnard. 2018. Perceptions of Entrepreneurs and Innovators Regarding Radical Innovation: Fundamentals, Requirements, and Method. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
127. Youngsoo Shin, Chaerin Im, Hyosun Oh, Jinwoo Kim. 2017. Design for experience innovation: understanding user experience in new product development. *Behaviour & Information Technology* 36:12, 1218-1234. [[Crossref](#)]
128. Daniel Trabucchi, Elena Pellizzoni, Tommaso Buganza, Roberto Verganti. 2017. Interplay between technology and meaning: How music majors reacted?. *Creativity and Innovation Management* 26:4, 327-338. [[Crossref](#)]

129. Shu-Pei Tsai. 2017. Driving holistic innovation to heighten hotel customer loyalty. *Current Issues in Tourism* 20:15, 1604-1619. [[Crossref](#)]
130. . Bibliography 147-165. [[Crossref](#)]
131. Ferran Giones, Alexander Brem. 2017. From toys to tools: The co-evolution of technological and entrepreneurial developments in the drone industry. *Business Horizons* 60:6, 875-884. [[Crossref](#)]
132. Mieke van der Bijl-Brouwer, Kees Dorst. 2017. Advancing the strategic impact of human-centred design. *Design Studies* 53, 1-23. [[Crossref](#)]
133. Aleidis S Brandrud, Michael Bretthauer, Guttorm Brattebø, May JB Pedersen, Kent Håpnes, Karin Møller, Trond Bjorge, Bjørnar Nyen, Lars Strauman, Ada Schreiner, Gro S Haldorsen, Maria Bergli, Eugene Nelson, Tamara S Morgan, Per Hjortdahl. 2017. Local emergency medical response after a terrorist attack in Norway: a qualitative study. *BMJ Quality & Safety* 26:10, 806-816. [[Crossref](#)]
134. Meira Levy. Promoting the Elicitation of Usability and Accessibility Requirements in Design Thinking: Using a Designed Object as a Boundary Object 156-159. [[Crossref](#)]
135. Adrien Monsimer, Jean-Charles Maré, Pierre Sicaire. 2017. Requirements engineering for radical innovation - Application to helicopter engine fuel system. *INCOSE International Symposium* 27:1, 446-460. [[Crossref](#)]
136. Wendy Cukier, Samantha Jackson. Welcoming Syrian refugees to Canada technology-enabled social innovation 32-36. [[Crossref](#)]
137. Mina Nasiri, Nina Tura, Ville Ojanen. Developing Disruptive Innovations for Sustainability: A Review on Impact of Internet of Things (IOT) 1-10. [[Crossref](#)]
138. Teresa Blanco, Roberto Casas, Eduardo Manchado-Pérez, Ángel Asensio, Jose M. López-Pérez. 2017. From the islands of knowledge to a shared understanding: interdisciplinarity and technology literacy for innovation in smart electronic product design. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education* 27:2, 329-362. [[Crossref](#)]
139. Ilgım Eroğlu, Süha Erda. 2017. Türkiye'deki Televizyon Üreticilerinin İnovasyon Karakteristikleri Üzerine Bir İnceleme. *Tasarım + Kuram* 120-136. [[Crossref](#)]
140. Per Åman, Hans Andersson, Mike Hobday. 2017. The Scope of Design Knowledge: Integrating the Technically Rational and Human-Centered Dimensions. *Design Issues* 33:2, 58-69. [[Abstract](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
141. Cees de Bont, Sylvia Xihui Liu. 2017. Breakthrough Innovation through Design Education: Perspectives of Design-Led Innovators. *Design Issues* 33:2, 18-30. [[Abstract](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
142. Sandhya Kode, Erkki Sutinen. Enhancing Computing Education in India: A Design Story 82-86. [[Crossref](#)]
143. Claudio Dell'Era, Naiara Altuna, Stefano Magistretti, Roberto Verganti. 2017. Discovering quiescent meanings in technologies: exploring the design management practices that support the development of Technology Epiphanies. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management* 29:2, 149-166. [[Crossref](#)]
144. R. Samuel Sale, Hani I. Mesak, R. Anthony Inman. 2017. A dynamic marketing-operations interface model of new product updates. *European Journal of Operational Research* 257:1, 233-242. [[Crossref](#)]
145. Moyan M. Mustaquim, Tobias Nyström. Some Aspects of Using Universal Design as a Redesign Strategy for Sustainability 49-60. [[Crossref](#)]
146. Gianluca Borghini, Pietro Aricò, Gianluca Di Flumeri, Fabio Babiloni. Introduction 1-11. [[Crossref](#)]
147. David Soasti Baretta, Gerardo Muñoz. Conceptual Model for the Explanation of the Phenomenon of Radical Innovation in the Disruption of the Internet of Things, on Scales of Smart Objects, Homes and Cities 103-108. [[Crossref](#)]
