

Commercialization Intelligence: Aligning Product Strategy, Pricing Architecture, and Go-To-Market Execution

ATAKAN BOLUKBASI

Abstract—In technology-driven markets, commercialization failure often stems not from weak products but from misalignment among product strategy, pricing architecture, and go-to-market execution. Organizations frequently treat these domains as sequential or siloed processes rather than as interdependent components of a unified revenue system. This paper develops a conceptual framework for commercialization intelligence—defined as the integrative capability to align product design, value capture mechanisms, and market activation strategies within a coherent decision architecture. Drawing from strategic management theory, pricing economics, and commercialization research, the study argues that sustainable growth depends on systemic coordination rather than tactical optimization. It proposes an integrative model linking product positioning, pricing structure, sales enablement, and capital allocation logic. The paper contributes to both theory and managerial practice by reframing commercialization as a governance challenge embedded in enterprise design.

Keywords—Commercialization Strategy; Product Strategy; Pricing Architecture; Go-To-Market Execution; Revenue Systems; Value Capture; Market Alignment; Strategic Governance; Technology Management

I. INTRODUCTION: THE FRAGMENTATION PROBLEM IN COMMERCIALIZATION

Commercialization is often conceptualized as the final step in product development—a downstream function that activates revenue once product-market fit has been achieved. Yet in contemporary technology organizations, commercialization is not an endpoint; it is a system. Misalignment between product strategy, pricing logic, and go-to-market execution can undermine even technically superior offerings.

Technology firms frequently excel at innovation while underinvesting in commercialization architecture. Product teams define feature roadmaps based on user insight. Pricing teams adjust rates in response to competitive pressure. Sales and

marketing teams launch campaigns to accelerate adoption. However, when these domains operate independently, the revenue system becomes fragmented.

This fragmentation produces predictable distortions. Pricing may not reflect the value drivers embedded in product architecture. Sales incentives may prioritize volume over strategic segment focus. Marketing messaging may overpromise capabilities misaligned with roadmap priorities. The result is revenue leakage—where potential value capture dissipates through structural misalignment.

Commercialization intelligence addresses this gap. It represents the integrative capability to align product design decisions, pricing architecture, and go-to-market execution within a unified strategic logic. Rather than treating commercialization as a tactical function, this perspective positions it as an enterprise-level governance mechanism.

The central thesis of this paper is that high-growth technology organizations require systemic alignment across product strategy, pricing structure, and go-to-market execution. Commercialization success depends on architectural coherence, not sequential handoff.

The sections that follow build a theoretical foundation for this argument, then develop an integrated commercialization intelligence framework capable of guiding strategic decision-making at scale.

II. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS: STRATEGY, VALUE CREATION, AND VALUE CAPTURE

Commercialization intelligence rests on a foundational distinction in strategic management theory: the difference between value creation and value capture. Firms create value through innovation,

differentiation, and capability development; they capture value through pricing architecture, positioning, and appropriation mechanisms. In technology organizations, these processes are frequently separated institutionally, yet they are inseparable economically.

The resource-based view posits that sustainable competitive advantage derives from valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable capabilities. However, even when such capabilities exist, economic returns depend on effective appropriation. A product that generates significant user utility may fail commercially if pricing architecture underprices differentiated value or if go-to-market execution fails to communicate positioning effectively.

Industrial organization theory further clarifies this relationship. Competitive advantage emerges not solely from cost leadership or differentiation but from structural alignment between firm capabilities and market structure. Pricing decisions mediate this alignment. They signal positioning, segment the market, and shape competitive response. Pricing is therefore not a tactical afterthought but a strategic design choice embedded within value architecture.

Commercialization also draws from market orientation theory. Firms that integrate market intelligence across functions outperform those that operate in silos. However, market orientation must extend beyond customer insight to encompass revenue system intelligence. Understanding willingness-to-pay, price elasticity, and segment heterogeneity requires systematic feedback loops that connect product design and pricing decisions to market response.

Another theoretical anchor lies in transaction cost economics. Firms structure exchange mechanisms to minimize coordination costs and protect value capture. Pricing architecture—subscription tiers, usage-based models, bundled offerings—shapes transaction boundaries between firm and customer. Poorly aligned pricing structures increase friction, reduce adoption, or invite arbitrage.

