

Artifact Validity in Design Science Research (DSR): A Comparative Analysis of Three Influential Frameworks

Sylvana Kroop¹

University of Vienna, Faculty of Philosophy and Education
sylvana.kroop@univie.ac.at

Abstract. Although the methodology of Design Science Research (DSR) is playing an increasingly important role with the emergence of the ‘sciences of the artificial’, the validity of the resulting artifacts is occasionally questioned. This paper compares three influential DSR frameworks to assess their support for artifact validity. Using five essential validity types (instrument validity, technical validity, design validity, purpose validity and generalization), the qualitative analysis reveals that while purpose validity is explicitly emphasized, instrument and design validity remain the least developed. Their implicit treatment in all frameworks poses a risk of overlooked validation, and the absence of mandatory instrument validity can lead to invalid artifacts, threatening research credibility. Beyond these findings, the paper contributes (a) a comparative overview of each framework’s strengths and weaknesses and (b) a revised DSR framework incorporating all five validity types with definitions and examples. This ensures systematic artifact evaluation and improvement, reinforcing the rigor of DSR.

Keywords: design science research, artifact validity, validity types

1 Introduction

With the rise of the ‘sciences of the artificial’ [27], Design Science Research (DSR) methodology plays an increasingly important role and is gaining ground in higher education institutions much faster than in previous years and decades. With Hevner [9,8], DSR has become widespread and popular in the field of information technology, but also through intensive efforts in German-speaking countries, especially in business informatics [34], as it focuses on the creation of novel artifacts. As technically oriented disciplines often permeate all areas of life and play an important supporting role in all subject disciplines, the DSR methodology can be applied to the development of new artifacts of all kinds, from software to physical tools such as printed teaching materials or human body prostheses.

Although it seems to have been clear among DSR experts for decades what DSR can and cannot achieve, e.g. [20,17,27,7], this discussion has only just begun

in the context of the education, not only for doctoral students but also for master's students, e.g. [2,14,33,11,25]. Frequently asked questions are, for example: How complex can or must a DSR-based research design be in order to be mastered within the framework of a master's thesis? Is it necessary to validate the generalizability of the developed artifact? Is it sufficient that the effectiveness of the artifact is evaluated solely in the context of my company? As DSR becomes more widely used, doubts arise about the validity of the resulting artifacts.

De Sordi et al. (2020) conducted a content analysis of 152 articles to examine the longitudinal development of DSR projects and the types of artifacts involved. The results suggest that the use of DSR has grown rapidly over the years and that this growth is likely to continue in the future. However, the text further states that 86 % of DSR artifact evaluations are unrealistic, which means that the criteria used to evaluate the artifact are not practical or feasible in real-world scenarios. The authors call for research to make Design Science Research (DSR) more accessible and less confusing as authors, reviewers, and editors struggle to understand and follow DSR guidelines [6]. This may indeed be difficult, especially for reviewers who grew up in a world where 'truth' was only found in the nature of descriptive research.

This paper addresses the examination and comparison of three commonly used DSR frameworks, namely Hevner et al. [9], Peffers et al. [21], and an integrated framework combining Österle et al. [34] and Benner-Wickner et al. [2], and the question: to what extent do these three influential design science research (DSR) frameworks support the validity of artifacts? The fundamental question arises as to which types of validity are essential for the evaluation of an artifact. And the resulting question of how a DSR framework can be improved to emphasize the need for a thorough evaluation of an artifact's validity.

2 Methodology

In order to compare the three DSR frameworks with the question of the extent to which they support the validity of artifacts, five validity types were established a priori, which were derived both from experience in the assessment and supervision of DSR-based master's theses and from the basic literature [4,26,18,19,5].

Each of the five validity types (instruments validity, technical validity, design validity, purpose validity and generalization) proposed for the artifact evaluation in DSR corresponds to several well-known scientific validity concepts, as shown in the overview table in Figure 1.

The five validity types were then defined and demonstrated using examples for application in the context of design science research (DSR), see Sect. 4.2.

Finally, the five validity types were used to conduct a qualitative content analysis [15]. The core literature on the three DSR frameworks examined was primarily the subject of the investigation in order to answer the central research question: To what extent do these three influential frameworks of Design Science Research (DSR) support the validity of artifacts?