148. Andreas Engelen, Clara von Gagern. Umweltbezogene Tools der Opportunity Recognition 157-228. [[Crossref](#)]
149. Meira Levy. Design Thinking in Multidisciplinary Learning Teams: Insights from Multidisciplinary Teaching Events 101-109. [[Crossref](#)]
150. Peter F.-J. Niermann, Fabrizio Palmas. Das kreative Management 333-354. [[Crossref](#)]
151. Christopher A. Jensen. 2017. Staged Competition as a Driver of Construction Innovation. *Procedia Engineering* 196, 872-879. [[Crossref](#)]
152. Caroline Gagnon, Valérie Côté. Design and Innovation Beyond Methods 379-390. [[Crossref](#)]
153. Paola Bertola, Chiara Colombi, Federica Vacca. Managing the Creative Process 159-188. [[Crossref](#)]

154. Sara Diamond, Steve Sziget, Ana Jofre. Building Tools for Creative Data Exploration: A Comparative Overview of Data-Driven Design and User-Centered Design 514-527. [[Crossref](#)]
155. Burcu Özdirlilik, Frédérique Pallez. 2017. Au nom de l'usager : co-concevoir la relation au public dans une mairie. *Sciences du Design* n° 5:1, 69. [[Crossref](#)]
156. Denis Pellerin, Marie Coirié. 2017. Design et hospitalité : quand le lieu donne leur valeur aux soins de santé. *Sciences du Design* n° 6:2, 40. [[Crossref](#)]
157. Rauno Rusko, Petra Merenheimo. Co-Creating the Christmas Story 137-157. [[Crossref](#)]
158. Tiago Camacho, Marcus Foth, Andry Rakotonirainy, Markus Rittenbruch, Jonathan Bunker. 2016. The role of passenger-centric innovation in the future of public transport. *Public Transport* 8:3, 453-475. [[Crossref](#)]
159. JULIA KATHERINE HAINES. 2016. Meaningful Innovation: Ethnographic Potential in the Startup and Venture Capital Spheres. *Ethnographic Praxis in Industry Conference Proceedings* 2016:1, 175-200. [[Crossref](#)]
160. Heekyung Moon, Sung H. Han. 2016. A creative idea generation methodology by future envisioning from the user experience perspective. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics* 56, 84-96. [[Crossref](#)]
161. Mikael Wahlström, Hannu Karvonen, Leena Norros, Jussi Jokinen, Hanna Koskinen. 2016. Radical Innovation by Theoretical Abstraction – A Challenge for The User-centred Designer. *The Design Journal* 19:6, 857-877. [[Crossref](#)]
162. Sittimont Kanjanabootra. 2016. Design Science method and theory in a construction and engineering context: “a phronetic tale of research”. *Engineering Project Organization Journal* 6:2-4, 64-77. [[Crossref](#)]
163. Mona Ashok, Rajneesh Narula, Andrea Martinez-Noya. 2016. How do collaboration and investments in knowledge management affect process innovation in services?. *Journal of Knowledge Management* 20:5, 1004-1024. [[Crossref](#)]
164. KwanMyung Kim, Kun-pyo Lee. 2016. Collaborative product design processes of industrial design and engineering design in consumer product companies. *Design Studies* 46, 226-260. [[Crossref](#)]
165. Bangsil (Esther) Lee, Jina Kang. 2016. The Power of Peripheral Innovation: A Case Study of AmorePacific's Cushion Foundation. *Research-Technology Management* 59:4, 21-29. [[Crossref](#)]
166. E. A. Pinkard, A. P. O'grady. 2016. Innovation in the forest industry: ready or not!. *Australian Forestry* 79:3, 153-156. [[Crossref](#)]
167. Kate Cheyne, Kirsty McDougall. 2016. Seismic Shifts: A Structural Health Monitoring Textile. *Journal of Textile Design Research and Practice* 4:2, 129-152. [[Crossref](#)]
168. Chyun-Chau Lin, Chun-Fu Chen. Applying TRIZ to develop radical innovations for knife sheaths 1-4. [[Crossref](#)]
169. Andrea Caputo, Giacomo Marzi, Massimiliano Matteo Pellegrini. 2016. The Internet of Things in manufacturing innovation processes. *Business Process Management Journal* 22:2, 383-402. [[Crossref](#)]
170. Paola Bertola, Federica Vacca, Chiara Colombi, Valeria M. Iannilli, Matteo Augello. 2016. The Cultural Dimension of Design Driven Innovation. A Perspective from the Fashion Industry. *The Design Journal* 19:2, 237-251. [[Crossref](#)]
171. Alfredo De Massis, Federico Frattini, Josip Kotlar, Antonio Messeni Petruzzelli, Mike Wright. 2016. Innovation Through Tradition: Lessons From Innovative Family Businesses and Directions for Future Research. *Academy of Management Perspectives* 30:1, 93-116. [[Crossref](#)]
