
ARTICLE

Limits to Modularity: Reflections on Recent Developments in Chip Design

DIETER ERNST

East–West Center, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA

ABSTRACT Research on “modularity” has made an important contribution to the study of technical change and economic institutions. It demonstrates that progress in the division of labor in design (technical modularity) has created new opportunities for the organization of firms beyond vertical integration, by fostering vertical specialization in both manufacturing and innovation. However, a small, but growing revisionist literature contends that the enthusiasm for modularity has gone too far. Instead of exploring challenges and difficulties that management is facing in implementing modularity, there is a tendency in the “modularity” literature to generalize empirical observations that are context-specific and to confound them with prescription as well as prediction. This paper sides with the revisionist literature in cautioning against claims of pervasive modularity. The objective is not to propose an alternative theory. More modestly, I am aiming to move the debate away from polemics to a scholarly discourse that asks what forces might constrain the convergence of technical, organizational and market modularity. A related objective is to explore what management can do to overcome these limits. I examine new evidence from a cutting-edge industry, semiconductors, that is often cited by modularity proponents as an indicator of broader industry trends. The paper shows that, even in this industry, there are powerful counter-forces causing organizational structures to become more integrated, not more arm’s length. Evidence from chip design is used to analyze how competitive dynamics and cognitive complexity create modularity limits, and to examine management responses. I demonstrate that inter-firm collaboration requires more (not less) coordination through corporate management, if codification does not reduce complexity—which it fails to do when technologies keep changing fast and unpredictably.

KEY WORDS: Modularity, innovation, product development, electronic design, firm strategy, firm organization, industry studies, electronics

Correspondence Address: Dieter Ernst, East–West Center, 1601 East West Road, Honolulu, HI 96848-1601, USA. Email: ernstd@eastwestcenter.org

1366-2716 Print/1469-8390 Online/05/030303–33 © 2005 Taylor & Francis
DOI: 10.1080/13662710500195918

1. Introduction

Debates on how business organization has moved beyond Chandler's vertically integrated multi-divisional firm (Chandler, 1977) have greatly benefited from the concept of "modularity" (e.g. Baldwin and Clark, 2000; Sanchez, 2000). We know that progress in the division of labor in design (technical modularity) has created opportunities for vertical specialization in project execution, enabling firms to disintegrate the value chain as well as to disperse it geographically. Increasingly this process has taken on a global dimension, giving rise first to offshore assembly in a wide range of industries (both traditional ones like garments and innovative ones like semiconductors), and later on to outsourcing to global contract manufacturers.¹ More recently, modular design has also provided ample opportunities for vertical specialization in the production of knowledge-intensive services, such as software, information services, engineering and R&D.²

However, as so often happens in the history of social sciences, the success of an idea may sometimes lead to exaggerated claims that forget that even the best theories have limits. There is a small, but growing revisionist literature (e.g. Chesbrough, 2003b; Pavitt, 2003a,b; Sabel and Zeitlin, 2004) that contends that the enthusiasm for modularity has gone too far. Instead of exploring challenges and difficulties that management is facing in implementing modularity, there is a tendency in the "modularity" literature to generalize empirical observations that are context-specific and to confound them with prescription as well as prediction. For some authors, modularity becomes an over-arching business model that changes the way firms do business and how they organize to develop their products, processes and organization (e.g. Sturgeon, 2002). And Langlois (2003) argues that modularity gives rise to a set of market-supporting institutions, notably stable interface standards and design rules, enabling firms to pursue focused strategies that rely heavily on outsourcing across the value chain. As a result, he expects the "Visible Hand" of large corporations to vanish. In short, modularity is expected to reduce the need for coordination through corporate management.

This paper sides with the revisionist literature in cautioning against strong claims of pervasive modularity. The objective is not to propose an alternative theory. More modestly, I am aiming to move the debate away from polemics to a scholarly discourse that asks what forces might constrain the convergence of technical, organizational and market modularity. A related objective is to explore what management can do to overcome these limits. To assess what we know about the limits to modularity, I examine new evidence from a cutting-edge industry,

¹On garments, see Gereffi (1994); on semiconductors, see Ernst (1983); and on outsourcing, see Ernst and O'Connor (1992), Hobday (1995), Luethje (2002), Sturgeon (2002) and Ernst (2004).

²For instance, Arora *et al.* (1998) and Ernst (2002a, 2005b).

semiconductors, that is often cited by modularity proponents as an indicator of broader industry trends. The paper shows that, even in this industry, there are powerful counter-forces causing organizational structures to become more integrated, not more arm's length.

I first summarize “stylized” propositions of the modularity literature that are well established, as well as predictions that are controversial. Section 3 presents a critical review of findings of an alternative set of revisionist theories that attempt to conceptualize the dynamics of modularity. The rest of the paper uses the case of chip design³ to demonstrate that inter-firm collaboration may require more (not less) coordination through corporate management, if codification does not reduce complexity—which it fails to do when technologies keep changing fast and unpredictably.

Section 4 highlights important differences in the coordination requirements of “project execution” (to design and produce an artifact, e.g. a chip) and of “technology development” (to produce the underlying knowledge bases). Section 5 documents two fundamental constraints to interface standardization in the semiconductor industry: competitive dynamics and cognitive complexity.⁴ Finally, Section 6 examines the difficulties that management faces when it attempts to respond to the limits to modularity in chip design. The conclusions spell out implications for future research, so that it can enhance the understanding of the dynamics of modularity, and its management.

2. The Modularity Literature: Propositions and Predictions

The modularity literature⁵ has made an important contribution to the study of technical change and economic institutions. It demonstrates that progress in the division of labor in design (technical modularity) has created new opportunities for the organization of firms beyond vertical integration, and that this may transform industry structure and markets.

³To establish what is really happening, I interviewed 60 companies and 15 research institutions in the USA, Taiwan, Korea, China and Malaysia that are involved in electronic design (for integrated circuits as well as systems). The sample includes leading specialized *research institutes* as well as nine *strategic groups of firms* (both global and regional players) that participate in global design networks (GDNs): system companies; integrated device manufacturers (IDMs); providers of electronic manufacturing services (EMSs) and design services (the so-called ODMs, or “original design manufacturers”); “fabless” chip design houses; “chipless” licensors of “silicon intellectual properties” (SIPs); chip contract manufacturers (“foundries”); vendors of electronic design automation (EDA) tools; chip packaging and testing companies; and design implementation service providers. For details, see Ernst (2005b).

⁴Intellectual property right protection is a third constraint that will be addressed in a separate paper.

⁵This paper does not address important related bodies of literature, such as economic theories of “production fragmentation” (e.g. Jones and Kierzkowski, 2001), “disintegration” (Feenstra, 1998) and “vertical specialization” (Hummels *et al.*, 2001). Nor does it cover related bodies of literature in industrial sociology and economic geography.

The starting-point is technical change—“[m]odularity is a particular design structure, in which parameters and tasks are interdependent within units (modules) and independent across them” (Baldwin and Clark, 2000: 88). But the main concern is with implications for business organization and markets. This gives rise to a research agenda that

considers the impacts which the adoption of modular products and process architectures can have on the organization of product creation processes, on the kinds of organizational learning that take place during product creation activities, on the interaction of individuals and work groups, and on the requirements for effective management of product creation as a strategic value-creating activity. (Sanchez, 2000: 611)

Modularity thus is defined broadly to encompass all “techniques for dividing effort and knowledge ... [that] ... are fundamental to the creation of highly complex manmade things” (Baldwin and Clark, 2000: 5).

What precisely does this literature tell us about the link between technical modularity and the organization of firms and markets? It is of course impossible to do justice to the many extremely insightful findings of a still relatively young and thriving body of literature. For our purposes, I suggest to focus on three “stylized” propositions that are well established through both theoretical and empirical work, and on two predictions that are controversial.

2.1. Propositions

The first proposition focuses on the convergence of technical and organizational modularity. It is argued that the architecture of a complex artifact corresponds with the organizational structure of the firm producing that artifact. Sanchez (2000: 612), for instance, explores “how the design rules an organization adopts for creating product architectures fundamentally constrain the feasible organization designs an organization can adopt for creating, producing, and supporting its products”. The computer industry is frequently cited as an important breeding ground for this new industrial organization model (e.g. Langlois, 1992; Baldwin and Clark, 2000). Until the early 1980s, IBM personified “vertical integration” within a multi-divisional firm: almost all ingredients necessary to design, produce and commercialize computers remained internal to the firm. This was true for semiconductors, hardware, operating systems, application software, and sales and distribution. Since then, modular design, based on standard interchangeable components as well as the widely shared Wintel architecture, has rapidly eroded the economic rationale for vertical integration. This, it is argued, has made vertical specialization (“organizational modularity”) the industry’s defining characteristic.

A second proposition argues that organizational modularity is made possible by a combination of two developments: the codification of

knowledge, enabled by the rapid diffusion of cheaper and more powerful information and communication technologies (ICT) (Sichel, 1997; Flamm, 1999); and market-led standardization (through technical standards and design rules) of the interfaces between organizationally separate stages of production (e.g. Sanchez and Collins, 2001). The focus of ICT-enabled information management has shifted from a machine to automate transaction processing to the establishment of Internet-enabled flexible information infrastructures that support not only information exchange among dispersed network nodes (e.g. Arora *et al.*, 1997), but also the sharing, utilization and creation of knowledge among multiple network participants at remote locations (Jørgensen and Krogstie, 2000; Foray and Steinmueller, 2001). And Sanchez (2000: 626) emphasizes that, “[o]nce component interface specifications are fully defined in a modular product architecture, there is little or no need for the traditional development management function of adjudicating interface issues among teams developing interdependent components”.

