International Journal of Innovative Research in Computer Science & Technology (IJIRCST)
ISSN: 2347-5552, Volume-10, Special Issue-7, July-2022
Innovative Projects 2022
Organized by Presidency University, Bangalore, India

Understanding Architectural Innovation

Dr. Lakshmi Prasanna Pagadala
Associate Professor, Masters In Business Administration (General Management), Presidency University, Bangalore, India,
Email Id-lakshmi.prasanna@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

A crucial idea in organizational studies and innovation management is architectural innovation. An overview of architectural innovation's concept, traits, and importance in boosting competitiveness and organizational success are given in this abstract. The fundamental reconfiguration or redesign of an organization's basic structure, procedures, or systems is referred to as architectural innovation in the context of innovation. Architectural innovation tackles the fundamental parts and linkages inside an organisations, resulting in significant changes to its general structure and operation. This is in contrast to product innovation, which focuses on creating new goods or services. The abstract focuses on the distinctive qualities of architectural innovation, such as its capacity to provide substantial competitive advantages, allow organisations to adapt to changing market situations, and promote breakthroughs in performance and efficiency. It also clarifies the difficulties and complications involved in putting architectural innovation into practice, since this sometimes necessitates significant organizational change, cultural adjustment, and strategic realignment. The abstract also examines the many architectural innovation kinds, from radical innovations that completely alter an organization's business model or value chain to modular innovations that make adjustments to individual components. For leaders and managers looking to remain ahead in a company environment that is changing quickly, understanding architectural innovation is essential. Organisations may reinvent themselves, improve their skills, and effectively react to disruptive forces and new possibilities by embracing and using architectural innovation.

KEYWORDS:

Architectural, Competitive, Change, Innovation, Organisations.

I. INTRODUCTION

In today's fast-paced and cutthroat corporate environment, innovation has emerged as a vital factor in determining an organization's success and survival. While most people are aware with technology and commercial breakthroughs, there is another kind of innovation that has enormous potential to reshape organisations: architectural innovation. Changing an organization's core structure and design is the emphasis of architectural innovation, a concept in organizational studies and innovation management. Architectural innovation, as opposed to incremental advancements or product breakthroughs, entails reorganizing an organization's fundamental components, functions, and relationships in order to accomplish radical change and ground-breaking performance. The constantly shifting dynamics of markets, technology, and client preferences drive the need for architectural innovation. Holding on to outdated structures and procedures may prevent an organisations from responding to disruptive forces or taking advantage of new possibilities. As a result, adopting architectural innovation turns into a key tactic for generating long-term development and sustained competitive advantages[1], [2].

We shall examine the many facets of architectural innovation in this essay, as well as its distinguishing traits, subtypes, and consequences for organizational success. We will also look at the distinctions between different types of innovation and why architectural innovation is unique in the quest for organizational excellence. The ability of architectural innovation to bring about dramatic change is one of its distinguishing characteristics. It creates new opportunities by changing the structure of the organisations, making it possible to include cutting-edge technology, simplified procedures, and

effective workflows. This agility is crucial for businesses that want to survive in an environment of unpredictability and upheaval.In this post, we'll look at case studies and actual instances of businesses that have benefited from architectural innovation. The effective implementation of architectural innovation has led to notable changes in business models, value chains, and overall competitiveness across big enterprises and startups. However, putting architectural innovation into practice is not without difficulties. It often calls for major cultural change, organizational realignment, and strategy realignment. To make sure that the innovation activities produce the required results and provide sustained value, managing these complications is crucial [3], [4].

Understanding the nuances of architectural innovation and how it may support organizational resilience, adaptation, and market leadership will be beneficial for leaders, managers, and innovators alike. Organisations can manage the dynamic business environment and put themselves in a position for long-term success by understanding the fundamentals and best practises of architectural innovation. We shall examine several architectural innovations, ranging from subtle tweaks to major reconstructions, in the parts that follow. We will also look at the frameworks and strategic methods that ensure effective implementation and talk about how businesses may promote an innovative culture that promotes architectural change. Business and technology are changing at an unprecedented rate, which necessitates constant innovation and change inside organisations. Architectural innovation is a potent strategy for redefining and reshaping organisations, putting them on a path to expansion, relevance, and toughness in a world that is becoming more dynamic and competitive. As we go further into the world of architectural innovation, we will learn the crucial truths and tactics that may propel significant and long-lasting change for businesses of all shapes and sizes[5], [6].