Proposed Validity Type for DSR	Corresponding Validity Types in Basic Literature	References
Instrument Validity	Construct Validity, Measurement Validity	Cronbach & Meehl (1955): Introduced construct validity as the extent to which a test measures the concept it is intended to measure. Messick (1989): Expanded construct validity to include consequential validity, ensuring interpretations are meaningful. Cook & Campbell (1979), Shadish et al. (2002): Emphasized measurement validity as essential in research design.
Technical Validity	Reliability, Internal Validity	Cook & Campbell (1979): Defined internal validity as ensuring causal conclusions are justified. Shadish et al. (2002): Emphasized reliability as the consistency of measurements, a critical component of technical validity.
Design Validity	Usability, Aesthetic Quality, Ecological Validity	Messick (1989): Discussed how validity should consider the impact of design on interpretation and use. Shadish et al. (2002): Ecological validity considers real-world applicability, relevant to usability.
Purpose Validity	Internal Validity, Construct Validity	Cook & Campbell (1979), Shadish et al. (2002): Internal validity ensures that findings align with the intended purpose of the study. Messick (1989): Construct validity also covers whether an artifact meets its theoretical intent.
Generalization (External Validity)	External Validity, Transferability	Cook & Campbell (1979): Defined external validity as the extent to which findings apply beyond the studied sample. Shadish et al. (2002): Highlighted the importance of transferability to other contexts.

Fig. 1. Type of validity categories used a priori for qualitative content analysis

3 Related Work

Similar work comparing the three selected DSR frameworks in terms of support for artifact validity has not yet been conducted. The overview table in Figure 2 shows how frequently cited literature on artifact evaluation, and other extensive literature, e.g. [9,8,10,24,28,7,30,29,12,13,22,1,16,31,32,3,2,23,34,21], relate to the five validity types applied here. In particular, 'instrument validity' as a mandatory prerequisite for a valid artifact (see Sect. 4.3) is difficult to find in all three DSR frameworks examined here. Sonnenberg & vom Brocke [28] is one of the few studies that clearly points out the need to evaluate the design and the construct separately and in interaction with the problem to be evaluated. This

can be equated with the need for 'instrument validity'. Although this model increases the basic evaluation effort, it ensures potentially valid artifacts in the end. Nevertheless, there has been a lack of consideration and differentiation of the five types of validity clearly defined here as an integral part of a comprehensive DSR framework.

DSR Validity Type	Corresponding DSR Validity Concepts or Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation in DSR
Instrument Validity	Construct Validity, Model Validity, Measurement Rigor	Hevner et al. (2004) : Emphasized rigor but did not explicitly define instrument validity. Prat, Comyn-Wattiau, & Akoka (2015) : Included construct validity in their DSR evaluation framework. Sonnenberg & Vom Brocke (2012) : Stressed the need for rigorous evaluation of constructs. Österle et al. (2010) & Benner-Wickner et al. (2020) : Implicitly address measurement rigor but do not explicitly distinguish instrument validity as a separate criterion.
Technical Validity	Reliability, Internal Consistency, Correctness of Artifacts	Hevner et al. (2004) : Discussed research rigor but did not define technical validity explicitly. Peffers et al. (2007) : The evaluation phase includes functional correctness. Venable et al. (2016) : Addressed reliability and internal validity in DSR evaluations. Österle et al. (2010) & Benner-Wickner et al. (2020) : Emphasize technical feasibility and correctness as part of artifact evaluation.
Design Validity	Usability, Aesthetic Quality, User-Centered Design, Utility	Gregor & Hevner (2013) : Stressed utility as a key DSR evaluation criterion. Iivari (2007) : Discussed how DSR should integrate human-centered design. Sonnenberg & Vom Brocke (2012) : Included usability as an evaluation criterion. Österle et al. (2010) & Benner-Wickner et al. (2020) : Acknowledge usability but do not systematically define design validity as a distinct evaluation category.
Purpose Validity	Relevance, Utility, Problem-Solution Fit	Hevner et al. (2004) : Defined problem relevance as a key DSR guideline. Peffers et al. (2007) : The DSR process model begins with problem identification, ensuring purpose validity. Gregor & Hevner (2013) : Stressed that DSR must align with real-world needs. Österle et al. (2010) & Benner-Wickner et al. (2020) : Strongly emphasize problem relevance and practical utility as core aspects of DSR.
Generalization (External Validity)	External Validity, Transferability of Artifacts, Adaptability	Hevner et al. (2004) : Discussed how DSR contributes to both practice and theory, implying the need for external validity. Prat, Comyn-Wattiau, & Akoka (2015) : Included external validity in their DSR evaluation framework. Venable et al. (2016) : Addressed transferability of DSR findings. Österle et al. (2010) & Benner-Wickner et al. (2020) : Emphasize diffusion of artifacts but do not explicitly address external validity as a formal evaluation construct.