A third proposition highlights implications for competitive strategies. It is argued that codification, together with shared interface standards and design rules reduces the “volume of information”, and hence the amount of knowledge sharing, that is required for coordination. Sanchez and Collins for instance argue that

when the standardized interfaces in modular architectures are used to coordinate product creation ... processes, those processes can become largely self-managing. Both mid-level and senior managers can then redirect much of their time and attention from the routine tasks of monitoring, problem solving and intervention in those processes to refocus on the essential tasks of strategic ... goal-setting. (2001: 662)

This makes it possible to transform products into fully “modular” or decomposable building-blocks, enabling firms to pursue focused strategies that rely heavily on outsourcing across the value chain. A computer company can now focus on those activities (“core competencies”) that generate the highest margins and which are critical for sustaining the company’s competitive advantage. In turn, the company outsources those low-margin activities in which it does not have a strategic advantage (e.g. Ernst, 2002b). While outsourcing initially was focused on manufacturing, it now extends to all stages of the value chain, including research and new product development (Chesbrough, 2003a; Ernst, 2003, 2005b, forthcoming).

In short, the aforementioned three propositions of the modularity literature explore how progress in design methodology (“technical modularity”) has created new opportunities for vertical specialization (“organizational modularity”) in project execution, enabling firms to disintegrate the value chain as well as to disperse it across firm boundaries and geographic borders. These propositions have been corroborated

by the experience since the 1980s of a rapid expansion of global outsourcing.

2.2. Predictions

However, the modularity literature moves into murky waters, when it attempts to generalize empirical observations that are context-specific, and when it ventures to provide prediction as well as prescription about the evolution of technology and industry structure. For instance, much of the current modularity literature shares the assumption (at least implicitly) that every technology will proceed from a less modular, more integrated state towards a more modular state (e.g. Baldwin and Clark, 2000). There is a tendency to assume that modularity will become the stable end state of industry evolution, irrespective of the specific characteristics of diverse industries and technologies.

Sanchez and Collins (2001: 660) for instance view modularity as “a new strategic logic for competing that contradicts much conventional management wisdom”. This new management doctrine is based on three defining principles (ibid.: 660–662): (i) products “design” organizations; (ii) interface standardization increases flexibility, and hence “greatly reduces the time, cost and difficulty” of product innovation; and (iii) standard interfaces provide “clear rules for managing both creative improvisation with an organisation’s current capabilities and creative transformations to new sets of organisational capabilities” (ibid.: 662). Formulated as predictions, these principles contain a quite strong element of determinism. The underlying assumption is that there are no significant constraints to interface standardization. The case study of chip design in this paper will demonstrate that this assumption is problematic. I will show that, as complexity increases in both chip design and process technology, it is no longer possible to freeze interface standards at the beginning of a design project. Instead, multiple and geographically dispersed participants in global design networks (GDNs) need to continuously negotiate *ex post* adjustments.

A related equally strong prediction addresses the evolution of industry structure. In this view, technical modularity is expected to establish a new type of division of labor—a proliferation of modules produced by specialized firms using general-purpose tools (both machinery and software). Langlois (2003), for instance, argues that modularity causes the “visible hand of managerial coordination” to vanish. The root cause is modular design which gives rise to “vertical disintegration and specialization ... [as] ... perhaps the most significant organizational development of the 1990s” (ibid.: 373). “By taking standardization to a more abstract level, modularity reduces the need for management and integration to buffer uncertainty... [Hence], the buffering functions of management are devolving to the mechanisms of modularity and the market...” (ibid.: 375 and 376). As a result, “large vertically integrated firms are becoming less

significant and are joining a richer mix of organizational forms ... [They] ... are an increasingly small part of a landscape that features a wide variety of market and network forms” (ibid.: 353).

Langlois’ predictive statements have raised strong opposition, culminating in a revisionist literature that I will review below. Take the late Keith Pavitt who, referring explicitly to the above paper of Langlois, has argued that “[t]he Visible hand of manufacturing will not become invisible ..., but continue to exploit economies of physical scale, speed, and scope” (Pavitt, 2003a: 88). But Langlois’ core argument that less coordination is required through corporate management, has been highly successful in shaping debates on modularity. At the same time, there is a tendency to assume that this will also erode entry barriers, and hence will undermine existing oligopolistic market structures. Two role models are mentioned in the literature: US-based global providers of electronic manufacturing services (EMS) which for Sturgeon (2002) represent a “new American model of industrial organization”; and Silicon Valley-style innovative start-up companies that focus on high-margin market segments, attract ample venture capital funding, and hence grow rapidly beyond their initial small size (e.g. Arora *et al.*, 1997).

3. The Revisionist Literature

Empirical research on a variety of industries (both highly innovative and traditional ones)⁶ has raised important questions to what degree the aforementioned predictions can be sustained. This has given rise to an alternative set of theories that center on the dynamics of modularity (Chesbrough, 2003b), “system integration” (Davies, 2003; Pavitt, 2003a), “open innovation” (Chesbrough, 2003a) and “iterated co-design” (Sabel and Zeitlin, 2004). This revisionist literature argues that current theories of modularity “predict too much” (Chesbrough, 2003b: 193), and it highlights three specific weaknesses: proponents of unfettered modularity confound technical with market modularity; they exaggerate the empirical significance of market modularity; and they fail to explore the dynamics of modularization. These weaknesses need to be addressed to understand what forces might constrain the convergence of technical, organizational and market modularity, and to identify possible management responses.

⁶ Studies of highly innovative sectors include aero-engines (Prencipe, 1997), telecommunications infrastructure (Davies, 1997), hard disk drives (Ernst, 1997; Chesbrough, 2003b), electronic manufacturing services (Luethje, 2002; Ernst, 2005a) and chip design (Tokumaru, 2004; Ernst, 2005b). Studies of traditional sectors cover chemical engineering (Brusoni, 2003), oil exploration (Acha, 2002), automobiles (Juergens, 2000; Takeishi and Fujimoto, 2003) and tyres (Acha and Brusoni, 2002).

3.1. *Technical versus Market Modularity*

Chesbrough's distinction between "technical modularity" and "market modularity" (2003b) highlights an important weakness of the modularity literature: a failure to distinguish between technical modularity and related changes in the organization of firms and markets. Chesbrough uses "market modularity" as a shorthand for the institutional, informational and cognitive conditions that "enable markets to take over ... [at least parts of, DE] ... the coordination tasks of innovation" (ibid.: 178).⁷ Both technical and market modularity may go hand in hand in some cases, but they need not always do so. Technical modularity is a necessary, but not sufficient condition for market modularity. Chesbrough highlights four criteria that must be met for both types of modularity to converge: knowledge diffusion, shared language, verification and supplier base.

Market modularity implies that, instead of a vertically integrated firm (e.g. IBM), multiple specialized suppliers contribute components (both hardware and software) that constitute a specific architecture. All of these firms thus need to be able to share the knowledge of how the components interact within a particular design architecture.⁸ This implies that the knowledge of how to implement technical modularity through adjustments in organization and management procedures, must now be diffused outside the firm (e.g. through open standards and production networks). Second, for network participants to be able to clearly communicate their requirements, there must be a shared language that can be used to specify unambiguously the features and functions of components. In other words, network participants must agree on a standard language that enables them to share their diverse concepts and codes.

Third, of particular importance is the verification criterion: tools and equipment must exist to verify that the required attributes of components have been met. In chip design, for instance verification has become a critical bottleneck that constrains market modularity.⁹ Finally, while

⁷The term "market modularity" is problematic, as it ignores market imperfections and uncertainty and the resultant coordination dilemmas analyzed by transaction cost economics (Coase, 1937; Williamson, 1985) and resource-based economics (Penrose, 1959/1995; Richardson, 1960/1990). I am grateful to Terutomo Ozawa and Ove Granstrand for raising this important issue that needs to be addressed in future research.

⁸Computer designers use the term "architecture" to refer to "the partitioning of the ... [computer] ... system into components of a given scope and related to each other functionally and physically through given interfaces. From a given architecture flows the design of components' functions and how they relate to each other ..." (Gawer and Cusumano, 2002: 18). These authors compare a system architecture with a geographic map, where the components of the system are the countries' territories and the interfaces between components are the countries' borders (ibid.: 19).

⁹With growing design complexity, it becomes necessary to verify early and frequently whether the SoC design can be produced at sufficiently high yield, and whether it will do what it is expected to do. Today, 60 to 70 percent of SoC hardware design time goes into verification, leaving only 30 to 40 percent for the actual device development. This "verification crisis" obviously constrains considerably the productivity of design (Ernst, 2005b).

technical modularity facilitates the development of complex networks for manufacturing and design, there is no guarantee that technical and market modularity will converge. For this to happen, a capable and broad-based supplier base must exist that allows the “flagship” of the resultant networks to switch suppliers.¹⁰

Using these four criteria can help to determine for a particular industry whether modular design (“technical modularity”) has been transformed into market modularity. Take the semiconductor industry where shared design rules have initially helped to separate design from fabrication, juxtaposing fabless design houses and silicon foundries in a modular market structure. However, the simultaneous transition to submicron process technologies and system-level integration (e.g. system-on-chip, SOC) design has dramatically increased complexity, with the result that the first three of the above four criteria for market modularity are no longer met (Ernst, 2005b): intractable constraints to interface standardization obstruct knowledge diffusion and the use of a shared language to specify unambiguously design rules and the features and functions of components. At the same time, the “verification bottleneck” has been spiraling out of control.

In short, we need empirical research to identify precisely “... when and why technical modularity leads (or does not lead) to modularity in the market” (Chesbrough, 2003b: 194). This of course requires an explicit analysis of the role of transaction costs and corporate strategy.