II. DISCUSSION

Architectural innovations are those that depend more on connections between product parts than they do on substantial advancements in the parts themselves. The idea may show how organisational processes and competitive strategies are impacted by product innovation. This entry covers the specifics of architectural innovation, how changes in component linkages interact with organisational capabilities and practises, how the idea interacts with market dynamics to produce competitive advantages, and how the concept interacts with market dynamics to produce competitive advantages. It concludes with a discussion of the potential pitfalls managers may encounter when trying to foster innovation[7], [8].

Fundamentals

Product architecture serves as the connecting point between components to create a working product, thus architectural innovation modifies the architecture or how the components interact rather than altering the components themselves. For instance, a standard coffee maker is made up of the following components: a housing, a filter basket, a carafe, a power source, a heating element, a water reservoir, and a water pump. By extending the time hot water is in contact with ground coffee, coffee strength may be changed. Consequently, a coffee machine that regulates the water pumping rate and flow through the coffee grinds might change the strength of the coffee; this is an architectural innovation. This demonstrates how innovative architecture just affects the way things are connected, rather than fundamentally altering the product's constituent parts. The architecture's individual components could evolve (becoming smaller, lighter, etc.), but the underlying component technology doesn't change. In our case, a new pump with an easily adjustable flow rate allowed the innovation, but a pump would still be the primary design element[9], [10].

A two-by-two matrix that describes innovation as the interplay between changes in product connections and changes in core-component ideas may be used to explain architectural innovation. The architectural improvements under consideration are those that solely involve modifications to the links. Modular innovation refers to modifications that alter the technology's fundamental building blocks while maintaining the connections. For instance, a digital-telephone dialer differs significantly from a digital dialer in terms of component technology, yet it nonetheless completes the same architectural role. Changes that don't impact the links or the fundamental technology are considered gradual, but those that do both are radical developments. Architectural innovation falls between gradual and radical innovation

on a scale. Component performance is improved incrementally without a large architectural change. A radical or disruptive innovation, which may make both component and architectural knowledge outdated, is based on wholly new technical or scientific ideas.

The technological prowess and administrative practises of the companies manufacturing the goods often reflect the architecture of the product. Companies that produce coffeemakers could have different departments with workers who are competent in housing moulding, filter basket and carafe production, power supply design, heating element design, and water pump design. Additionally, businesses would create processes and routines for resolving issues to allow departments to work together. These methods and skills constitute the company's core competencies, allowing it to take advantage of incremental component advances and successfully respond to rivals' incremental component advancements. However, when confronted with architectural advancements, businesses may not respond effectively.

Due to the skills and processes established inside the organisation based on the original product design, it may be difficult to identify the warning indications of such innovations. Introducing a coffeemaker that utilises a package of ground coffee, for instance The need of a carafe and filter basket would be eliminated if coffee had an inbuilt filter that produced one cup. companies having sections for carafes and filter-baskets may encounter internal pushback as a result of its innovation. Their primary competencies have evolved into core rigidities that limit their capacity to adapt to change. Businesses that are good at developing component-core competencies are often constrained by the product architecture of their initial offerings and suffer competitive failure when the generally recognised design changes.

Architectural innovations are often offered by businesses that are competing with the industry leader and have ramifications for both marketing and technology. The dominant business is often prevented from implementing novel designs due to a lack of adequate processes and skills or because they are constrained by their current "successful" attitude. Additionally, when compared using criteria valued by the clients serviced by the dominant business, the early architectural advances are often outperformed by the existing designs. Furthermore preventing dominant enterprises from using the architectural innovation is the low value put on the invention's early performance. By being devoted to a particular product and its structure rather than offering value to a wide spectrum of clients, the dominant business runs the danger of having a myopic perspective.

Challenger companies may offer architectural advances into markets that the dominant company views as irrelevant but where the innovations have a competitive benefit. The neighbouring market gains the knowledge and resources to incrementally enhance the new architecture until it surpasses the initially dominant architecture as the challenger introduces architectural innovation into that market. The market leader faces competition from a better performing product architecture and risks losing ground to a competitor who introduces an innovative architectural design.The architectural-innovation model gives practical managers advice on how to create ambidextrous organisations that can foster both incremental changes to the existing architecture and architectural innovations with the potential to disrupt it.Such ambidextrous organisations are intrinsically unstable, and the older, more established, and more powerful portions of the company that are linked to the prevailing architecture often triumph over the younger, more innovative entrepreneurs. Architectural innovations often need to be protected in distinct facilities with different administrations and cultures. Seiko protected the development of the quartz watch movement from the mechanical watch movement's dominating culture. By carefully managing a stream of incremental innovations, fundamentally new innovations, and architectural innovations, businesses may maintain a competitive edge. In order to create an organisation that can function both now and in the future, senior management must strike a balance between these conflicting demands on organisational resources.