Fig. 2. Type of validity categories, aligned with frequently cited DSR literature on artifact evaluation

4 Revised DSR framework focused on artifact validity

4.1 Revised DSR Framework

Compared to Hevner et.al [9] and Peffers et.al. [21], the DSR framework, originally developed and popularized by Österle et al. [34] and later put into a graphical form by Benner-Wickner et al. [2], is perhaps less well known because it is only available in German. However, due to its simplicity, it is rather popular among master students in German-speaking countries. Figure 3 is based on this - I call it - "integrated DSR framework", combining Österle et al. [34] and Benner-Wickner et al. [2].




Fig. 3. Revised DSR framework focused on artifact validity, based on the integrated DSR framework combining Österle et al. [34] and Benner-Wickner et al. [2]

The revision shown in Figure 3 is the extension made in the evaluation step to include the five proposed validity types. The five types of validity were harmonized with the main types of validity (construct, internal and external validity), which have been known and used for decades, see Figure 1. Furthermore, the ethical and ecological validity were pointed out, which should be addressed as standalone measurement instruments, but which would require a separate study. The five validity types are defined in more detail in Sect. 4.2 and demonstrated using examples.

4.2 Validity types

Although the rigor required in design science research (DSR) implicitly encompasses all five types of validity proposed here, none of the three compared frameworks explicitly refer to or differentiate between these fundamentally necessary types of validity. Therefore, they can easily be overlooked by students who rely exclusively on one of these popular DSR frameworks in their master's thesis. To ensure artifact validity, each validity type is defined in its core below, accompanied by a key question and examples, and discussed further in chap. 5.

Instruments validity ensures the evaluation instruments and metrics used to assess the artifact are reliable, accurate, and aligned with the constructs they are intended to measure. The KEY QUESTION is: Are the evaluation tools (e.g., surveys, log files, usability tests, experimental setups) valid and capable of accurately measuring what they are intended to measure?

EXAMPLE from everyday situations: When designing or using a thermometer for body temperature, it should accurately measure body temperature and not something else (e.g., room temperature or humidity). If a thermometer mistakenly reacts to the air temperature rather than body heat, it *lacks instruments validity* because it is not measuring what it is supposed to.

EXAMPLE of a DSR application: If a learning analytics dashboard is designed to track student engagement, *instruments validity* ensures that the selected metrics (e.g., time-on-task, login frequency) actually measure engagement rather than unrelated factors (e.g., technical errors causing inactivity).

Technical validity ensures the artifact performs as intended without bugs or glitches, focusing on technical reliability and functional correctness. The KEY QUESTION is: Does the artifact's technical functionality perform as intended and without problems?

EXAMPLE from everyday situations: A car's brakes must work correctly every time you press the pedal. If they function sometimes but fail at other times, the braking system *lacks technical validity* because it is unreliable and does not consistently perform its intended function.

EXAMPLE of a DSR application: A machine learning-based fraud detection system must be completely free of critical bugs, biases, or instability issues. If the system produces false fraud alerts due to faulty code, misclassifies legitimate transactions because of biased training data, or crashes under high transaction loads, it *lacks technical validity*. Such errors can lead to financial losses, customer distrust, and regulatory penalties, making error-free performance essential for reliable fraud detection.

Design validity evaluates the artifact's design from a subjective and aesthetic perspective, as well as its alignment with user expectations and contextual relevance. The KEY QUESTION is: Does the artifact exhibit good style, taste, and elegance, making it aesthetically pleasing and intuitive to users?

EXAMPLE from everyday situations: A chair might technically function (it allows sitting), but if it is uncomfortable, ugly, or too complex to use, it *lacks design validity*. A well-designed chair should be comfortable, aesthetically pleasing, and easy to sit on.

EXAMPLE of a DSR application: A finance dashboard for managers must not only provide accurate financial data but also be designed with clarity, usability, and efficiency in mind. If the dashboard is cluttered, difficult to navigate, or visually overwhelming, it *lacks design validity*, as poor design can hinder decision-making even when the data is correct. A well-designed dashboard enhances comprehension, streamlines analysis, and enables managers to make informed decisions quickly.

Purpose validity determines whether the artifact achieves its intended purpose by effectively solving the targeted problem with the defined requirements. The KEY QUESTION is: Does the artifact fulfill the intended goals (does it meet the defined requirements), and are the observed results attributable to the artifact itself (and not to confounding factors)?

EXAMPLE from everyday situations: A parachute's purpose is to slow down a person's fall. If a parachute doesn't open, opens too late, or fails to slow the fall, it *lacks purpose validity*, even if it was well-designed and made of high-quality materials.