Dynamic capabilities theory introduces a temporal dimension. Markets evolve, and commercialization systems must adapt. Firms must sense changes in customer demand, seize emerging opportunities through pricing innovation, and reconfigure go-to-market execution accordingly. Commercialization

intelligence thus represents a dynamic integrative capability rather than a static framework.

These theoretical perspectives converge on a central insight: commercialization is not downstream of strategy; it is embedded within it. Product architecture defines potential value; pricing architecture determines value capture logic; go-to-market execution operationalizes exchange at scale. When these elements align, revenue systems compound. When misaligned, value dissipates.

The following section examines how product vision must be translated into commercial architecture, reframing commercialization as design challenge rather than execution afterthought.

III. FROM PRODUCT VISION TO COMMERCIAL ARCHITECTURE

Product vision is often articulated in aspirational terms: redefining workflows, transforming user experience, or unlocking new efficiencies. Yet vision alone does not generate revenue. Between product design and market performance lies an intermediate layer—commercial architecture. This architecture determines how value created by the product is structured, packaged, segmented, and delivered to the market.

Commercial architecture translates product capability into monetizable structure. It defines which features are bundled, which are tiered, which are premium, and which serve as entry points. It determines how customers experience value thresholds and how willingness-to-pay is activated. When product teams design features without considering commercial structure, pricing teams are left to retrofit monetization onto architecture that was never intended for scalable value capture.

The first dimension of commercial architecture concerns value segmentation. Not all customers derive identical benefit from a product. Enterprise clients may value integration depth and security compliance; small businesses may prioritize simplicity and affordability. Effective commercialization intelligence requires aligning feature development with segment-specific value propositions. Product roadmaps should anticipate pricing tiers rather than treat them as post-development adjustments.

A second dimension involves monetization logic. Subscription, usage-based, freemium, transactional, and hybrid models represent distinct structural choices. Each shapes user incentives differently. For example, usage-based pricing aligns revenue with intensity of engagement but may introduce volatility. Subscription models stabilize revenue but may discourage marginal usage expansion. Selecting monetization logic must reflect product usage dynamics and strategic positioning.

A third dimension relates to packaging coherence. Products rarely exist as single-feature offerings; they function as systems. Packaging decisions determine how these systems are presented. Bundling can enhance perceived value and increase switching costs, but excessive bundling may obscure differentiation or reduce pricing transparency. Commercial architecture must balance clarity and complexity.

Temporal alignment is also critical. Early-stage products may prioritize adoption over monetization, leveraging low entry barriers to build network effects. As maturity increases, monetization depth may expand. Commercial architecture should evolve alongside product lifecycle, avoiding premature monetization that suppresses adoption or delayed monetization that forfeits value capture.

Importantly, commercial architecture must be designed concurrently with product strategy. Feature prioritization influences monetization flexibility. For instance, designing modular feature sets enables differentiated pricing tiers. Embedding analytics instrumentation facilitates value-based pricing refinement. Architectural foresight enhances commercialization optionality.

When commercial architecture is misaligned with product design, distortions occur. Sales teams struggle to articulate pricing logic. Customers experience friction in feature gating. Revenue predictability weakens. Over time, such misalignment erodes strategic coherence.

Therefore, commercialization intelligence requires integration at the design stage. Product vision must anticipate monetization pathways. Pricing architecture must reflect value drivers embedded within the product. Go-to-market execution must reinforce this alignment.

The next section deepens the analysis by examining pricing architecture as structural design rather than tactical adjustment, exploring how pricing decisions shape organizational incentives and market positioning.

IV. PRICING AS STRUCTURAL DESIGN, NOT TACTICAL ADJUSTMENT

Pricing is frequently treated as a tactical lever—adjusted in response to competitive pressure, quarterly revenue targets, or sales feedback. In technology-driven markets, however, pricing architecture functions as structural design. It encodes strategic positioning, shapes customer behavior, and organizes internal incentives. Commercialization intelligence therefore requires elevating pricing from reactive instrument to architectural pillar.

At its core, pricing is a translation mechanism. It converts differentiated value into economic capture. Yet translation is never neutral. Pricing choices signal quality, define target segments, and influence competitive perception. A premium pricing model communicates exclusivity and capability depth; a freemium entry model signals accessibility and scale ambition. Thus, pricing is inseparable from brand and product identity.