3.2. Limited Empirical Significance of Market Modularity

On the empirical significance, the electronics industry is often taken as the pre-eminent example of market modularity. Yet, as Sabel and Zeitlin (2004: 10) rightly emphasize: “arm’s-length coordination among specialists based on standard technical interfaces ... [i.e. ‘market modularity’, DE] is less common than is often claimed”.¹¹ For instance, in 2002, the share of US-based contract manufacturers (the providers of electronic manufacturing services, or EMS) in worldwide production of electronics hardware was estimated to be around 16 percent.¹²

¹⁰ The theory of “global flagship networks” (GFNs) emphasizes three essential characteristics: (i) *scope*: GFNs encompass all stages of the value chain, not just production; (ii) *asymmetry*: flagships dominate control over network resources and decision making; and (iii) *knowledge diffusion*: the sharing of knowledge is the necessary glue that keeps these networks growing (e.g. Ernst, 2002b, 2003). As discussed below, the hierarchical nature of flagship-dominated networks may actually facilitate organizational modularity.

¹¹ The limited empirical significance of market modularity has also been documented by research on complex mechanical assembly industries (such as automobiles, aircraft, construction and agricultural machinery) and chemical engineering (see sources quoted in Sabel and Zeitlin, 2004 and in Prencipe *et al.*, 2003).

¹² Ernst (2004a), quoting data provided by Eric Miscoll, CEO, Technology Forecasters, Inc., 15 April 2002.

But even more important are fundamental changes in the organization of electronic contract manufacturing. Recent research (e.g. Ernst, 2004, 2005a) highlights serious limitations to the US model of contract manufacturing. For instance, global contract manufacturing is a highly volatile industry. While powerful forces push for outsourcing, this process is by no means irreversible. Major global brand leaders (the so-called original-equipment manufacturers, OEMs) retain substantial internal manufacturing operations; they are continuously evaluating the merits of manufacturing products or providing services internally versus the advantages of outsourcing (e.g. Bengtsson and Berggren, 2002). Second, global EMS are now in a much weaker bargaining position than OEMs, whose number has been reduced by the current downturn and who are now much more demanding (e.g. Benson-Armer *et al.*, 2004).

Furthermore, serious conflicts of interest have emerged between OEMs, who are looking for flexibility, and EMS, who are looking for predictability and scale. For instance, OEMs focus on early market penetration and rapid growth of market share to sustain comfortable margins. OEMs thus need flexibility in outsourcing arrangements that allows them to divert resources at short notice to a given product as it becomes a hit. This sharply contrasts with the situation of EMS: with razor-thin margins, they need to focus ruthlessly on cost cutting. EMS need predictability: “they want to make commitments in advance to reap benefits like big-lot purchases and decreased overtime” (Lakenan *et al.*, 2001: 10).

These conflicting interests complicate the coordination of “modular” production networks. They also require substantial changes in the organization of both OEMs and EMS, as well as an alignment of incentives through contract terms and agreements. The irony is that, the more “modular” these contract manufacturing networks become, the more difficult it is to coordinate them.

In addition, the proponents of modularity have neglected a powerful trend towards reintegration of manufacturing and design that appears to counter earlier modularization processes. Let us first look at manufacturing. Since the turn of the century, two different business models compete for success in the global electronics contract manufacturing industry—EMS (=electronic manufacturing services) and ODM (=original design manufacturing).¹³ The two main strengths of EMS companies are process-related, with a focus on scale and global presence and “integrated solutions”. But EMS are typically weak in product-specific knowledge and design capabilities, which keeps their profit margins low. Contrast this with

¹³ The term “EMS” is used for companies that provide manufacturing (PCB assembly and box assembly) and order fulfillment services, across a wide range of product markets, to global system/brand name companies (the so-called OEM customers). The term “ODM” on the other hand describes companies that provide product design, manufacturing and distribution logistics for OEM customers with a relatively narrow product focus.

the ODM business model which provides reasonable margins, but requires good design capabilities. More specifically, ODM companies must be able to choose the appropriate hardware platforms, and they must be able to integrate software and applications of growing complexity, while meeting a diverse array of standard protocols. Equally important are short design cycles and a capacity for flexible response. This must be combined with sufficient scale, sophisticated component sourcing and a strong supply chain in low-cost Asia.

Both EMS and ODM have tried to overcome their respective disadvantages, giving rise to an at least partial convergence of EMS and ODM business models (Ernst, 2004, 2005a).¹⁴ No EMS can survive without covering ODM services, and vice versa. Economies of scale and scope determine success in this business, which drives the growth of these firms, primarily through mergers and acquisitions. As EMS grow and expand globally, system integration capabilities become their most important differentiating factor.

It is thus fair to argue that “market modularity”, defined as reliance on arm’s-length transactions mediated by market forces, has provided new opportunities for global brand leaders to pursue selective strategies of vertical specialization. It would however be misleading to claim that “market modularity” dominates electronics manufacturing.

That claim can also no longer be made for chip design. During the initial euphoria of the late 1990s, there were widespread expectations that technical modularity, that is, the reuse of design knowledge through modular design, combined with the transition to system-on-chip (SoC) design, would naturally lead to organizational and market modularity. This perception is mirrored in the claim by Linden and Somaya (2003: 545) that “we observe a burgeoning market for licensed DMs [=design modules, or SIPs in industry parlance, DE]”. The authors acknowledge that “integrated modes currently enjoy the upper hand in SoC, primarily due to the initial distribution of industry assets and the lack of supporting licensing institutions at the dawn of the SoC era” (ibid.: 571). They argue however that the balance will shift over time towards open market SIP licensing.

Reality is much more complex. While the aggregate open SIP market has grown fairly large—from \$892 million in 2001 to \$1.2 billion in 2004 (Gartner/Dataquest, 2004), this does not imply that market modularity dominates. Small SIP design “boutique shops” that were supposed to be the main carriers of market modularity, only play a marginal role. Instead, the lion’s share of the global SIP market is controlled by a handful of global

¹⁴This raises an important question for the study of business models. Chesbrough and Rosenbloom (2002) have argued that the complementarities that link the different elements of a business model together constitute a source of inertia for the business model. Yet, the malleability and partial convergence of the EMS and ODM models of contract manufacturing do not support this proposition.

players that are engaged in intense oligopolistic rivalries. These global players include a few suppliers of “star” SIPs,¹⁵ two leading electronic design automation (EDA) tool vendors that also provide SIPs (Synopsis and Mentor), and design groups within system companies.

Three forces are shaping the structure of the SIP market: high entry barriers to the star SIP market; the need to differentiate standard SIPs; and diversification strategies of EDA tool vendors. Entry barriers are high because the star SIP business model requires very high investments of financial and human resources in the establishment of a broad global partnership network that include integrated device manufacturers (IDMs), design houses, EDA tool suppliers, and developers of operating systems and applications software. A case study of ARM (O’Keeffe and Williamson, 2002) shows that such a network is necessary to provide access to diverse bodies of knowledge that the star IP provider needs to define a SIP architecture: “partners not only boosted ARM’s sales, they also added to its knowledge base, thereby increasing the likelihood that ARM would be able to design chips that best fitted the future technological and application needs of its partners” (ibid.: 5).

Second, as differentiation is the key to the effective use of star SIPs, design groups within system companies are gaining in importance. Differentiation requires systems knowledge. For a standard star SIP (like those provided by ARM), differentiation can only come via embedded software. For a configurable SIP (like those provided by Tensilica), differentiation requires a combination of both software and some powerful instruction set extension capabilities to tune it to a particular application set. Thus star IPs may have standard configurable interfaces, but “they are not drop-in substitutes for each other”.¹⁶

A third determinant of the structure of the global SIP market are diversification strategies of EDA tool vendors. With \$3.8 billion sales turnover, the EDA tool industry remains too small to generate sufficient scale economies. Its oligopolistic market structure creates rents for the market leaders, as long as the status quo remains intact. But EDA tool providers face major changes in technology and markets. Technology bottlenecks have accumulated and require quite far-reaching changes in EDA tools. As complexity increases with progressive miniaturization, chip designers demand design tools that can automate large parts of the design process and that can facilitate close interaction with fabrication. But an even more demanding challenge is to provide tools for designing systems. This requires high-level design services, and “integrated solutions”. In

¹⁵ “Star” SIPs are defined to include MPUs, DSPs, memories and analog design blocks. In addition to ARM, the market leader, this small group of companies includes MIPS, Rambus, Tensilica and Ceva, the former DSP Group.

¹⁶ Grant Martin, chief scientist, Tensilica, Inc., Santa Clara, California, in an email to the author, dated 21 September 2004.

response, EDA tool vendors are aggressively trying to acquire promising SIP provider start-up companies.¹⁷

In short, market modularity has not come to dominate chip design. In contrast to predictions of a convergence of technical and market modularity in that sector, organizational integration appears to gain in importance, albeit in novel hybrid forms that differ from Chandler's vertically integrated firm. Ernst and Martin (2005) document that, propelled by increasing complexity in process and design technology, a shift is under way in market power to those system companies and IDMs that own system knowledge, SIPs, as well as advanced process development skills. On the other hand, favorites of the "modularity" literature, such as foundries, fabless design houses, chipless SIP suppliers and EDA tool providers are facing new and very demanding challenges to their established business models.

3.3. Dynamics of Modularization

Current modularity theories pay insufficient attention to the dynamics of technical advances, and hence fail to explore the complex forces and constraints that shape processes of modularization. Of particular importance are cognitive limits to modularity that emerge with each transition from a well-established ("mature") to a new ("fluid") design architecture. Proponents of modularity have left unexplored what happens when component and architectural design, as well as fabrication technologies, keep changing fast and unpredictably, and how that affects the convergence of technical and market modularity.

Take again chip design (Ernst, 2005b). Since the mid-1990s, intensifying pressures to improve design productivity, combined with increasingly demanding performance requirements for electronic systems (lighter, thinner, shorter, smaller, faster, multi-functional, less power-consuming and cheaper) have produced an upheaval in chip design methodology.¹⁸ Under the label of "system-on-chip" (SoC) design, systematic attempts have been made to enhance design methodology by combining "modular design" and "design automation" with attempts to move design from the individual component on a printed circuit board closer to "system-level integration" on a chip (Chang *et al.*, 1999; Martin and Chang, 2003). Fed by a massive inflow of abundant venture capital during the "New Economy" boom, which has encouraged aggressive

¹⁷ This is also a response to new challenges that EDA tool vendors are facing from system companies and foundries, who are positioning themselves as alternative sources of EDA tools, by acquiring EDA start-up companies.

