WORKSHEET + WORKED EXAMPLE

Notice the Overlooked Opportunity

A checked opportunity hypothesis and a bounded experiment.

25 minutes | Innovator's Dilemma · Nonconsumption and low-end needs

Use it in three moves

1. Understand the logic that makes the current offer successful.
2. Talk to people who cannot use it or who need less than it provides.
3. Test a smaller offer and its operating model before calling it disruption.

What does the current model reward?

Describe the customer, performance standard, and financial or operating logic you already serve well.

Who cannot use it, or needs much less?

Look for nonconsumers and overserved users. Ask them directly; do not infer demand from a market-size slide.

What simpler option might serve that need?

Describe a usable offer and its constraints. An idea is not disruptive merely because it uses new technology.

Notice the Overlooked Opportunity

YOUR WORKING NOTES / CONTINUED

Why would our current rules reject it?

Examine margin expectations, sales incentives, approval thresholds, and service assumptions. Treat rejection as evidence to examine, not proof of brilliance.

Test the need and the operating model

Set a small scope, owner, permission, capacity limit, and stop condition. Avoid promising a product you cannot support.

What evidence earns another step?

Watch actual usefulness, demand, delivery cost, and who might be harmed or excluded.

A question for me

Whose unmet need disappears from our reports because they never became a customer?

See one way through

FICTIONAL WORKED EXAMPLE / NOT THE ANSWER TO YOUR SITUATION

What does the current model reward?

Our advisory service is designed for large clients who value comprehensive analysis and can fund a long engagement.

Who cannot use it, or needs much less?

Small teams cannot afford a full engagement. Some only need help interpreting one existing report; interview them before assuming they would pay for a simpler service.

What simpler option might serve that need?

A short guided review of one report, with explicit limits on analysis and follow-up. It would not replace a full advisory engagement.

Why would our current rules reject it?

The usual proposal process costs more time than the small engagement could support. Check whether a different intake can preserve quality.

Test the need and the operating model

Offer three clearly scoped trial sessions with informed participants. Limit total staff time to six hours and stop if the scope cannot protect service quality.

What evidence earns another step?

Ask whether the session changed a real decision. Record preparation and follow-up time. Rework or stop if the offer requires hidden unpaid analysis.

The thinking behind it

Who gets counted as a customer shapes what a team learns to value. Include excluded people without treating them as a cheap experiment or promising more than you can deliver.

Clayton Christensen's disruptive innovation theory describes entrants beginning with low-end customers or nonconsumers, often with simpler offers and different business models. It is narrower than "any major innovation." This original discovery activity explores those questions; it cannot predict which idea will disrupt a market.

Christensen Institute · Disruptive innovation

Read You Have a Culture Problem by Nic Payne