Structural pricing design begins with understanding value drivers. Which features generate disproportionate utility? Which use cases correlate with retention? Which integrations deepen customer dependence? Pricing tiers should reflect these structural value gradients rather than arbitrary feature bundles. When pricing fails to map onto genuine value differentiation, customers perceive unfairness or confusion.

Usage-based pricing illustrates structural consequences vividly. When aligned with customer value metrics—such as transactions processed, data analyzed, or seats utilized—revenue scales with product engagement. However, poorly calibrated usage metrics can create friction, unpredictability, or cost anxiety. Pricing architecture must therefore balance alignment with simplicity.

Bundling strategies further demonstrate structural design. Bundling can cross-subsidize complementary products, reduce transaction costs,

and increase lifetime value. Yet excessive bundling may obscure price transparency or reduce perceived flexibility. Structural coherence demands that bundles reinforce product architecture rather than compensate for weak differentiation.

Internal organizational effects of pricing are equally significant. Sales compensation models, marketing messaging, and product roadmap prioritization often align around revenue targets. If pricing architecture emphasizes volume over margin, sales incentives may prioritize discounting. If pricing tiers are poorly differentiated, product teams may struggle to justify feature investments. Thus, pricing shapes internal behavior.

Another structural dimension involves elasticity intelligence. Commercialization systems must incorporate feedback loops that monitor willingness-to-pay, churn sensitivity, and discounting patterns. Data-driven refinement of pricing architecture enhances dynamic adaptability. Static pricing models in volatile markets quickly lose alignment with value perception.

Temporal evolution is also central. Early-stage products may prioritize market penetration pricing to accelerate adoption. Mature offerings may transition toward value-based pricing to deepen margin capture. Structural pricing design anticipates lifecycle shifts rather than reacting opportunistically.

Importantly, pricing cannot compensate for weak product-market alignment. Artificial discounting may accelerate short-term revenue but erodes perceived value. Commercialization intelligence requires ensuring that pricing architecture reinforces, rather than distorts, product positioning.

When pricing is treated structurally, it becomes a design discipline integrated with product development and go-to-market planning. It defines how value is segmented, how incentives align internally, and how the market perceives differentiation.

The next section expands this systemic perspective by reframing go-to-market execution not as a campaign, but as an execution system embedded within commercialization architecture.

V. GO-TO-MARKET AS AN EXECUTION

SYSTEM, NOT A CAMPAIGN

In many organizations, go-to-market (GTM) is treated as an episodic event—launch campaigns, promotional pushes, or sales enablement initiatives that accompany product releases. This framing understates its structural role. In reality, go-to-market is an execution system that operationalizes commercialization architecture. It translates strategic positioning and pricing logic into sustained market interaction.

A GTM system encompasses channel selection, sales process design, customer acquisition strategy, messaging coherence, and post-sale engagement mechanisms. When misaligned with product strategy and pricing architecture, even well-designed offerings fail to achieve scalable adoption.

The first structural dimension of GTM design concerns segmentation alignment. If product tiers target differentiated customer segments, GTM channels must reflect those distinctions. Enterprise-focused pricing architecture requires consultative sales motion and longer sales cycles. Self-serve pricing tiers necessitate digital acquisition, frictionless onboarding, and automated support. Misalignment between pricing structure and channel design introduces inefficiency and revenue leakage. Second, messaging coherence determines whether value propositions are communicated consistently. Marketing narratives must mirror the value segmentation embedded in pricing tiers. Sales enablement materials must articulate feature differentiation clearly. Fragmented messaging undermines perceived value and weakens pricing discipline.

Third, GTM systems shape feedback loops. Market response—conversion rates, win-loss analysis, churn patterns—provides intelligence that informs product and pricing refinement. Without structured feedback mechanisms, commercialization architecture remains static despite evolving market signals. Commercialization intelligence depends on continuous bidirectional learning.

Incentive systems also influence GTM performance. Sales compensation models aligned exclusively with volume may encourage discounting that erodes pricing architecture. Balanced metrics incorporating margin protection, segment penetration, and

customer lifetime value strengthen structural coherence.