¹⁸ "Design methodology" is the sequence of steps by which a design process will reliably produce a design "as close as possible" to the design target, while maintaining feasibility with respect to constraints. All known design methodologies combine (1) the enforcement of system specification and constraints via top-down planning and search, with (2) a bottom-up propagation of constraints that stem from physical laws, limits of design and manufacturing technology, and system cost limits.

fabless semiconductor start-ups, this has loosened the bonds between design and fabrication.

Best known is the symbiotic relationship between the two main carriers of modularity: “fabless” design houses that outsource chip fabrication, and specialized suppliers of contract fabrication services, the so-called “silicon foundries”. Less well known, but equally important are a diverse group of specialized providers of complementary services, such as tools for EDA, verification, testing and the development of embedded software. It is this decoupling of design and fabrication and its fragmentation into diverse specialized suppliers that gave rise to the aforementioned predictions of a convergence of technical and market modularity.

Note however that Macher *et al.* (2002) emphasize the persistent tension between vertical specialization and reintegration. This argument is supported by more recent research (Ernst, 2005b). In fact, current transformations appear to move away from market modularity in the opposite direction to more integrated, albeit new hybrid forms of industrial organization (Ernst and Martin, 2005). The earlier decoupling of design and manufacturing is now being reversed by the increase in cognitive complexity (both on the chip/“silicon” and on the “system”) that results from advanced process geometry and progress in SoC design. This constrains the division of inter-firm collaboration within GDNs, and requires more (not less) coordination through corporate management. Large global corporations (the network flagships) are required as “knowledge integrators” to coordinate multiple interfaces between specialized bodies of knowledge within GDNs that have evolved as a result of technical modularity.

Chesbrough’s dynamic theory of modularity provides a useful framework for analyzing how each transition to a new architecture affects the process of modularization (Chesbrough and Kusunoki, 2001; Chesbrough, 2003b). Chesbrough argues that the evolution of technology is cyclical, moving from “interdependent” to “modular” design architectures and back to “interdependent” ones, and that this technology cycle conditions the choice of organization and strategy. This reflects fundamental “limits to modularity” that are most prominent at the early stages of the development of a new technology. It is worthwhile to quote in detail this proposition:

When technologies are interdependent, internal organization can better sort out these complex technical interactions than market-mediated transacting, due to the lower coordination costs of internal organization.... This internal advantage goes away when technologies’ interrelationships become better understood.... [T]he incentives available within the market ... [now] elicit greater innovation, and spread the costs of innovation across a wider market, relative to internal organization. At some later time, though, once these well-understood, modular technologies hit their performance limits, an interdependent technology phase arises anew. (Chesbrough, 2003b: 184–185).

Chesbrough's model distinguishes three stages: interdependent architecture 1 (I1), modular architecture 1 (M1) and interdependent architecture 2 (I2). Technological interdependence characterizes any new technology. During stage I1,

the requisite information of how the different elements function together is not well defined, and interactions between elements are poorly understood.... In this early stage of technology evolution, managerial coordination, rather than markets, provides the most effective mechanisms to coordinate the relationship between elements of the system. (Chesbrough, 2003b: 176)

With growing maturity of the technology, modularization becomes possible, leading to stage M1. Engineers can now use the twin tools of analysis and synthesis to reduce significantly the complexity of the technology interfaces (Simon, 1962; Henderson and Clark, 1990; von Hippel, 1990; Kogut and Zander, 1993). When benefits from established modular architecture are decreasing, the search for a new design architecture will lead to a new stage I2. At each stage, firms pursue different types of learning: learning-by-doing is required during I1, while learning-before-doing (Pisano, 1996) becomes possible during M1. The transition to I2 requires relearning and a return to learning-by-doing.

Chesbrough (2003b) uses the development of heads, one of the key components of a hard disk drive, to demonstrate the dynamic cyclical evolution of modularity. He shows that, with each transition to a new generation of head technology, integrated modes of organization have regained advantages over more modular modes of organization—at least for a certain period of time. With the transition from iron-oxide to thin-film heads,

... [t]he integrated head manufacturers (i.e. the firms that made drives, as well as heads) were able to adopt the thin film heads years ahead of the merchant suppliers, precisely because they could employ internal administrative means to coordinate the interdependencies between the heads and the drive design. (Chesbrough, 2003b: 183)

A similar shift occurred with the development of a recording head technology, called *magneto-resistive* (MR) heads. Extreme interdependence is the hallmark of this complex technology—"the design of the disks, actuator mechanisms, and read-write channels depended upon the design of the head—and vice versa" (Chesbrough, 2003b: 183). Again, integrated manufacturers who made their own heads such as IBM, Hitachi and Fujitsu, found it easier to sort out these interdependencies, and figure out solutions to these problems. Chesbrough and Kusunoki (2001) demonstrate that non-integrated disk drive companies like Western Digital and Maxtor in the USA, and NEC and Toshiba in Japan, found themselves in a

“modularity trap” as they lacked the internal systems integration capabilities to cope with the interdependencies of MR heads.

This pattern also holds for the example of chip design that I have introduced at the beginning of this section. As both design and fabrication technologies keep changing fast and unpredictably, the resultant increase in the cognitive and organizational complexity of chip design has produced an extreme degree of interdependence. Consequently, for each SoC design project, GDNs are constructed around project leaders (the network flagships) with systems integration capabilities strong enough to coordinate multiple design interfaces (Ernst, 2005b). These knowledge integrators are needed to coordinate multiple interfaces between fabless design houses and foundries, as well as with a diverse group of specialized providers of complementary services, such as tools for EDA, verification, testing and the development of embedded software (ESW).

This gives rise to an important strategic dilemma that has been widely emphasized in the revisionist literature. As modularity is not the stable end state of industry evolution, firms must retain their system-level knowledge. There are thus strong reasons to believe that market modularity, without corrective moves towards organizational integration, may slow down the pace of innovation. First, as demonstrated by Chesbrough (2003b: 191), “[o]nce the advance of modularity has obliterated the rents from architectural knowledge, there is a real question of how a firm may sustain its systems integration capabilities in the absence of being able to profit from that knowledge”. In other words, how can system companies and IDMs develop their system-level knowledge in a modular world, when they must compete against firms that pursue highly focused business strategies, and thus do not incur the cost of developing and maintaining system-level knowledge?

But even if a protect leader retains extensive systems integration capabilities and market power, it may find it difficult to advance architectures (“lead platforms”) in an industry, precisely because so much modularity has been developed. A typical example are the difficulties faced by Intel in its attempt to promote its “platform leadership” strategies (Gawer and Cusumano, 2002: 39–76). These strategies are defined by decisions on the “system architecture (the degree of modularity), interfaces (the degree of openness of the interfaces to the platform), and intellectual property (how much information about the platform and its interfaces to disclose to outside firms)” (ibid.: 40). To build a coalition of complementors to its platform, Intel must shoulder the substantial costs and risks involved in making new products that complement the new architecture.

However, three caveats need to be added to Chesbrough’s dynamic theory of modularity. First, his proposition that the maturity of a technology is a necessary condition for market modularity certainly holds at M1 (phase of modular architecture 1). But this proposition may not be applicable for “interdependent architecture 2” (I2). The long and very costly search for a new and better architecture may actually require some degree of market

modularity as a searching tool, to cope with increasing complexities.¹⁹ This would imply however that the role of modularity at I2 may be quite different from the role it plays at M1.

Second, pure modularity and pure technological interdependence are of course extreme boundary conditions (Brusoni and Prencipe, 2001)—most products and technologies exist somewhere along a continuum between these extremes. But these concepts are useful for examining the arduous process of advancing to a new and better architecture in an industry characterized by significant modularity. Chesbrough's dynamic theory of modularity demonstrates that, if a firm fails to adjust its organization and innovation management to the requirements of the new architecture, it risks being caught in a "modularity trap". In other words, if a firm focuses too much on developing products *within* given interface standards, this may erode the firm's system integration capabilities. A "modularity trap" exists, when flagships fail to retain those system integration capabilities that are necessary to incorporate new (interdependent) component technologies effectively into their systems (Chesbrough and Kusunoki, 2001).

A third caveat is that the sheer logic of technological development may not be sufficient to explain why "modularity traps" occur and why this leads to more organizational integration.²⁰ As I demonstrate below, limits to modularity (Chesbrough's "modularity traps") quite often reflect fundamental conflicts of interest that separate for instance a global system player and its modular suppliers of manufacturing and design services. The dilemma a system player faces is that the more system technology he gives away to his suppliers, he may get better and cheaper products. But, at the same time, he may experience a substantial loss in the control that he can exercise over his suppliers.

Despite these caveats, however, there is no doubt that Chesbrough's theory has opened up important new avenues for the study of modularity. A dynamic perspective of modularization processes demonstrates that almost every technology gives rise to a "modularity trap" at some stage in its evolution. This is so because attempts to advance beyond the current architecture reintroduce "the complexity at the systems level that modularity was intended to manage" (Chesbrough, 2003b: 190). It is thus difficult to sustain the assumption, implicit in much of the modularity literature, that modularity is the stable end state of industry evolution, and that this is true across industries and technologies. While modular design has acted as a powerful catalyst for changes in business organization and industry structure, limits to modularity are aplenty, and constrain the convergence of technical, organizational and market modularity.

¹⁹I am grateful to Hiroyuki Chuma from Hitotsubashi University for this important qualification.

²⁰Xiaobai Shen from Edinburgh University has emphasized this important caveat in an email to the author, dated 4 November 2004.