EXAMPLE of a DSR application: A waste tracking app designed to help customers reduce landfill waste must be validated by measuring actual waste reduction against initial goals (e.g., a significant decrease in non-recyclable waste disposal per user). Even if the app correctly logs waste disposal data (*technical validity*), features a well-structured and visually appealing interface (*design validity*), and uses reliable tracking metrics (*instruments validity*), it *lacks purpose validity* if users do not actually reduce their waste. This failure could result from ineffective behavioral nudges, lack of actionable insights, or poor integration with waste disposal services, meaning the app does not fulfill its intended goal despite functioning as designed.

Generalization (external validity) assesses whether the performance and effectiveness of the artifact are transferable to other contexts, populations or environments. The KEY QUESTION is: Can the success of the artifact be repeated in other environments with similar results?

EXAMPLE from everyday situations: A good (universal) cell phone charger should work across multiple cell phone brands and models, not just for one specific device. If a charger only works for one phone and fails for others, it lacks generalization validity.

EXAMPLE of a DSR application: A predictive maintenance model developed for automobile engines may not perform well in other contexts, such as with aircraft engines or manufacturing machinery. Without testing the model in these different domains, it lacks generalization (external validity), meaning its effectiveness beyond the original domain remains uncertain.

4.3 Mandatory and Flexible Validity Types

The distinction between the five types of validity is essential, as they each relate to different aspects of the quality and impact of an artifact. Without differentiating between these aspects, critical weaknesses may be overlooked during the evaluation. While it is crucial to understand and differentiate between all five

validity types, their application should be flexible and context-dependent. Some projects require all five types, while others may only focus on the most relevant ones. In any case, Evaluation should be systematic, meaning that validity aspects should not be arbitrarily combined or reduced to a single category, such as purpose validity. The structured consideration of all five validity types ensures a rigorous, meaningful and context-sensitive research evaluation.

Essential (Mandatory) Validity Types:

- *Instrument Validity* – Ensures that the constructs, measures, and theoretical foundations of research are valid. Without it, the entire study may lack credibility.
- *Purpose Validity* – Establishes the relevance and utility of the research. Any study should have a clear purpose and contribute meaningfully to knowledge or practice.

More Flexible Validity Types (Depending on Research Context):

- *Technical Validity* – Essential for implemented artifacts but less relevant for theoretical work that does not involve direct technological instantiation.
- *Design Validity* – Important in design-based research but less critical in exploratory or purely theoretical studies where artifact structuring is not the focus.
- *Generalization (External Validity)* – Critical in empirical and applied research but not always required in context-specific or conceptual studies. Some research deliberately focuses on niche scenarios without aiming for generalization.

5 Discussion of the five types of validity

5.1 Instruments Validity

Hevner et al. (2004) emphasize rigor in research methods but do not explicitly define instrument validity. While they stress that artifacts should be evaluated using reliable metrics (p. 85), they do not differentiate between validity of the artifact and validity of the instruments used for evaluation. This can lead to methodological weaknesses, as unreliable measurement tools could compromise artifact assessment. As a result, instrument validity remains an implicit concern rather than a structured requirement.

Peppers et al. (2007) integrate evaluation as a core phase of their DSR process model, yet they do not explicitly address instrument validity. The framework assumes that research evaluations inherently produce valid findings but does not provide guidance on verifying the accuracy of evaluation instruments. Since measurement errors could affect the validity of conclusions, the absence of explicit considerations for instrument validity leaves a methodological gap, making it one of the least developed aspects.

Österle et al. (2010) and **Benner-Wickner et al. (2020)** emphasize scientific rigor but do not formally distinguish instrument validity as a critical component of evaluation. Although their structured four-phase DSR model (analysis, design, evaluation, diffusion) suggests systematic assessment, it does not explicitly ensure that the instruments used for evaluation are valid. This oversight reinforces the tendency to assume rather than verify measurement validity, making instrument validity among the least developed aspects across all three frameworks.

5.2 Technical validity

Hevner et al. (2004) acknowledge technical validity by emphasizing rigorous evaluation to assess artifact quality. Guideline 3 (Design Evaluation) states that artifacts should be evaluated based on functionality, reliability, accuracy, and performance (p. 85). However, technical aspects are considered within broader purpose validity, meaning artifacts are assessed for effectiveness rather than systematically verifying their technical soundness. This can create risks. For example, a learning software tested on students may fail, not due to purpose misalignment, but because of technical issues such as excessive bugs. Despite mentioning evaluation methods such as experiments and simulations (p. 86), Hevner et al. do not establish technical validity as a distinct prerequisite, making it acknowledged but only partially considered.