Channel diversification adds complexity. Multi-channel strategies—direct sales, partners, marketplaces—expand reach but introduce governance challenges. Pricing consistency across channels, partner margin alignment, and brand positioning discipline become critical. Poor channel coordination leads to arbitrage, brand dilution, or internal conflict.

Temporal cadence further differentiates GTM systems from campaigns. Sustained commercialization requires repeatable processes—launch playbooks, customer onboarding frameworks, renewal workflows. Institutionalizing these processes reduces volatility and enhances scalability.

Crucially, GTM design influences organizational resource allocation. Marketing spend, sales headcount, and channel investments must align with product portfolio priorities. If GTM investment concentrates disproportionately on one segment while product roadmap emphasizes another, structural imbalance arises.

Thus, go-to-market is not peripheral execution but core component of commercialization intelligence. It activates revenue architecture and reinforces strategic alignment. When integrated coherently with product strategy and pricing design, GTM systems convert value creation into durable market position.

The next section synthesizes these elements into an integrated commercialization intelligence framework, articulating how product, pricing, and GTM decisions cohere within enterprise-level governance systems.

VI. COMMERCIALIZATION INTELLIGENCE AS AN INTEGRATIVE DECISION FRAMEWORK

Product strategy, pricing architecture, and go-to-market execution are often managed by different leadership functions, governed by different KPIs, and evaluated on different timelines. Commercialization intelligence emerges when these domains are integrated into a single decision architecture rather than treated as sequential

handoffs.

At its core, commercialization intelligence is a systemic capability. It requires visibility across value creation, value segmentation, and value activation. Instead of asking, “Is the product innovative?”, “Is pricing competitive?”, or “Is marketing effective?” in isolation, the integrative question becomes: “Does the commercialization system convert differentiated product capability into scalable, defensible revenue?”

An integrative framework rests on three pillars: strategic coherence, feedback integration, and capital discipline.

Strategic coherence ensures that product roadmap decisions anticipate monetization structure and channel motion. Feature prioritization reflects segment willingness-to-pay; pricing tiers reflect architectural modularity; GTM investments reinforce positioning embedded in product design. When coherence is present, internal trade-offs become transparent and aligned with overarching revenue logic.

Feedback integration connects market response to upstream decision-making. Win-loss analysis informs pricing adjustments. Usage analytics influence feature gating decisions. Customer acquisition cost trends shape channel optimization. Rather than operating as downstream signals, these inputs become structural drivers of roadmap refinement.

Capital discipline anchors commercialization intelligence within enterprise governance. Investments in marketing spend, sales expansion, pricing experimentation, and product development must be evaluated through unified ROI logic. Fragmented budgeting—where product, sales, and marketing operate with isolated financial metrics—creates distortion. Unified capital allocation aligns commercial architecture with growth ambition and margin objectives.

Decision cadence also defines intelligence maturity. Organizations that institutionalize cross-functional commercialization reviews—where product, pricing, and GTM leaders jointly assess performance—reduce misalignment risk. These forums elevate commercialization from tactical adjustment to governance mechanism.

Data infrastructure underpins integration. Unified dashboards tracking conversion rates, churn sensitivity, price realization, and segment performance provide shared analytical foundation. Without integrated data visibility, alignment depends excessively on anecdotal feedback.

Importantly, commercialization intelligence balances agility and discipline. Overly rigid structures inhibit experimentation, while excessive flexibility undermines pricing integrity and brand consistency. Governance systems must accommodate structured experimentation—A/B pricing tests, pilot segment launches—while protecting architectural coherence.

The integrative framework therefore positions commercialization as enterprise design challenge rather than functional optimization. It demands leadership capable of spanning product, finance, and revenue operations domains.

The next section examines organizational design implications—how firms must structure leadership roles, incentive systems, and decision forums to sustain commercialization alignment at scale.

VII. ORGANIZATIONAL DESIGN FOR COMMERCIAL ALIGNMENT

Commercialization intelligence cannot rely solely on analytical frameworks; it must be embedded within organizational structure. When product, pricing, and go-to-market functions operate as loosely connected departments, structural misalignment becomes predictable. Sustainable alignment requires deliberate design of authority, incentives, and decision forums.