4. Limits to Modularity (1): Demanding Coordination Requirements

That this is so should not be surprising. As Pavitt (1999: XX) has convincingly argued, activities that require complex knowledge pose very demanding coordination requirements. There are cognitive limits to the process of modularization. Based on Brusoni (2003) and Tokumaru (2004), it is possible to highlight important differences in the coordination requirements of “project execution” (to design and produce an artifact, e.g. a chip) and of “technology development” (to produce the underlying knowledge bases).

Baldwin and Clark (2000: ch. 3) correctly emphasize that modularity in design has created opportunities for vertical specialization (combining disintegration and geographic dispersion) in project execution. Their analysis however neglects the increased knowledge exchange that is necessary to develop design and manufacturing technologies. This, in turn, requires *ex ante* coordination through integration in technology development. Modular product design thus needs knowledge-integrating firms to coordinate specialized bodies of knowledge and increasingly distributed learning processes. It does not reduce the need for system integration.

This argument runs counter to established wisdom. Arora *et al.* (1997) for instance argue that modularity can be applied to innovation as well as to manufacturing.

This is because modularity allows for a separation of the innovation process in two main activities: The production of basic (standardised) modules, and their combination to produce variants of technologies or product designs that are better suited to the special needs of individual users or markets. (ibid.: 123)

In this view, there is a clear-cut separation between specialized suppliers and system integrators, with interactions between these firms coordinated by the market. Each supplier, focusing on a specific innovation module, would be able to specialize in specific learning and innovative efforts, while the “combination of modules” will be performed by downstream firms or by the users themselves. This “modular” division of labor is made possible by the use of information technology (Arora *et al.* mention simulation software for design purposes) that allows to codify knowledge, and hence facilitates knowledge exchange. Modularity is supposed to erode the importance of ownership control, because it creates alternative market-based coordination mechanisms. This is so because a modular architecture creates an “information structure” that cannot be changed during the duration of the project, and hence can be used to coordinate decentralized design teams.

But this argument fails to acknowledge that the reuse of knowledge to combine modules requires a broader knowledge base for systems integration. In other words, modular product design may well increase

complexity and hence the need for system integration. Large global network flagships retain diversified technology bases precisely to cope with the demanding coordination requirements of disintegrated and geographically dispersed “technology development”. This is in line with the findings of Granstrand *et al.* (1997) that large firms are more diversified in the technologies they master than the products that they make and that their technological diversity has been increasing while typically their product range has narrowed.

There is no automatic link between adopting a modular product design strategy and the adoption of a modular organization. Such a direct link is even less likely between the use of a modular product design and the modularization of the firm’s knowledge base (Brusoni, 2003: 5). In fact, it is necessary to push the argument one step further (Ernst, 2005b). Network flagships that can serve as “system integrators” are required to coordinate multi-layered global networks of firms that interact to conceive, design and engineer an artifact. As explained above, this is especially the case for new, “interdependent” design architectures—their development requires flagships that possess the systems integration knowledge to evaluate how best to advance across the myriad possible combinations (Brusoni and Prencipe, 2001; Brusoni, 2003).

Take “platform design”, an important recent development in chip design methodology that attempts to reduce the time required and risk involved in designing and verifying a complex SoC, by heavily and systematically reusing as many design steps as possible (Chang, 2003: 23; Martin, 2003: 12–15). Platforms design attempts to capture and reuse not just individual design building-blocks (SIPs), but the “best architectures and design approaches found for particular types of products and markets ... [Platforms] crystallize and harden these approaches for reuse by others” (Martin, 2003: 13). In essence, platform design provides “a common base for the manifestation of differentiated systems knowledge”. But platform design does little to reduce the need for system integration. On the contrary, a capacity to coordinate diversified knowledge bases has become the main focus of competitive strategy, complementing the earlier focus on vertical specialization.

A combination of process technology, design IP and system applications knowledge have helped IDMs like Intel, Texas Instruments and STMicroelectronics to develop “platform leadership” strategies. This has enabled IDMs to compete successfully against the “modularity” model, as represented by the collaboration between fabless design houses and foundries. The same is true for system companies like IBM, Philips, Nokia, Samsung, LG and the leading Japanese electronics system companies. Even when they purchase semiconductors from specialized suppliers (whether from IDMs, like Intel or TI, or from fabless and chipless companies), these system companies make a strong effort to retain considerable internal expertise in SC process technology, fabrication, EDA tools and design IP. They realize that, without in-house mastery of such

capabilities, it would be difficult to retain systems knowledge—the latter being a necessary prerequisite for turning these assets into differentiating features of their products and services.

Of critical importance for the flagships of GDNs is the ability to frame the problems (architectures; components; performance features) to be addressed in specific, temporary design projects.²¹ As explained by Brusoni (2003), flagships need to be able to identify the crucial technological and organizational interdependencies, to explore alternative ways of de-composing the problem, and to isolate those options that do not deserve to be pursued further. They need to be able to identify, probe and freeze key interdependencies. For each specific project, that is, the design of an embedded microcontroller for a mobile phone for Motorola, the network “provides a temporary administrative framework within which some form of hierarchical coordination replaces the market” (Brusoni, 2003: 15).

In short, modular product design may lead to vertical specialization in project execution, but it requires integration in technology development. Ownership of tangible assets is not a sufficient condition for the effective coordination of multi-layered GDNs. Equally important are network flagships that can serve as “system integrators”.

5. Limits to Modularity (2): Constraints to Interface Standardization

A surprising feature of modular systems is their considerable rigidity. Once deployed, interface standards are difficult to adjust. When performance gains from a particular design architecture approach a limit, it becomes necessary to establish a new architecture. But a defining characteristic of modular systems is that any transition to a new generation of design architecture requires fundamental changes in system components, which consequently will break down established interface standards (Chesbrough, 2003b).²²

Take the aforementioned transformation of chip design, where a re-coupling of design and chip fabrication requires fundamental changes in design methodology. The result is that established interface standards cease to function, even for the most profoundly documented design rules that link fabricators (the silicon foundries) and design houses (Ernst, 2005b). Another example is the transition from 8-bit to 16-bit micro-processors that required massive changes in complementary software and

²¹ A project is defined as “basically a contract, or rather a bundle of contracts, that specify the duties, responsibilities and rewards of the firms involved” (Brusoni, 2003: 15).

²² Recently, however, attempts to avoid being trapped by prematurely frozen design parameters have led to new approaches to improve the flexibility of SoC design, for instance, through reconfigurable processors (Rowen, 2004). But it remains to be seen how viable these new approaches will be.

hardware, and hence necessitated a redefinition of interface standards (Chesbrough, 2003b: 180, 181).

Sabel and Zeitlin (2004: 2 m) demonstrate that it is impossible to establish "... standard design interfaces so comprehensive and stable that customers and suppliers can in effect interact as if operating in spot markets for complex components or subassemblies without jeopardizing their long-term survival". In line with Pavitt (1999), they argue that innovation creates "unpredictable novelty", requiring continuous relearning. Hence, "modularization, at least in the form of entrenched standards, cannot be" (Sabel and Zeitlin, 2004: 5 m).

Chip design provides an important example of the tight limits to interface standardization. Based on standard interfaces and design rules, the division of labor used to be reasonably simple during much of the 1990s. The resulting separation of chip design and fabrication has been one of the favorite examples of modularization proponents. Engineers designed chips and handed the definition to the mask makers, who then sent the masks to the wafer manufacturers (the silicon foundries). And (most of the time, at least) the result of having this modular division of labor was a chip that could be manufactured at an acceptable yield.

However, this easy phase of modularization of the semiconductor industry has vanished for good. As process technology has dramatically increased in complexity, intense interactions are required across all stages of the semiconductor value chain, and it is no longer possible to work with entrenched standard interfaces and design rules. All participants in the semiconductor industry know that they need to find a way to organize collective and integrated solutions. They also know that uncertainty makes this extremely difficult, as does the fact that the industry is now vertically specialized.

Current attempts to develop a "Unified Data Model" (UDM) provide an excellent example of the limits to interface standardization in the semiconductor industry. UDM is a database of chip definitions that encapsulates the information required for chip design, mask making and wafer manufacturing and that can function as a single data representation for a wide range of "electronic design automation" (EDA) tools. It is expected that UDM will enable designers to simulate a manufacturing run for different variations of a chip design and then address trade-offs between functionality, density and yield. Equally important benefits are expected to accrue to mask makers and wafer fabricators.²³

²³ Main carriers of UDM include the Silicon Integration Initiative Inc. (SI2), an organization of industry-leading semiconductor manufacturers, electronic system companies, design houses and EDA tool vendors, with the mandate to improve the productivity of integrated circuit manufacturing and design. This industry organization has started to incorporate work from the "Design to Mask Coalition" (DTMC) to extend the "Open Access" standard for EDA tools (see below) with UDM-like features.

While potential benefits are substantial, two fundamental constraints are currently blocking the development of UDM: intense competition among oligopolists; and uncertainty that results from rising complexity due to a shift to a new, interdependent design architecture (SoC). Both constraints indicate persistent limits to modularity. First, intense competition among oligopolists in the EDA tool market prevents companies from agreeing on a common standard. To understand why, let us first look at earlier attempts to develop common data formats for EDA tools. Conditions seemed to be favorable. There were strong pressures to move forward, as design engineers needed common data formats for EDA to collaborate more effectively. In addition, process and design technologies were relatively mature, enabling modular design architectures. Nevertheless, developing a common database was not possible. Reflecting the oligopolistic market structure of the EDA industry, two competing data formats for EDA tools have emerged: “Open Access”, led by Cadence, and supported by IBM, and “Milkyway”, led by Synopsys.