172. Stephen Fox. 2016. Open prosperity: How latent realities arising from virtual-social-physical convergence (VSP) increase opportunities for global prosperity. *Technology in Society* 44, 92-103. [[Crossref](#)]
173. Peter Hehenberger, David Bradley. Conclusions 255-259. [[Crossref](#)]
174. Tamir Agmon, Stefan Sjögre. 37. [[Crossref](#)]
175. Avril Accolla, Luigi Bandini Buti. Ask Yourself the Right Question. To Know and Understand the Beauty of Human Diversity It Is the First Design Step: A Design for All Structured and Autopoietic Tool 131-140. [[Crossref](#)]
176. Jurgita Giniuniene, Lolita Jurksiene. 2015. Dynamic Capabilities, Innovation and Organizational Learning: Interrelations and Impact on Firm Performance. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 213, 985-991. [[Crossref](#)]

177. Andy Dong. 2015. Design × innovation: perspective or evidence-based practices †. *International Journal of Design Creativity and Innovation* 3:3-4, 148-163. [[Crossref](#)]
178. Tommaso Buganza, Claudio Dell'Era, Elena Pellizzoni, Daniel Trabucchi, Roberto Verganti. 2015. Unveiling the Potentialities Provided by New Technologies: A Process to Pursue Technology Epiphanies in the Smartphone App Industry. *Creativity and Innovation Management* 24:3, 391-414. [[Crossref](#)]
179. Francesco Izzo, Barbara Masiello. 2015. Strategie di innovazione nelle imprese creative di servizi. *ECONOMIA E DIRITTO DEL TERZIARIO* :1, 63-104. [[Crossref](#)]
180. Mohammad Ghasemi, Amir Hossein khoshakhlagh, Sadrollah Mahmudi, Mohammad Gholami Fesharaki. 2015. Identification and Assessment of Medical Errors in Triage Area of an Educational Hospital Using SHERPA Technique in IRAN. *International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics* 1-15. [[Crossref](#)]
181. Serena Camere, Monica Bordegoni. 2015. A strategy to support Experience Design process: the principle of Accordance. *Theoretical Issues in Ergonomics Science* 16:4, 347-365. [[Crossref](#)]
182. Sergio Barile, Marialuisa Saviano, Cristina Simone. 2015. Service economy, knowledge, and the need for T-shaped innovators. *World Wide Web* 18:4, 1177-1197. [[Crossref](#)]
183. Nina Veflen Olsen. 2015. Design Thinking and food innovation. *Trends in Food Science & Technology* 41:2, 182-187. [[Crossref](#)]
184. Jinwoo Kim. Creative Conflicts and Dynamic Balancing 65-88. [[Crossref](#)]
185. Seth C. Oranburg. 2015. The Non-Pecuniary Value of Equity Crowdfunding. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
186. Christophe Pennetier, Karan Girotra, Jurgen Mihm. 2015. R&D Spending: Dynamic or Persistent?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
187. Calvin Martin. 2015. Seeing the Unseen: Sensemaking as a Deliberate Strategy for Radical Innovation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
188. Moyeen Mohammad Mustaqim, Tobias Nyström. Information System Design Space for Sustainability 39-54. [[Crossref](#)]
189. Tobias Nyström, Moyeen M. Mustaqim. Universal design as a cause of triggering innovation levels for sustainability-a deliberative concept 114-121. [[Crossref](#)]
190. Adriana Chammas, Manuela Quaresma, Cláudia Renata Mont'Alvão. Children's Mental Model as a Tool to Provide Innovation in Digital Products 23-33. [[Crossref](#)]
191. Jin Ma. When Human-Centered Design Meets Social Innovation: The Idea of Meaning Making Revisited 349-360. [[Crossref](#)]
192. Dhruv Sharma, Lynne Blair, Stephen Clune. Developing Radical-Digital Interventions to Tackle Loneliness Amongst the Elderly 170-180. [[Crossref](#)]
193. Nicholas D. Fila, Justin Hess, Avneet Hira, Cole H. Joslyn, DeLean Tolbert, Morgan M. Hynes. The people part of engineering: Engineering for, with, and as people 1-9. [[Crossref](#)]
194. Alessandro Deserti, Francesca Rizzo. 2014. Design and Organizational Change in the Public Sector. *Design Management Journal* 9:1, 85-97. [[Crossref](#)]
195. Helge Löbler, Robert F. Lusch. 2014. Signs and Practices as Resources in IT-Related Service Innovation. *Service Science* 6:3, 190-205. [[Crossref](#)]
196. Alma L. Culén, Asbjørn Følstad. Innovation in HCI 849-852. [[Crossref](#)]
197. D. Opresnik, C. Zanetti, M. Taisch. Design Driven Product-Service innovation in manufacturing 265-269. [[Crossref](#)]