One recurring challenge is fragmentation of ownership. Product leaders often own roadmap and feature prioritization. Finance or revenue operations teams oversee pricing analysis. Sales leadership drives go-to-market execution. Marketing controls messaging and demand generation. Without integrative governance, these domains optimize local objectives. Organizational design must therefore clarify cross-functional accountability for commercialization outcomes.

An effective structural response is the institutionalization of commercialization councils or

revenue strategy forums. These bodies convene product, pricing, marketing, sales, and finance leadership at regular intervals to evaluate performance through unified metrics. Their mandate extends beyond campaign review; they assess structural alignment across roadmap, monetization, and channel motion.

Role definition also matters. Enterprises increasingly appoint revenue strategy leaders or chief commercial officers with cross-functional mandate bridging product and sales domains. These roles act as integrative nodes, translating product innovation into monetization architecture and market activation systems. Their authority derives not from hierarchy alone but from enterprise-level accountability for revenue coherence.

Incentive alignment reinforces structural clarity. If product teams are evaluated solely on adoption metrics while sales teams are rewarded for short-term quota attainment, discounting behavior may erode pricing architecture. Balanced scorecards incorporating margin integrity, retention, and segment penetration encourage holistic behavior.

Information symmetry is another structural necessity. Shared dashboards, transparent pipeline analytics, and standardized performance reviews reduce informational silos. When data visibility is uneven, alignment deteriorates.

Decision rights must also be defined clearly. Who authorizes pricing changes? Who approves bundle modifications? Who determines channel expansion? Ambiguity in decision authority creates conflict and delays. Structured governance clarifies escalation pathways and prevents ad hoc adjustments that undermine strategic coherence.

Cultural norms reinforce structural mechanisms. Organizations that reward collaboration and long-term thinking are better positioned to sustain commercialization alignment. Conversely, adversarial dynamics between product and sales teams generate chronic tension and reactive decision-making.

Ultimately, organizational design transforms commercialization intelligence from conceptual aspiration into operational reality. Without structural reinforcement, even sophisticated frameworks fail

under growth pressure.

The next section explores the risks of misalignment and the systemic revenue leakage that emerges when commercialization architecture fragments.

VIII. RISK, MISALIGNMENT, AND REVENUE LEAKAGE

When product strategy, pricing architecture, and go-to-market execution drift apart, the consequences are rarely immediate collapse. Instead, misalignment manifests gradually—through margin erosion, inconsistent positioning, churn volatility, and stalled growth. Revenue leakage becomes systemic rather than episodic.

One of the most common sources of leakage is structural pricing dilution. If sales incentives reward volume without adequate guardrails, discounting becomes normalized. Over time, realized pricing deviates from intended architecture. This erosion undermines both profitability and brand positioning. Once customers anchor to discounted pricing, restoring discipline becomes difficult.

Another source arises from feature-value mismatch. When product roadmaps prioritize functionality that does not correspond to differentiated willingness-to-pay, pricing tiers lose clarity. Customers struggle to understand value differentiation. Sales teams compensate with promotional concessions, further weakening architecture integrity.

Channel misalignment generates additional distortion. For example, if enterprise-focused pricing is paired with predominantly digital self-serve acquisition channels, conversion efficiency declines. Conversely, overinvestment in direct sales for low-priced offerings inflates customer acquisition cost. Channel-product mismatch amplifies inefficiency.

Revenue leakage also emerges through segmentation confusion. If messaging blurs target segments, marketing spend disperses across heterogeneous audiences. Sales cycles elongate. Churn increases as misfit customers adopt products not aligned with their use cases.

Lifecycle mismanagement compounds risk. Aggressive monetization too early in product maturity may suppress adoption and weaken network

effects. Delayed monetization may habituate customers to underpriced access, constraining future margin expansion.

Operational fragmentation contributes further. When pricing updates are not synchronized across billing systems, contracts, and promotional materials, execution inconsistencies proliferate. Customers experience confusion, damaging trust.

Beyond financial leakage, strategic risk intensifies. Misalignment signals organizational incoherence to the market. Competitors may exploit positioning inconsistencies. Investor confidence may erode if growth lacks margin sustainability.

Mitigating these risks requires continuous alignment diagnostics. Organizations should periodically assess coherence across product roadmap, pricing realization, channel performance, and segment profitability. Early detection of drift enables corrective action before systemic leakage becomes entrenched.