Developing UDM may be even more difficult. This standard is based on the “Open Access” standard, which means that Cadence as well as IBM would greatly benefit if UDM would materialize. It is thus hardly surprising that both these companies are strong supporters of the UDM standard, while both Synopsys and Mentor remain hostile.²⁴

But more important are complexity-related constraints that drastically increase uncertainty, obstructing the development of entrenched standards. Increasing complexity results from changes in design architecture as well as from advanced process geometry that pushes the limits of semiconductor fabrication. To cope with increasing complexity requires dense interactions between IC design and fabrication, and these interactions must occur simultaneously at multiple levels. In contrast to the earlier separation of design and manufacturing, current transformations appear to move in the opposite direction, to a more integrated model.

Design teams now must share data and exchange knowledge with mask makers and wafer fabricators (foundries). For instance, mask makers must have access to design data so that they can make quick changes in their techniques (such as for recticle enhancement), which gets increasingly tricky as component size shrinks. However, today’s chip design methodologies do not provide mask manufacturers with the data they need. As a result, mask makers

... often waste time tuning circuits inappropriately or, worse, tuning layout features that aren’t even part of the actual circuitry.... There’s always the danger that the tweaking that takes place during mask making may result in accidental changes to the performance of chip circuits, necessitating expensive design iterations. (James, 2004: 2)

²⁴ Cadence actually provided the Open Access original code to the SI2 organization.

Design rules are also no longer capable of coordinating the interface between design and fabrication. With growing miniaturization, design rules become geometrically more complex and interdependent. The chief technical officer of a major photomask producer worries that "... at 65nm, designers may end up with so many rules that it will be impossible for a mere mortal (even a design engineer) to cope with all of them" (quoted in James, 2004: 2).

All of this indicates very tight constraints to interface standardization. "We simply don't have enough science to understand how to create a data format that would work in all these different environments" (Joe Sawicki, vice president of the design-to-silicon group at Mentor, as quoted in James, 2004: 3). Other observers go even further, and argue that a common interface standard is logically impossible, as "... the tasks and tools in different (design) phases need to see data very differently to be effective ... [Hence], [e]ach tool requires a data model that is specific to the task" (Richard Goldman, VP of strategic market development at Synopsys, as quoted in James, 2004: 3). An additional modularity constraint is built-in obsolescence, a concern voiced especially by IP providers. In this view, common standard interfaces are much too rigid to cope with frequent adjustments in chip manufacturing processes which are commonplace at the sub-micron level.

Our analysis of constraints to interface standardization in chip design confirms Chesbrough's dynamic theory of modularity (see Section 3.3 of this paper). These constraints result from the transition to new and immature architectures and process technologies. However, I part company with Chesbrough's analysis, in emphasizing that these limits to modularity will not necessarily lead to a pendulum-like swing back to the *status quo ante* of vertical integration. Instead, as demonstrated in Ernst and Martin (2005), new hybrid forms of industrial organization that mix and match elements of modularity and integration, are likely to emerge. These hybrid organizational responses reflect the simple fact that firms need to cope with highly complex technical and competitive challenges for which no ready-made organizational solutions exist.

Take design rules. With increasing complexity, they need to treat a fine balance. Design rules need to be "enabling, i.e. firm enough to encourage modular innovation and recombination—but loose enough not to be constraining to the evolution of the system" (Sabel and Zeitlin, 2004: 5, 6m). This is why inter-firm collaboration increasingly relies on emerging methodologies and practices of iterated co-design, such as concurrent engineering, bench-marking, co-location of personnel, problem-solving teams and processual quality standards. This forces "collaborators to question and clarify their assumptions about their joint project, ... [allowing] for a corrigible partitioning of tasks within and across firm boundaries [, DE: and national borders] in ways that fixed modular interfaces do not" (Sabel and Zeitlin, 2004: 2).

The only thing certain is that, with rising complexity, designers, mask makers and wafer fabricators must move beyond the “modular” design network. They must find new and unconventional ways to work together “collaboratively” as part of more integrated GDNs. For this to happen, however, all three actors will need a shared data model, so redesigns that are mandated during fabrication will not force the designers to start again from scratch. But developing such a common database for interdependent design architectures is extremely difficult.

Whether these limits to modularity can be overcome, depends in the end on competitive dynamics. There might be forces that can break the limits of oligopolistic rivalry. For instance, a leading foundry (e.g. TSMC) or IDM could impose a solution by forcing the rest of the industry to use whatever UDM definition would work well in its factories. But this would force the foundry or IDM to reveal more about its own internal data representations than it might normally want to do. Alternatively, a “customer revolt” by the chip design community may help to break the stalemate: “... at some point, EDA users will probably ... refuse to buy additional tools until they get the interoperability that’s necessary to preserve their cost structure” (James, 2004: 5).

6. Management Responses

As chip design has moved beyond the “easy” phase of modularization, this raises new challenges for managing complex SoC design projects. To examine how management attempts to respond, I use two analytical devices: the concept of “iterated co-design”, introduced by Sabel and Zeitlin (2004), and Christensen’s concept of “disruptive technologies” (Christensen, 1997).

“Iterated co-design” is defined as adjustments in organization, work routines and location that allow for formalized but flexible inter-firm collaboration within global networks. This concept is particularly helpful to understand how management seeks to adjust the organization of engineering and design networks, to cope with the above limits to modularity. A basic characteristic of “iterated co-design” arrangements is that “suppliers contribute to the redefinition of interface specifications for new products based on their experience in manufacturing existing models” (Sabel and Zeitlin, 2004: 12). As a decentralized process of concurrent engineering, “iterated co-design” has been pioneered in the car industry. But, as research on GDNs in the electronics industry shows, SoC design methodologies are following similar principles (Ernst, 2005b).

Iterated co-design has two objectives: to cope with uncertainty that incumbent market leaders face through disruptive technologies, as defined in Christensen (1997); and to shape and adjust the multiple interfaces among disintegrated and geographically dispersed design teams that are contributing to a modular design project. “Disruptive technologies” are a serious challenge for incumbent market leaders, precisely because they

begin to realize their potential in lower-end and initially peripheral markets, and because they are typically cheaper, simpler, smaller, and, frequently, more convenient to use (Christensen, 1997: XV).²⁵ “Disruptive technologies” are ubiquitous—in principle, all established technologies are disruptible. This explains why “modularization, by entrenching deep assumptions about the design of products or product classes, is a self-limiting strategy” (Sabel and Zeitlin, 2004: 8). With high uncertainty about changes in technology and markets, stabilization of technical interface standards is a two-edged sword.

Some standardization is obviously necessary to allow specialists to focus on the complex subsystems in which they have distinctive capabilities. But too much standardization can just as obviously become a barrier to systematic innovation and lock component manufacturers into a potentially obsolete product architecture. (Sabel and Zeitlin, 2004: 9)

Especially in fast-moving industries like semiconductors, firms are reluctant to commit to a single product architecture and to a single set of technical interface standards. The ubiquitous threat of “disruptive technologies” may thus constrain the development of market modularity.

Of equal importance is the second objective of “iterated co-design”, that is, to coordinate the multiple interfaces that reflect the growing complexity of SoC design. An interface is created when information must flow, and when knowledge must be exchanged, “... between groups that are isolated from each other, whether by goals, methodologies, geography or culture” (Wilson, 2003: 49). This is exactly what is happening with SoC design. The diversity of functions that must be integrated into the chip means that

various blocks within the finished design will have come from different groups, some within and some outside the design team. Some of these groups ... may not share a vocabulary, or even a language and culture with the primary chip design group. (Wilson, 2003: 48)

A typical SoC design team needs to manage at least six main types of design interfaces (Ernst, 2005b): with system designers, with providers of design building-blocks (the so-called silicon intellectual property, SIP), with

²⁵ Christensen provides three reasons why incumbents fail to notice “lower-end” markets that may erode their market leadership: (i) Because these technologies are simpler and cheaper, they promise lower margins, not greater profits: “It is very difficult for a company whose cost structure is tailored to compete in high-end markets to be profitable in low-end markets as well” (Christensen, 1997: XX). (ii) Disruptive technologies are first commercialized in emerging and insignificant markets that large companies have great difficulties addressing. And (iii) The incumbents’ most profitable customers generally do not want, and initially cannot use products based on disruptive technologies.

software developers, with verification teams, with EDA tool vendors, as well as with foundry services (fabrication).

In addition, these different design network communities are spread across the firms and research institutes that participate in GDNs, described in footnote 3 of this paper. Managing these multiple design interfaces poses extremely demanding coordination requirements. For instance, each of the different design network communities insists on using its own language and tools. Typically, in SoC design teams, there are “islands of automation” of different design tasks, each based on a different language. “Nobody will easily give up the language or the approach used for their own particular task for the sake of the overall flow” (Pierre Bricaud, design manager at Mentor Graphics, quoted in “SoC designers describe their ‘best practices’”, 2002).

This poses a serious challenge to modular design organization. As design teams become larger and separated by distance or design disciplines, they need to be able to communicate with each other. While they share a common objective, they use highly dissimilar vocabularies. Defining interfaces requires shared definitions of the data that need to be exchanged, of the formats and protocols that govern data transfer and interpretation, and of the economic performance requirements of the designs. Developing a precise common vocabulary for these three interface attributes is extremely difficult. Equally important, data must be translated into a form usable by different design groups.

“Iterated co-design” is an attempt to cope with these difficulties, by rendering tacit knowledge at least partly explicit. But this requires a profound capacity for systems integration in order to coordinate the multiple interfaces (e.g. Davies, 2003). Equally important is a capacity for close monitoring of interactions, in order “to detect performance failures and deception before they lead to disastrous consequences” (Sabel and Zeitlin, 2004: 13). To understand the challenges for “iterated co-design”, let us look at two illustrative examples of design interface management within GDNs: interfaces of the core SoC design team with system designers, and interfaces with foundry services.