Asch Effect

Solomon E. Asch started researching social pressure at Columbia University after reading Edward Thorndike's work on the law of effect for positive reinforcement. Asch devised the experiment to see whether peer pressure would have an impact on wrong replies. The Asch effect is a term used to

describe the findings of these research. Asch started his research while working as a professor at Swarthmore College. He wanted to know how people adjust their views to those of their social group. Asch devised his experiment to test a group of students who are assembled and sat in a room, with the "subject" placed towards the rear of the room, in order to provide a response to the question. Two images are shown to the whole group. In the first, a line is shown, and in the second, three lines of varying sizes are shown, only one of which is the same size as the line in the first image.

The group is then given a series of questions on the images after they have been presented to them. The other participants have been taught to continue agreeing that one of the uneven lines in the second image is really the same size as the original line in the first image in order to provide erroneous answers to the questions. In this experiment, a single participant is asked to state his or her own viewpoint, independent of the frequent views of individuals around him. The topic is informed by the other participants' inaccurate responses. On average, the person answers correctly after first disagreeing. Even while the rest of the group continues to insist on their incorrect response, the subject often disagrees once again on the second attempt. The individual frequently begins to exhibit overt indications of pain at this time. Despite the subject's own visual impression, a significant portion of the participants concur.

Subjects who concur provide numerous justifications. The two most common explanations people provide for following the group are either that they feel the majority must be right or that their responses must accord with the group's replies in order for the experiment to function well. There are three ways that subjects might respond. The subjects may consistently disagree with the group, consistently agree with the group, or alternately express disagreement and agreement. In a follow-up test, individuals performed flawlessly when assessed individually 99% of the time. After participating in the experiment, the individuals continued to alter their responses in an effort to fit in with the group, conforming to the consensus 36.8% of the time. In all, 75% of the individuals altered at least one of their answers to the experiment's multiple-choice questions during the experiment trials in order to concur with the general majority. In contrast, 25% of the participants stuck with their decisions and stuck by their own judgement throughout all of the experiment's trials.

As he carried out his research, Asch noticed many behaviours. The subject is put in the situation of being judged as if he has really provided the incorrect response, he observed, even if the subject is genuinely answering the question properly. The public proof of the subject's publicly stated position and the consensus of the group are in conflict in this case. Asch listed a number of potential reactions to the circumstance, but only a small number of the individuals in the experimenter's trials explicitly acknowledged the group's collaboration. While Asch opted not to make any definite conclusions regarding motives, he eventually came to the conclusion that the experiment validated an important tenet of how we interpret the world. Asch was just as curious in what He was interested in what drove the participants to submit to group pressures because he wanted to know what motivated them to resist. group pressures to reach agreement. He came to the conclusion that the experiment had effects on both personal values and the established educational system.

Since it was initially published in the 1950s, this set of studies has been repeated several times. Theorists have altered the studies to examine a variety of various factors, such as the size of the general group and the number of participants, as well as age, ethnicity, place of birth, sex, and socioeconomic position of the subjects. Additionally, the experiment was repeated with time as the sole variable under identical circumstances. Even though there have been reports of diversity in the findings of several investigations, the main conclusion is unwavering. People have a continuous propensity to succumb to peer pressure and follow the consensus of the group. The Asch effect demonstrates to managers how coworkers and employees could be persuaded to alter their stated opinions in response to pressure from the group in order to reach agreement. This occurrence emphasises how crucial it is for managers to refrain from approving group choices without first investigating the procedure. Managers must go deeper to take into account all available information and find the best potential solution in order to avoid making suboptimal decisions.

Importance

Organisations must prioritise architectural innovation because it generates adaptation, resilience, and competitive advantage in a market that is changing quickly. Architectural innovation facilitates the incorporation of cutting-edge developments and efficient workflows by redefining key elements of an organisation, such as its core procedures, technology, and linkages. As a result, businesses are better equipped to react quickly to market changes, seize new opportunities, and successfully deal with disruptive forces. By creating a culture of forward-thinking and continual development, architectural innovation guarantees that organisations stay relevant and future-proof, resulting in continued growth and long-term success. Organisations that place a high priority on architectural innovation will ultimately be better equipped to grow, develop, and reshape their sectors for a sustainable and prosperous future. Architectural innovation is also essential for enabling organisational change and performance breakthroughs. It disrupts the existing quo and promotes innovative problem-solving, encouraging organisations to consider fresh options and rethink their business strategies. Architectural innovation fosters an atmosphere where staff members feel encouraged to offer their ideas and effect good change through fostering a culture of innovation and risk-taking.

Moreover, in today's globalised and linked marketplaces, architectural innovation is crucial for remaining one step ahead of the competition. To be relevant and satisfy consumer needs, businesses must constantly innovate as disruptive technology and new market entrants appear. Companies may actively build their future via architectural innovation as opposed to just responding to external constraints. Additionally, the value of innovative architecture goes beyond particular organisations. Additionally, it has an effect on all sectors and economies. Embracing architectural innovation tends to make an industry more robust and more equipped to deal with social issues, which promotes advancement and economic success. In order for organisations to succeed in a world that is always changing, architectural innovation is not just a strategic choice but also a must. Embracing this kind of innovation gives organizations the ability to reinvent themselves, take advantage of possibilities, and maintain an edge in the marketplace, making it a crucial component of long-term relevance and sustained success.

III. CONCLUSION

In the competitive corporate environment, architectural innovation is emerging as a key driver of organisational agility and competitive advantage. By radically altering the structure and architecture of an organisation, it makes it possible to integrate cutting-edge technology, simplify processes, and increase efficiency, enabling organisations to survive in the face of disruption and take advantage of new possibilities. Adopting a culture of innovation and strategic leadership may successfully negotiate these issues even while executing architectural innovation presents difficulties including cultural transformation and strategic realignment. Numerous real-world instances of organisations revolutionising their business models and value chains and successfully adopting architectural innovation show its revolutionary potential. In order for organisations to be flexible, competitive, and future-proof in a constantly changing business environment, they must cultivate an innovation-driven attitude and continuously improve their architectural design. This phenomenon has important ramifications for a range of societal contexts, including businesses, educational institutions, and the shaping of public opinion. The Asch Effect emphasises how crucial it is to comprehend group dynamics and how social pressure may affect people's views and behaviours. Understanding the Asch Effect may help us make better informed decisions as we negotiate difficult social challenges and decision-making processes. It can also inspire us to create cultures that support independent thought and open communication.

REFERENCES

[1] J. Lund and E. Ebbesson, “Understanding digital innovation from a layered architectural perspective,” *Technology Innovation Management Review*. 2019. doi:

10.22215/TIMREVIEW/1218.

[2] H. Kim, C. Park, and H. Lee, "The Effect of Incremental Innovation and Switching-Over to Architectural Innovation on the Sustainable Performance of Firms: The Case of the NAND Flash Memory Industry," *Sustain.*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/su11247105.

[3] S. Yang, T. Page, and Y. F. Zhao, "Understanding the role of additive manufacturing knowledge in stimulating design innovation for novice designers," *J. Mech. Des. Trans. ASME*, 2019, doi: 10.1115/1.4041928.

[4] P. Dewick, E. Maytorena-Sanchez, and G. Winch, "Regulation and regenerative eco-innovation: the case of extracted materials in the UK," *Ecol. Econ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.01.034.

[5] L. Verstegen, W. Houkes, and I. Reymen, "Configuring collective digital-technology usage in dynamic and complex design practices," *Res. Policy*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.respol.2018.10.020.

[6] Y. Zavoleas and M. Taylor, "From Cartesian to Topological Geometry: Challenging Flatness in Architecture," *Nexus Netw. J.*, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s00004-018-0414-8.

[7] O. Hacihasanoglu, "Architectural Design Studio Culture," *Archit. Des. Stud. Cult.*, 2019.

[8] M. Szopinska-Mularz and S. Lehmann, "Urban farming in inner-city multi-storey car-parking structures- adaptive reuse potential," *Futur. Cities Environ.*, 2019, doi: 10.5334/fce.50.

[9] A. Menges, T. Schwinn, and O. D. Krieg, "Advancing Wood Architecture," in *Advancing Wood Architecture*, 2019. doi: 10.4324/9781315678825-1.

[10] Q. Asghar, M. Ghani, and A. Saleh, "Bio mimicry permeated Architectural Pedagogy," *J. Res. Archit. Plan.*, 2019.