Commercialization intelligence therefore functions not only as a growth enabler but as a risk management discipline. By institutionalizing alignment mechanisms, firms reduce the probability that fragmented decisions accumulate into structural inefficiency.

IX. COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE THROUGH COMMERCIAL COHERENCE

Sustained competitive advantage in technology markets increasingly depends not only on innovation velocity but on commercialization coherence. Firms capable of integrating product design, pricing architecture, and go-to-market execution create reinforcing cycles of growth and profitability.

Commercial coherence enhances margin durability. When pricing tiers align with genuine value differentiation and sales execution preserves pricing integrity, revenue scales without proportional cost escalation. Margin expansion funds further innovation, reinforcing competitive position.

Coherence also strengthens customer lifetime value. Aligned messaging attracts appropriately segmented customers. Pricing architecture reflects usage intensity and value realization. Product roadmap

prioritizes retention drivers. Together, these factors reduce churn and increase expansion revenue.

Operational efficiency benefits as well. Unified commercialization systems minimize internal conflict, reduce discounting friction, and streamline decision-making. Resource allocation becomes more predictable and strategically aligned.

Strategically, commercial coherence generates signaling power. Clear pricing logic and disciplined execution communicate confidence and maturity to the market. This signaling effect can differentiate firms in crowded categories where feature parity exists.

Importantly, commercialization coherence amplifies scalability. As firms expand into new geographies or verticals, integrated systems replicate more effectively than fragmented ones. Governance discipline becomes a multiplier rather than a constraint.

In contrast, innovation without commercialization alignment produces fragile growth—rapid expansion accompanied by margin instability and positioning ambiguity.

X. CONCLUSION

This paper has advanced the concept of commercialization intelligence as an integrative capability aligning product strategy, pricing architecture, and go-to-market execution. Rather than treating commercialization as downstream activation, the analysis positions it as a structural design challenge embedded within enterprise governance.

The framework developed herein argues that sustainable growth in technology organizations depends on architectural coherence across value creation and value capture mechanisms. Product decisions must anticipate monetization pathways. Pricing architecture must reflect genuine value segmentation. Go-to-market systems must operationalize strategic positioning consistently.

Misalignment among these domains produces systemic revenue leakage, strategic fragility, and organizational tension. Alignment, by contrast, generates margin durability, customer lifetime value

expansion, and scalable competitive advantage.

Future research may explore empirical relationships between commercialization coherence and enterprise valuation, examine governance maturity across industries, or analyze dynamic adaptation of pricing architectures under competitive pressure.

Ultimately, commercialization intelligence transforms revenue generation from tactical execution into strategic discipline. Firms that institutionalize alignment convert innovation into durable economic performance.

REFERENCES

- [1] Amit, R., & Zott, C. (2001). Value creation in e-business. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(6–7), 493–520. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.187>
- [2] Day, G. S. (1994). The capabilities of market-driven organizations. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(4), 37–52.
- [3] Hinterhuber, A. (2004). Towards value-based pricing—An integrative framework for decision making. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 33(8), 765–778.
- [4] Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). *The Balanced Scorecard: Translating Strategy into Action*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- [5] Liozu, S. M., & Hinterhuber, A. (2013). Pricing orientation, pricing capabilities, and firm performance. *Management Decision*, 51(3), 594–614.
- [6] Nagle, T. T., Hogan, J. E., & Zale, J. (2023). *The Strategy and Tactics of Pricing: A Guide to Growing More Profitably* (7th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- [7] Porter, M. E. (1980). *Competitive Strategy: Techniques for Analyzing Industries and Competitors*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- [8] Porter, M. E. (1985). *Competitive Advantage: Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- [9] Slater, S. F., & Narver, J. C. (1995). Market orientation and the learning organization. *Journal of Marketing*, 59(3), 63–74.
- [10] Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of sustainable enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(13), 1319–1350.
- [11] Teece, D. J. (2010). Business models,

business strategy and innovation. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2–3), 172–194.

- [12] Urban, G. L., & Hauser, J. R. (1993). *Design and Marketing of New Products* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- [13] Zott, C., Amit, R., & Massa, L. (2011). The business model: Recent developments and future research. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1019–1042.