By definition, SoC design requires close interaction with system designers, marketing people and global brand leaders (the OEMs). With product life cycles often as short as 6 months or less, system design requirements keep changing rapidly. The protocol necessary to transmit these changes real time to all the different design network participants is “one of the great unsolved problems of design management” (Wilson, 2003: 56). Communication is also fraught with problems between hardware and software designers: “Verilog representation of a block by hardware designers, for example, may need to be translated into ... a Java transaction-level model of the block for use by software designers” (Wilson, 2003: 52). The amount of work required for this translation is enormous, so much depends on the availability of new software tools that would make a progressive automation possible.

Interactions with foundry services are arguably the most explicitly recognized interfaces in the entire SoC flow, with well documented and automatically checkable “design rules” (Macher *et al.*, 2002). Yet, with growing complexity of SoC design, the management of the foundry interface also poses new challenges. A combination of new processes and drastic changes in design methodology implies that design rules need to be tweaked and stretched, requiring a much closer interaction between designers and process engineers. From the perspective of foundries, for instance, process technology with line-width below 130 nanometers makes yield enhancement much more difficult for complex SoCs (author’s interview with Taiwanese foundry, 22 September 2003). As processes grow more demanding, mask makers and process engineers will try to pass this growing complexity to the chip design team through an enormous increase in complexity in either cell selection or design rules. Typically, the foundry’s process engineers now include into the design rules for SoC designers the request to “design-for-yield-enhancement”.

This new interface requirement with fabrication means that design teams must adjust the design to improve the odds that the process will yield well and that the dice will continue working even under demanding system performance requirements. In other words, designers must take into account the effects of fabrication process variations, which makes design even more complex. There is now a much greater need for dense interaction between physical designers and process integration teams, even for relatively stable designs. Designers increasingly must take into account the intricacies of process development. An “extraordinary degree of coordination” is required between SoC designers, mask makers, foundries and third party SIP suppliers (“90-nm design flow is seen as a community effort”, 2003).

In short, chip design has become itself a highly complex technology system, where multiple communication and knowledge exchange interfaces must be managed simultaneously. Obviously, the idea of translating technical modularity into organizational modularity through vertical specialization has many attractions. Yet, its implementation requires a mind-boggling degree of cooperation among the diverse participants of design networks. We have seen that this is true for all the different design interfaces. Ironically, the more chip design becomes modularized through SoC methodologies, and the more it moves into sub-micron territory, the more current transformations appear to move in the opposite direction to more integrated forms of industrial organization. Yet this does not imply a return to the *status quo ante* of vertical integration. Instead, new hybrid forms of “virtual reintegration” are likely to emerge, as firms need to cope with increasingly complex technical and competitive challenges (as explored in Ernst and Martin, 2005).

7. Conclusions

To conclude, there is no doubt that progress in the division of labor in design (technical modularity) has created ample opportunities for the organization of firms beyond Chandler's vertically integrated multi-divisional firm. Modularity has also transformed industry structure and markets, by fostering vertical specialization in both manufacturing and innovation. But there is nothing automatic about this process. That we do not find a "natural" convergence of technical, organizational and market modularity has its root cause in fundamental limits to modularity.

We obviously need to revisit earlier debates on modularity in order to improve the theoretical and empirical validity of that concept. The paper presents a critical review of a revisionist literature that has highlighted three specific weaknesses of current modularity theories: they confound technical with market modularity; they exaggerate the empirical significance of market modularity; and they fail to explore the dynamics of modularization. The paper argues that these weaknesses must be addressed, if we want to capture the complex forces and constraints that link technical modularity with changes in organization and market structure. A particularly important priority for research are technology transitions across product generations and their impact on limits to modularity.²⁶

All of this strongly suggests that we need to counter whatever tendency exists in the "modularity" literature to generalize empirical observations that are context-specific and to confound them with prescription as well as prediction. It is certainly not possible to sustain the claim that modularity is the stable end state of industry evolution, and that this is true across industries and technologies. While modular design has acted as a powerful catalyst for changes in business organization and industry structure, limits to modularity are aplenty, and constrain the convergence of technical, organizational and market modularity.

However, while revisionist accounts have identified the weaknesses of the "pure" modularity theories, we need to push the analysis further. To get to the root causes of the modularity limits, we need to move beyond the inherent logic of technological development and examine the impact of broader economic forces, such as competitive dynamics and government policies. Using evidence from chip design, the paper demonstrates that the limits to modularity quite often reflect fundamental conflicts of interest that separate for instance a global system player and its modular suppliers of manufacturing and design services. Equally important are conflicting interests between the specialized engineering design communities and the diverse group of firms that contribute to a particular chip design project. I have used this broader conceptual framework to examine in detail two fundamental limits to modularity: demanding coordination requirements,

²⁶ In addition to Henry Chesbrough's work, see also Cantwell *et al.* (2004) and Ernst (forthcoming).

especially for technology development; and constraints to interface standardization that result from competitive dynamics and cognitive complexity. Finally, two analytical devices have been used to examine how management attempts to respond to these limits: the concept of “iterated co-design” (Sabel and Zeitlin, 2004) and the concept of “disruptive technologies” (Christensen, 1997).

These findings add an important qualification to a widely accepted proposition that, as relevant knowledge can now be codified in frameworks and categories, codification will “naturally” enhance the division of innovative labor by lowering the transaction cost of technological knowledge (e.g. Arora and Gambardella, 1994). As Tokumaru (2004: 3) observes, this concept of “knowledge” comes very close to Arrow’s (1962) concept of context-independent information that can be easily transmitted. By reducing learning to information processing, that proposition neglects the increasing complexity of technological knowledge that accompanies the process of codification, as this paper demonstrates for chip design.

The paper also adds a second important qualification. I emphasize that technical modularity does not imply that the “Visible Hand” of large global corporations will vanish. The paper shows that even in semiconductors, an industry favored by modularity proponents, there are powerful counterforces causing organizational structures to become more integrated, not more arm’s length. In line with Brusoni *et al.* (2001), Brusoni (2003), Chesbrough (2003a, b), Pavitt (2003a, b) and Tokumaru (2004), this paper introduces a counter-proposition: if codification does not reduce complexity (which it fails to do when technologies keep changing fast and unpredictably), then the division of innovative labor will remain constrained, and requires more (not less) coordination through system integrators or network flagships.

Acknowledgements

The author gratefully acknowledges comments and suggestions from Grant Martin, Barry Naughton, Ove Granstrand, Henry Chesbrough, Charles Sabel, Terutomo Ozawa, Hiroyuki Chuma, Shen Xiaobai, Ron Wilson, Henry Chang, Larry Rosenberg, Stefano Brusoni, Norio Tokumaru, Kazufumi Tanaka and Boy Luethje.

References

- Acha, V. (2002) Framing the past and future: the development and deployment of technological capabilities in the upstream petroleum industry. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Science Policy Research Unit (SPRU), University of Sussex at Brighton.
- Acha, V. and Brusoni, S. (2002) Knowledge on wheels: new lessons from the tyre industry. Paper presented at the June 2002 DRUID Conference, Copenhagen, Denmark.

- Arora, A. and Gambardella, A. (1994) The changing technology of technological change: general and abstract knowledge and the division of innovative labor, *Research Policy*, 23, pp. 523–532.
- Arora, A., Gambardella, A. and Rullani, A. (1997) Division of labour and the locus of inventive activity, *Journal of Management and Governance*, 1, pp. 123–140.
- Arrow, K. J. (1962) The economic implications of learning by doing, *Review of Economic Studies*, June.
- Baldwin, C. W. and Clark, K. B. (2000) *Design Rules: The Power of Modularity* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).
- Bengtsson, L. and Berggren, C. (2002) Horizontally integrated or vertically divided? A comparison of outsourcing strategies at Ericsson and Nokia. Working Paper, Linköping University, Sweden, October.
- Benson-Armer, R. J. *et al.* (2004) Getting contract manufacturers back on track, *The McKinsey Quarterly*, July.
- Brusoni, S. (2003) Authority in the age of modularity. SPRU Electronic Working Paper Series, No.101, The Freeman Centre, University of Sussex, June.
- Brusoni, S. and Prencipe, A. (2001) Technologies, product, organisations: opening the blackbox of modularity, *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 10(1), pp. 179–205.
- Brusoni, S., Prencipe, A. and Pavitt, K. (2001) Knowledge specialisation, organisational coupling, and the boundaries of the firm: why do firms know more than they make?, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46, pp. 597–621.
- Cantwell, J. *et al.* (2004) *Economics and Management of Technological Diversification* (London: Routledge).
- Chandler, A. D. (1977) *The Visible Hand. The Managerial Revolution in American Business* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press).
- Chang, H. (2003) SoC design methodologies, chapter 2 in: G. Martin & H. Chang (Eds) *Winning the SoC Revolution: Experiences in Real Design* (Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic).
- Chang, H. *et al.* (1999) *Surviving the SoC Revolution: A Guide to Platform-Based Design* (Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic).
- Chesbrough, H. W. (2003a) *Open Innovation. The New Imperative for Creating and Profiting from Technology* (Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press).
- Chesbrough, H. W. (2003b) Towards a dynamics of modularity. A cyclical model of technical advance, in: A. Prencipe *et al.* (Eds) *The Business of Systems Integration* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Chesbrough, H. and Kusunoki, K. (2001) The modularity trap: innovation, technology phases shifts and the resulting limits of virtual organizations, in: I. Nonaka & D. Teece (Eds) *Managing Industrial Knowledge*, pp. 202–230 (London: Sage).
- Chesbrough, H. and Rosenbloom, R. (2002) The role of the business model in capturing value from innovation, *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 11(2), pp. 529–556.
- Christensen, C. M. (1997) *The Innovator's Dilemma. When New Technologies Cause Great Firms to Fail* (Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press).
- Chuma, H. and Aoshima, Y. (2003) Determinants of microlithography industry leadership: the possibility of collaboration and outsourcing. RIETI Discussion Paper Series 03-E-003, Institute of Innovation Research, Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo.
- Coase, R. (1937) The nature of the firm, *Economica*, 4, November, pp. 386–405.
- Davies, A. (1997) The life cycle of a complex product system, *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 1(3), pp. 229–256.
- Davies, A. (2003) Integrated solutions. The changing business of systems integration, in: A. Prencipe *et al.* (Eds) *The Business of Systems Integration* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Ernst, D. (1983) *The Global Race in Microelectronics*, with a foreword by Prof. David Noble, 290 (Frankfurt and New York: Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), Campus Publishers).
- Ernst, D. (1997) *From Partial to Systemic Globalization. International Production Networks in the Electronics Industry*, report prepared for the Sloan Foundation, published as *The Data Storage*