Peppers et al. (2007) integrate evaluation into their DSR process model, requiring researchers to demonstrate artifact effectiveness (p. 56). However, like Hevner et al., they do not explicitly distinguish technical validity from purpose or design validity. The focus is on relevance and utility, which align more with purpose validity. While iterative improvement through feedback loops helps refine artifacts, the framework lacks systematic validation techniques. This can lead to a situation where an artifact is assessed for effectiveness before its technical reliability is fully ensured, increasing risks in practical applications. By prioritizing usability and problem relevance without explicitly addressing technical rigor, technical validity is acknowledged but only partially considered.

Österle et al. (2010) and **Benner-Wickner et al. (2020)** provide a structured DSR process (analysis, design, evaluation, diffusion) but, like earlier frameworks, do not explicitly define technical validity as a separate requirement. However, they integrate empirical standards from software engineering research ([23]). This inclusion strengthens technical validation compared to Hevner et al. and Peppers et al., yet the framework still lacks a formalized, distinct technical validity assessment. Instead, it assumes that evaluation inherently addresses technical concerns without making them an explicit focus. While this framework recognizes the importance of technical soundness, it remains only partially considered, embedded within broader evaluation processes rather than treated as a separate, required step.

5.3 Design validity

Hevner et al. (2004) emphasize artifact utility but do not explicitly define design validity as a distinct evaluation criterion. While they discuss usability, completeness, and functionality as relevant quality attributes (p. 85), they do not provide systematic methods to assess coherence, user experience, or aesthetic quality. The framework prioritizes problem-solving and effectiveness over structured design validation, making design validity underdeveloped and largely assumed rather than explicitly assessed.

Peppers et al. (2007) acknowledge artifact usability as part of iterative refinement but do not explicitly define design validity. The DSR process model ensures that artifacts evolve based on feedback loops, but it does not establish specific design evaluation criteria. As a result, usability and aesthetic considerations remain secondary to functionality and problem-solving. Without clear guidance on assessing logical structure, clarity, or user-friendliness, design validity remains one of the least developed aspects.

Österle et al. (2010) and Benner-Wickner et al. (2020) emphasize practical relevance and structured evaluation, but design validity is not separately addressed. While their framework improves accessibility and application through a structured DSR process, it does not explicitly differentiate usability or aesthetic considerations from broader artifact evaluation. By focusing on practical implementation rather than formalized design assessment, design validity remains largely underdeveloped, similar to the other frameworks.

5.4 Purpose validity

Hevner et al. (2004) emphasize purpose validity by defining DSR as the creation of artifacts that improve organizational effectiveness and efficiency (p. 76). They state that artifacts must be purposeful, addressing key organizational problems (p. 82), reinforcing that utility and knowledge contribution are inseparable in DSR. The framework ensures feasibility assessment, confirming whether an artifact meets its intended purpose (p. 79).

Peppers et al. (2007) explicitly link DSR to problem-solving and human purpose (p. 55), stating that successful artifacts must meet predefined objectives (p. 46). Their DSR process model prioritizes problem identification and objectives as key research phases, ensuring artifacts are designed with clear intent and evaluated based on their effectiveness (p. 54). This structured approach reinforces the direct connection between problem relevance, utility, and knowledge contribution.

Österle et al. (2010) and Benner-Wickner et al. (2020) strongly emphasize practical relevance and societal impact by structuring DSR into analysis, design, evaluation, and diffusion phases, ensuring artifacts serve real-world needs. Benner-Wickner et al. enhance purpose validity further by transforming this structured process into a clear, visually accessible framework, making DSR principles easier to apply and reinforcing the artifact's practical relevance.

5.5 Generalization (external validity)

Hevner et al. (2004) recognize that DSR contributes to both practice and theory (p. 79) but do not explicitly emphasize external validity. While artifacts are intended to be applicable to real-world contexts, the framework does not focus on transferability or scalability beyond the initial problem space. Instead, it assumes that utility within the studied environment implies broader applicability, making generalization only somewhat addressed rather than a key concern.

Peffer et al. (2007) focus on artifact effectiveness within its intended context but provide no explicit guidance on how results can be generalized. Their DSR process model structures research around problem-solving and iterative refinement, yet it lacks formal mechanisms for testing whether findings hold across different settings. As a result, generalization remains secondary to immediate artifact applicability, meaning it is acknowledged but not strongly emphasized.

Österle et al. (2010) and Benner-Wickner et al. (2020) highlight practical impact and diffusion as a core DSR phase, which implies some focus on generalization. However, their emphasis on real-world problem-solving does not extend to explicitly ensuring external validity. While diffusion facilitates broader application, it does not establish formal validation mechanisms for ensuring that artifacts can be applied across multiple domains. Thus, generalization is acknowledged but remains a secondary concern, similar to the other frameworks.

6 Summarized assessment of the five validity types in the three DSR frameworks

The table in Figure 4 provides a summarized overview of how each of the DSR frameworks discussed in chap. 5 addresses the five types of validity. This overview should help researchers and students to quickly identify the strengths, weaknesses and gaps in the validity considerations of each DSR framework. It also leads to the recommendation to seek a more in-depth discussion about the validation of an artifact.

Figure 4 shows a summarized assessment of the five validity types defined in Sect. 4.2 in the three Design Science Research (DSR) frameworks of Hevner et al. (2004), Peffer et al. (2007) and the integrated DSR framework combining Österle et al. (2010) and Benner-Wickner et al. (2020). Each validity type is rated using a *qualitative scale*, represented with colored labels, ranging from **explicit consideration** (*most emphasized*) to **weak consideration** (*least emphasized*). From this, the following patterns and commonalities can be identified:

- Purpose validity is the most developed across all three frameworks.
- Technical validity is acknowledged in all three frameworks, but only partially considered.
- Generalization is somewhat addressed, but not strongly emphasized in any framework.
- Instrument validity and design validity are the least developed overall.

DSR Framework	Instruments Validity	Technical Validity	Design Validity	Purpose Validity	Generalization (External Validity)
Hevner et al. (2004)	● Implicit	● Partially	● Somewhat	● Explicit	● Somewhat
Peffers et al. (2007)	● Weakly	● Partially	● Weakly	● Explicit	● Somewhat
Österle et al. (2010) & Benner-Wickner et al. (2020)	● Implicit	● Partially	● Somewhat	● Explicit	● Somewhat

Index: Definition of the terms used in the table

- Explicit = The validity type is directly defined, emphasized, and required.
- Partially = The validity type is acknowledged, more developed than "Somewhat," but still not fully explicit.
- Somewhat = The validity type is referenced in related concepts but not given direct attention.
- Implicit = The validity type is lightly implied in broader discussions but not developed as a distinct concept.
- Weakly = The validity type is weakly or hardly addressed, requiring significant interpretation to find relevance.

Fig. 4. Consideration of the five validity types in three DSR frameworks

7 Conclusion and Future Work

This paper compares three influential DSR frameworks - Hevner et al. (2004), Peffers et al. (2007), and the integrated framework combining Österle et al. (2010) and Benner-Wickner et al. (2020) - to assess their support for artifact validity. Five essential validity types (instrument validity, technical validity, design validity, purpose validity, and generalization) were applied to the context of Design Science Research (DSR). The analysis reveals that while purpose validity is explicitly emphasized in all three frameworks, instrument validity and design validity remain the least developed.

Although DSR rigor implicitly encompasses all five validity types, none of the frameworks explicitly define or differentiate them. This poses a risk that mandatory instrument validity may be overlooked, leading to invalid artifacts and undermining research credibility. The biggest weakness arises when students or researchers rely solely on one of the frameworks without recognizing the need for deeper validation studies, particularly regarding instrument validity.

Differentiating these validity types is essential, as each addresses distinct aspects of an artifact's quality and impact, as demonstrated by examples in Sect. 4.2. While all five types are relevant, their application should be flexible, depending on the research context. Evaluation should not oversimplify validity

by subsuming it under a single category, such as purpose validity, but should systematically process each type to ensure comprehensive assessment.

To address these gaps, this paper provides (a) a comparative overview highlighting strengths and weaknesses in each framework and (b) a revised DSR framework that systematically integrates all five validity types with definitions and examples. This structured approach enhances the rigor and reliability of DSR research.

To address these gaps, this paper provides (a) a comparative overview highlighting strengths and weaknesses in each framework and (b) a revised DSR framework that systematically integrates all five validity types with definitions and examples. This structured approach enhances the rigor and reliability of DSR research.

Additionally, the lack of explicit emphasis on design validity, distinct from technical validity, is notable given that design is central to DSR. While design validity may not be as critical as instrument validity, greater focus on user-centric criteria - such as simplicity, taste, style, and elegance - could enhance artifact adoption and usability. The revised framework proposed in this paper acknowledges the role of such subjective and aesthetic factors and can be adapted to different types of artifacts (e.g., software, processes, physical tools), ensuring broad applicability.

Further research could validate the revised DSR framework through case studies and establish formal methods for instrument validity, and also include ethical and ecological validity as standalone measurement instruments. Exploring the impact of weak instrument validity and AI-driven assessments could enhance research credibility. Comparative analyses across domains may reveal best practices for ensuring validity. Addressing these issues will refine artifact evaluation, strengthening DSR's rigor and impact.

References

1. Zaha 1 1 Iowa State University Alonazi and K. S. A. Majmaah University. Examining validity in computerized dynamic assessment. pages 55–70, 2017. Num Pages: 55-70 Publisher: De Gruyter Poland.
2. Marian Benner-Wickner, Ralf Kneuper, and Inga Schlömer. Leitfaden für die Nutzung von Design Science Research in Abschlussarbeiten. Working Paper 2/2020, IUBH Discussion Papers - IT & Engineering, 2020.
3. Jan vom Brocke, Robert Winter, Alan Hevner, and Alexander Maedche. Accumulation and Evolution of Design Knowledge in Design Science Research - A Journey Through Time and Space. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 21:520–544, May 2020.
4. Thomas D. Cook and Donald T. Campbell. *Quasi-experimentation: design & analysis issues for field settings*. Houghton Mifflin, Boston, Mass. [u.a.], 1979.
5. Lee J. Cronbach and Paul E. Meehl. Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52(4):281–302, 1955. Place: US Publisher: American Psychological Association.
6. José Osvaldo De Sordi, Marcia Azevedo, Manuel Meireles, Luis Hernan Contreras Pinochet, and Carlos Francisco Bitencourt Jorge. Design Science Research in

- Practice: What Can We Learn from a Longitudinal Analysis of the Development of Published Artifacts? *Informing Science: The International Journal of an Emerging Transdiscipline*, 23:1–23, 2020. Place: Santa Rosa Publisher: Informing Science Institute.
7. Shirley Gregor. Building theory in the sciences of the artificial. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Design Science Research in Information Systems and Technology - DESRIST '09*, page 1, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 2009. ACM Press.
 8. Alan Hevner and Samir Chatterjee. Design Science Research in Information Systems. In Alan Hevner and Samir Chatterjee, editors, *Design Research in Information Systems: Theory and Practice*, pages 9–22. Springer US, Boston, MA, 2010.
 9. Alan R. Hevner, Salvatore T. March, Jinsoo Park, and Sudha Ram. Design Science in Information Systems Research. *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 28.(No. 1):75–105, 2004. Publisher: Management Information Systems Research Center, University of Minnesota.
 10. Alan R. Hevner, Jeffrey Parsons, Alfred Benedikt Brendel, Roman Lukyanenko, Verena Tiefenbeck, Monica Chiarini Tremblay, and Jan Vom Brocke. Transparency in design science research. *Decision Support Systems*, 182:114236, July 2024.
 11. Alan R. Hevner and Jan vom Brocke. A Proficiency Model for Design Science Research Education. *Journal of Information Systems Education (JISE)*, Volume 34(Issue 3):264–278, September 2023.
 12. Juhani Iivari. A Paradigmatic Analysis of Information Systems As a Design Science. *Scandinavian Journal of Information Systems*, 19(2):Article 5, January 2007.
 13. Juhani Iivari, Alan Hevner, and Samir Chatterjee. Twelve Theses on Design Science Research in Information Systems. volume 22, pages 43–62. Springer, June 2010.
 14. Eric Knauss. Constructive master’s thesis work in industry: guidelines for applying design science research. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International Conference on Software Engineering: Joint Track on Software Engineering Education and Training*, ICSE-JSEET ’21, pages 110–121, Virtual Event, Spain, 2021. IEEE Press.
 15. Udo Kuckartz and Stefan Rädiker. *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Methoden, Praxis, Computerunterstützung*. Beltz Juventa, Weinheim Basel, 5 edition, 2022.
 16. William Kuechler and Vijay Vaishnavi. On theory development in design science research: anatomy of a research project. *EJIS*, 17:489–504, January 2008.
 17. Salvatore T. March and Gerald F. Smith. Design and natural science research on information technology. *Decision Support Systems*, 15(4):251–266, December 1995.
 18. Samuel Messick. Validity. In *Educational measurement, 3rd ed*, The American Council on Education/Macmillan series on higher education, pages 13–103. American Council on Education, 1989.
 19. Samuel Messick. Validity of Psychological Assessment: Validation of Inferences from Persons’ Responses and Performances as Scientific Inquiry into Score Meaning. *Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.*, (Research Report RR-94-45), 1994.
 20. Jay F. Nunamaker, Minder Chen, and Titus D.M. Purdin. Systems development in information systems research. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 7(3):89–106, 1990.
 21. Ken Peppers, Tuure Tuunanen, Marcus Rothenberger, and S. Chatterjee. A design science research methodology for information systems research. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 24:45–77, 2007.
 22. Nicolas Prat, Isabelle Comyn-Wattiau, and Jacky Akoka. A Taxonomy of Evaluation Methods for Information Systems Artifacts. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 32(3):229–267, July 2015.

23. Paul Ralph, Nauman bin Ali, Sebastian Baltes, Domenico Bianculli, Jessica Diaz, Yvonne Dittrich, Neil Ernst, Michael Felderer, Robert Feldt, Antonio Filieri, Breno Bernard Nicolau de França, Carlo Alberto Furia, Greg Gay, Nicolas Gold, Daniel Graziotin, Pinjia He, Rashina Hoda, Natalia Juristo, Barbara Kitchenham, Valentina Lenarduzzi, Jorge Martínez, Jorge Melegati, Daniel Mendez, Tim Menzies, Jefferson Moller, Dietmar Pfahl, Romain Robbes, Daniel Russo, Nytti Saarimäki, Federica Sarro, Davide Taibi, Janet Siegmund, Diomidis Spinellis, Mirosław Staron, Klaas Stol, Margaret-Anne Storey, Davide Taibi, Damian Tamburri, Marco Torchiano, Christoph Treude, Burak Turhan, Xiaofeng Wang, and Sira Vegas. Empirical Standards for Software Engineering Research, March 2021. arXiv:2010.03525 [cs].
24. Samir Chatterjee, Anol Bhattacharjee, and Tom Gilb. A Typology of Knowledge Creation in Design Science Research Projects. 2024.
25. Ricarda Schlimbach, Bijan Khosrawi-Rad, Linda Grogorick, Felix Becker, Timo Strohmann, Dominik Siemon, and Susanne Robra-Bissantz. A Teaching Framework for the Methodically Versatile DSR Education of Master's Students. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, 34(3):333–346, August 2023.
26. William R. Shadish, Thomas D. Cook, and Donald T. Campbell. *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference. Houghton, Mifflin and Company, Boston, MA, US, 2002. Pages: xxi, 623.
27. Herbert A. Simon. *The Sciences of the Artificial, third edition*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 3. ed. edition, September 1996. Google-Books-ID: k5Sr0nFw7psC.
28. Christian Sonnenberg and Jan vom Brocke. Evaluations in the Science of the Artificial – Reconsidering the Build-Evaluate Pattern in Design Science Research. In David Hutchison, Takeo Kanade, Josef Kittler, Jon M. Kleinberg, Friedemann Mattern, John C. Mitchell, Moni Naor, Oscar Nierstrasz, C. Pandu Rangan, Bernhard Steffen, Madhu Sudan, Demetri Terzopoulos, Doug Tygar, Moshe Y. Vardi, Gerhard Weikum, Ken Peffers, Marcus Rothenberger, and Bill Kuechler, editors, *Design Science Research in Information Systems. Advances in Theory and Practice*, volume 7286 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 381–397. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2012. Series Title: Lecture Notes in Computer Science.
29. V. Vaishnavi and W. Kuechler. Design Science Research in Information Systems, 2004. last updated November 24, 2021.
30. John Venable, Jan Pries-Heje, and Richard Baskerville. FEDS: a Framework for Evaluation in Design Science Research. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 25(1):77–89, January 2016.
31. Vijay K. Vaishnavi and William Kuechler, Jr. *Design Science Research Methods and Patterns: Innovating Information and Communication Technology, 2nd Edition*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, 2 edition, May 2015.
32. Jan vom Brocke, Alan Hevner, and Alexander Maedche. Introduction to Design Science Research. In Jan vom Brocke, Alan Hevner, and Alexander Maedche, editors, *Design Science Research. Cases*, Progress in IS, pages 1–13. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2020.
33. Robert Winter and Jan vom Brocke. *Teaching Design Science Research*. November 2021.
34. Hubert Österle, Jörg Becker, Ulrich Frank, Thomas Hess, Dimitris Karagiannis, Helmut Krcmar, Peter Loos, Peter Mertens, Andreas Oberweis, and Elmar J. Sinz. Memorandum zur gestaltungsorientierten Wirtschaftsinformatik. *Schmalenbachs Zeitschrift für betriebswirtschaftliche Forschung*, 62(6):664–672, September 2010.