- Industry Globalization Project Report 97-02* (Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies, University of California at San Diego).
- Ernst, D. (2002a) Global production networks and the changing geography of innovation systems. Implications for developing countries, *Economics of Innovation and New Technologies*, XI(6), pp. 497–523.
- Ernst, D. (2002b) The economics of electronics industry: competitive dynamics and industrial organization, in: W. Lazonick (Ed.) *The International Encyclopedia of Business and Management (IEBM), Handbook of Economics* (London: International Thomson Business Press).
- Ernst, D. (2003) Digital information systems and global flagship networks: how mobile is knowledge in the global network economy?, in: J. F. Christensen (Ed.) *The Industrial Dynamics of the New Digital Economy* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar).
- Ernst, D. (2004) Global production networks in East Asia's electronics industry and upgrading perspectives in Malaysia, in: S. Yusuf *et al.* (Eds) *Global Production Networking and Technological Change in East Asia* (Washington, DC: World Bank and Oxford University Press).
- Ernst, D. (2005a) The new mobility of knowledge: digital information systems and global flagship networks, in: S. Sassen (Ed.) *Digital Formations in a Connected World*, published for the US Social Science Research Council (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Ernst, D. (2005b) Complexity and internationalisation of innovation: why is chip design moving to Asia?, *International Journal of Innovation Management*, special issue in honour of Keith Pavitt (P. Augsdoerfer, J. Sapsed & J. Utterback, guest editors), 9(1), March, pp. 47–73.
- Ernst, D. (forthcoming) *Internationalization of Innovation. Root Causes and Policy Implications*, book manuscript (Honolulu, HI: East–West Center).
- Ernst, D. and Martin, G. (2005) Co-evolution of technical modularity and organizational integration—the case of “system-on-chip” design. Manuscript, East–West Center, Honolulu.
- Ernst, D. and O'Connor, D. (1992) *Competing in the Electronics Industry. The Experience of Newly Industrialising Economies*, 303 (Paris: Development Centre Studies, OECD).
- Feenstra, R. (1998) Integration of trade and disintegration of production in the global economy, *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12(4), pp. 31–50.
- Flamm, K. (1999) Digital convergence? The set-top box and the network computer, in: J. A. Eisenach & T. M. Lenard (Eds) *Competition, Innovation and the Microsoft Monopoly: Antitrust in the Digital Market Place* (Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic).
- Foray, D. and Steinmueller, W. E. (2001) Replication of routine, the domestication of tacit knowledge and the economics of inscription technology: a Brave New World? Paper presented at the conference in honor of Richard R. Nelson & Sidney Winter, Danish Research Unit in Industrial Dynamics (DRUID), Aalborg, Denmark, 12–15 June.
- Gartner/Dataquest (2004) Presentation by Jim Tully at Design Automation Conference (DAC) 2004, San Jose, CA.
- Gawer, A. and Cusumano, M. A. (2002) *Platform Leadership. How Intel, Microsoft and Cisco Drive Industry Innovation* (Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press).
- Gereffi, G. (1994) The organization of buyer-driven global commodity chains: how U.S. retailers shape global production networks, in: G. Gereffi & M. Korzeniewicz (Eds) *Commodity Chains and Global Capitalism*, pp. 95–122 (Westport, CT: Greenwood).
- Granstrand, O. *et al.* (1997) Multi-technology corporations: why they have “distributed” rather than “distinctive core” competencies, *California Management Review*, 39(4), pp. 8–25.
- Henderson, R. M. and Clark, K. B. (1990) Architectural innovation: the reconfiguration of existing systems and the failure of established firms, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, March, pp. 9–30.
- Hobday, M. (1995) *Innovation in East Asia: The Challenge to Japan* (Aldershot: Edward Elgar).
- Hummels, D. *et al.* (2001) The nature and growth of vertical specialization in world trade, *Journal of International Economics*, 54(1), June, pp. 75–96.
- James, G. (2004) Panacea or snake oil?, *Electronic Business*, 1 June.

- Jones, R. and Kierzkowski, H. (2001) Horizontal aspects of vertical fragmentation, in: L. K. Cheng & H. Kierzkowski (Eds) *Global Production and Trade in East Asia* (Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic).
- Jørgensen, H. D. and Krogstie, J. (2000) Active models for dynamic networked organisations. Working Paper, Institute of Computer & Information Sciences, Norwegian University of Science and Technology. Available from Harvard.D.Jorgensen@informatics.sintef.no
- Juergens, U. (Ed.) (2000) *New Product Development and Production Networks. Global Industrial Experience* (Berlin: Springer).
- Kogut, B. and Zander, U. (1993) Knowledge of the firm and the evolutionary theory of the multinational corporation, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 24(4), pp. 625.
- Lakenan, B. et al. (2001) Why Cisco fell: outsourcing and its perils, *Strategy + Business*, Booz-Allen & Hamilton, Issue 24, 3rd Quarter, pp. 18–32.
- Langlois, R. N. (1992) External economies and economic progress: the case of the microcomputer industry, *Business History Review*, 66(Spring), pp. 1–50.
- Langlois, R. N. (2003) The vanishing hand: the changing dynamics of industrial capitalism, *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 12(2), pp. 351–385.
- Linden, G. and Somaya, D. (2003) System-on-a-chip integration in the semiconductor industry: industry structure and firm strategies, *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 12(3), pp. 545–576.
- Luethje, B. (2002) Electronics contract manufacturing: global production and the international division of labor in the age of the Internet, *Industry and Innovation*, special issue “Global Production Networks”, 9(3), pp. 227–247.
- Macher, J. T. et al. (2002) e-Business and the disintegration of the semiconductor industry value chain, *Industry and Innovation*, special issue “Global Production Networks”, 9(3), pp. 155–181.
- Martin, G. (2003) The history of the SoC revolution, chapter 1, in: G. Martin & H. Chang (Eds) *Winning the SoC Revolution: Experiences in Real Design* (Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic).
- Martin, G. and Chang, H. (Eds) (2003) *Winning the SoC Revolution: Experiences in Real Design* (Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic).
- O’Keeffee, E. and Williamson, P. (2002) *Case Study ARM Holdings Plc* (Fontainebleau: INSEAD).
- Pavitt, K. (1999) *Technology, Management and Systems of Innovation* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar).
- Pavitt, K. (2003a) Are systems designers & integrators “post-industrial” firms?, in: A. Prencipe et al. (Eds) *Systems Integration and Firm Capabilities* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Pavitt, K. (2003b) What are advances in knowledge doing to the large industrial firm in the “new economy”?, in: J. F. Christensen & P. Maskell (Eds) *The Industrial Dynamics of the New Digital Economy* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar).
- Penrose, E. T. (1959/1995) *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Pisano, G. (1996) *The Development Factory: Unlocking the Potential of Process Innovation* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press).
- Prencipe, A. (1997) Technological capabilities and product evolutionary dynamics: a case study from the aero engine industry, *Research Policy*, 25, pp. 1261–1276.
- Prencipe, A. et al. (Eds) (2003) *The Business of Systems Integration* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Richardson, G. B. (1960/1990) *Information and Investment. A Study in the Working of the Competitive Economy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Rowen, C. (2004) *Engineering the Complex SOC. Fast, Flexible Design with Configurable Processors* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Upper Prentice Hall).
- Sabel, C. F. and Zeitlin, J. (2004) Neither modularity nor relational contracting: inter-firm collaboration in the new economy, *Enterprise and Society*, 5(3), September.
- Sanchez, R. (2000) Modular architectures, knowledge assets, and organizational learning: new management processes for product creation, *International Journal of Technology Management*, 19(6), pp. 610–629.

- Sanchez, R. and Collins, R. P. (2001) Competing—and learning—in modular markets, *Long Range Planning*, 34(6), pp. 645–667.
- Sanchez, R. and Mahoney, J. T. (1996) Modularity, flexibility, and knowledge management in product and organization design, *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(winter special issue), pp. 63–76.
- Sichel, D. E. (1997) *The Computer Revolution: An Economic Perspective* (Washington: Brookings Institution Press).
- Simon, H. (1962) The architecture of complexity, *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 106(6), pp. 467–482.
- SoC designers describe their “best practices” (2002) Editorial, *EEdesign*, 5 April.
- Sturgeon, T. (2002) Modular production networks: a new American model of industrial organization, *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 11(3), pp. 451–496.
- Takeishi, A. and Fujimoto, T. (2003) Modularization in the car industry: interlinked multiple hierarchies of product, production and supplier systems, in: A. Prencipe, A. Davies & M. Hobday (Eds) *The Business of Systems Integration* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Tokumaru, N. (2004) Codification of technological knowledge, technological complexity, and division of innovative labour, in: J. H. Finch & M. Orrillard (Eds) *Complexity and the Economy: Implications for Economic Policy* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar).
- von Hippel, E. (1990) Task partitioning: an innovation process variable, *Research Policy*, 19, pp. 407–418.
- Williamson, O. E. (1985) *The Economic Institutions of Capitalism. Firms, Markets, Relational Contracting* (New York and London: Free Press).
- Wilson, R. (2003) Non-technical issues in SoC design, in: G. Martin & H. Chang (Eds) *Winning the SoC Revolution: Experiences in Real Design* (Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic).