SCIENCE SET
OPEN ACCESS PUBLISHERS

Research Article

Journal of Material Sciences & Applied Engineering

Inventing Over Reinventing the Wheel

Candauda Arachchige Saliya

Department of Business Management, SLIIT Business School, Sri Lanka Institute of Information Technology, Malabe, Sri Lanka.

***Corresponding author:** Candauda Arachchige, Department of Business Management, SLIIT Business School, Sri Lanka Institute of Information Technology, Malabe, Sri Lanka.

Submitted: 23 January 2025 **Accepted:** 27 January 2025 **Published:** 31 January 2025

Citation: *Candauda Arachchige Saliya. (2025). Inventing Over Reinventing the Wheel. J Mat Sci Apl Eng 4(1), 01-05.*

Abstract

This paper examines the critical distinctions between innovation and reinvention, highlighting the transformative potential of creating entirely new systems versus the limitations of incremental adjustments to existing frameworks. Drawing on theoretical foundations such as Schumpeter's "creative destruction" and Christensen's "disruptive innovation," the study underscores the advantages of systemic innovation. Global case studies, including Estonia's e-government platform, Singapore's urban transportation planning, and Rwanda's drone-based healthcare delivery, exemplify the success of building systems from scratch. Conversely, the pitfalls of reinvention are illustrated through the inefficiencies of legacy systems, such as the U.S. IRS's outdated tax processing systems and Sri Lanka's flawed phone-tracking mechanisms. Through a narrative analysis of real-world examples, the paper argues for the adoption of proactive, transparent, and future-focused approaches to innovation rather than adopting already developed system elsewhere. The findings emphasize the necessity of leadership, stakeholder collaboration, and robust investment in research and development to overcome institutional inertia and resource constraints. By fostering a culture of innovation, societies can address contemporary challenges while anticipating future needs, achieving resilience, efficiency, and public trust.

JEL Codes: *O31, O32, H11, L22, R41, I18, D73, F55*

Keywords: Innovation vs. Reinvention, Creative Destruction, Disruptive Innovation, E- Government, Institutional Inertia, Resilience and Public Trust

Inventing Over Reinventing the Wheel

Introduction

In an era marked by unprecedented technological advancements and dynamic societal shifts, the debate between inventing new systems and reinventing existing ones is more relevant than ever. The decision to innovate from the ground up or to adapt legacy systems carries profound implications for efficiency, adaptability, and progress. While reinvention offers the allure of familiarity and perceived cost savings, the case for invention—creating entirely new frameworks—is increasingly compelling. It is through invention that societies can transcend the limitations of the past, integrate cutting-edge technologies, and build systems designed to address contemporary and future challenges [1].

This essay explores the merits of inventing over reinventing the wheel, drawing on theoretical perspectives, global case studies, and real-world examples. Schumpeter's concept of "creative destruction" emphasizes the necessity of dismantling outdated systems to make way for transformative progress [2]. Similarly, Christensen's "The Innovator's Dilemma" highlights how disruptive innovation often originates outside established institutions, as entrenched players are constrained by existing paradigms [3]. These perspectives underscore the potential for invention to address inefficiencies and unlock new opportunities.

Global examples further illustrate the advantages of systemic innovation. Estonia's pioneering e-government platform, which enables citizens to vote, file taxes, and access healthcare online, demonstrates how designing systems from scratch can leapfrog traditional bureaucratic constraints [4]. Rwanda's deployment of drones for healthcare delivery bypasses the limitations of traditional logistics systems, offering a faster and more reliable solution for remote areas [4]. Singapore's integrated urban planning and transportation systems show the long-term benefits of

building forward- thinking frameworks rather than patching aging infrastructures [6].

Conversely, the pitfalls of reinvention are evident in numerous cases where outdated systems failed to meet modern demands. For example, the United States Internal Revenue Service (IRS) continues to struggle with inefficiencies stemming from its reliance on legacy tax processing systems, even after repeated updates [7]. In Sri Lanka, the failure to implement a robust phone-tracking system following a hacking incident in 2022 highlights the risks of relying on patchwork solutions that do not address core issues [8].

Through this analysis, the essay advocates for a paradigm shift in how governments, institutions, and organizations approach systemic challenges. By prioritizing invention over reinvention, societies can build resilient, efficient, and future-proof systems capable of navigating the complexities of a rapidly evolving world.

Literature Review

Theoretical Foundations of Innovation vs. Reinvention

The literature on innovation emphasizes that creating new systems often leads to more significant breakthroughs and long-term efficiency compared to incremental adjustments. Joseph Schumpeter's theory of "creative destruction" underscores the importance of dismantling outdated structures to make way for new, more effective ones. Argues that true progress relies on innovation that disrupts the status quo, paving the way for transformative economic and social advancements [1].

Similarly, Christensen's The Innovator's Dilemma differentiates between sustaining innovations—those that improve existing systems—and disruptive innovations that create new markets and value networks. highlights that disruptive innovation often comes from outside established institutions, as entrenched players are too invested in existing frameworks to envision transformative changes [2].

Global Case Studies: The Success of New Systems

Estonia's E-Government System

Estonia's decision to build an entirely new digital governance system is a textbook example of effective innovation. Drawing on the principles of transparency, efficiency, and accessibility, Estonia created a secure digital platform where citizens can vote, file taxes, and access healthcare services online. This leapfrogged traditional bureaucratic methods, showcasing the benefits of designing systems from scratch. Researchers like attribute Estonia's success to its "path creation" approach, where new systems are designed to bypass the limitations of existing infrastructure entirely [3].

Singapore's Urban Planning and Transportation

Singapore's approach to urban mobility demonstrates the power of systemic innovation. Faced with increasing urbanization, Singapore built a comprehensive public transport system integrated with advanced technologies like predictive maintenance, real-time data analytics, and autonomous vehicles. Unlike many cities that attempt to modernize aging transit systems, Singapore chose to create a forward-thinking framework from the ground up [9].

Rwanda's Drone-Based Healthcare Delivery

In Rwanda, the government addressed the challenges of healthcare delivery in remote areas by partnering with companies like Zipline to deploy drones for medical supply delivery. This innovative approach bypassed the constraints of traditional logistics systems, creating a faster and more reliable method of service delivery. According to this strategy not only improved healthcare outcomes but also set a precedent for technology- driven solutions in developing countries [4].

The Pitfalls of Reinventing the Wheel

The dangers of relying on reinvention are evident in numerous cases where outdated systems failed to meet modern demands. In the United States, for example, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) has struggled with inefficiencies due to its reliance on legacy tax processing systems. Despite repeated updates, these systems remain ill-equipped to handle the complexity of contemporary tax codes and the volume of filings. Academic studies suggest that patching outdated frameworks often results in diminishing returns, as the systems become increasingly resistant to adaptation [6].

In Sri Lanka, the inefficiencies of reinventing the wheel are starkly illustrated in the mismanagement of phone-tracing mechanisms. Following a hacking incident in 2022, authorities failed to implement a robust new system, leaving citizens frustrated by convoluted processes. The lack of a coherent, innovative framework not only wasted resources but also eroded public trust in institutions. According to such situations highlight the "design-reality gap," where systems designed to fit outdated paradigms fail to address current needs effectively [7].

Learning from Failures: The Role of Innovation

Academic literature supports the idea that inventing new systems often requires a paradigm shift. Kuhn's The Structure of Scientific Revolutions posits that progress in any field relies on replacing outdated paradigms with new ones that better explain and address current realities [10]. This principle applies not only to science but also to organizational and societal systems.

For instance, the European Union's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) has undergone numerous reforms without addressing its core inefficiencies. Scholars like argue that these piecemeal changes have perpetuated systemic problems, including unequal subsidies and unsustainable practices [22]. A fundamental redesign of the policy, rather than incremental adjustments, is necessary to align it with contemporary environmental and economic goals [11].

Barriers to Innovation and Strategies for Overcoming Them

Despite its advantages, inventing new systems faces several obstacles:

- **Institutional Inertia:** Established organizations often resist change due to entrenched interests and fear of disruption [12].
- **Resource Constraints:** Designing new systems requires significant investment in expertise, time, and funding, which many institutions are reluctant to allocate.
- **Cultural Resistance:** Societal norms and perceptions can hinder the adoption of innovative systems, as seen in the public's skepticism toward digital governance initiatives in some countries [13].

Overcoming these barriers requires a combination of leadership, collaboration, and education. Research by Kotter (1996) emphasizes the importance of visionary leadership in driving systemic innovation. Effective communication and stakeholder engagement are also crucial to building trust and ensuring the adoption of new systems [14].

The Way Forward: Embracing Innovation

To foster innovation, governments and institutions must prioritize long-term goals over short-term fixes. Policymakers should invest in research and development, adopt agile methodologies, and encourage cross-sector collaboration to design systems that are adaptable and future-proof. As seen in Estonia, Singapore, and Rwanda, the benefits of such investments far outweigh the initial costs.

Moreover, international cooperation can accelerate innovation by sharing best practices and pooling resources. Organizations like the United Nations and the World Bank have a critical role to play in promoting systemic innovation, particularly in developing countries where resource constraints are more pronounced.

Methodology

The paper seeks to provide a nuanced understanding of the challenges associated with innovation over copying already developed systems offering insights into the broader reconfiguration of the global developments in the isarea.

Employing the 10Ps iterative research model (Saliya, 2023), the study adopts a flexible, non-linear approach, allowing for continual revisitation and refinement of research tasks to optimize the integration of these themes. This paper is developed using a flexible integrated research method [15-16].

This study employs a case study methodology to examine the distinctions between innovation and reinvention, drawing on real-world examples to provide a nuanced understanding of the transformative potential of systemic innovation and the limitations of incremental adjustments. The case study approach is justified for the following reasons [17].

Exploratory Nature of the Research

The central aim of this study is to explore the complex interplay between innovation and reinvention in diverse institutional and socio-economic contexts. The case study method allows for an in-depth analysis of specific examples, making it particularly suitable for unpacking multifaceted phenomena that cannot be fully captured through quantitative methods alone.

Context-Specific Insights

By examining cases such as Estonia's e-government platform, Singapore's urban transportation planning, and Rwanda's drone-based healthcare delivery, the study highlights the role of systemic innovation in addressing contemporary challenges. Conversely, examples like the U.S. IRS's outdated tax processing systems and Sri Lanka's flawed phone-tracking mechanisms provide critical insights into the pitfalls of reinvention. These context-specific examples enable the study to identify patterns, draw comparisons, and derive actionable lessons that are rooted in real-world experiences.

Richness of Data

Case studies provide rich, qualitative data that allow researchers to investigate not just the outcomes but also the processes and mechanisms behind innovation and reinvention. Through narrative analysis, this study delves into how leadership, stakeholder collaboration, and investment in research and development drive systemic innovation, while institutional inertia and resource constraints hinder reinvention efforts [18].

Comparative Analysis

The selected case studies represent a mix of successful and flawed approaches across different sectors and countries, offering a basis for comparative analysis. This method facilitates a deeper understanding of the factors that contribute to the success or failure of innovation initiatives and allows for the identification of best practices and common pitfalls.

Relevance to policy and Practice

Case studies provide tangible examples that can inform policymakers, business leaders, and other stakeholders. By focusing on real-world scenarios, the findings are directly applicable to decision-making processes and can guide the adoption of proactive, transparent, and future-focused approaches to innovation [19].

Data Collection and Analysis

The study utilizes secondary data sources, including academic literature, government reports, industry publications, and credible media coverage. These sources are triangulated to ensure accuracy and reliability. A narrative analysis approach is employed to identify recurring themes, draw insights, and establish connections between innovation practices and their outcomes.

In sum, the case study methodology is a robust and appropriate choice for this research, as it aligns with the study's objectives of exploring the distinctions between innovation and reinvention and deriving practical implications from real-world examples [20].

The case

Anura lost his iPhone 15 on December 15, 2024, while traveling between Borella and Kaduwela in Colombo the capital city of Sri Lanka. What followed was a grueling process that highlighted the bureaucratic labyrinth ordinary citizens must navigate. Although armed with advice from two telecommunications veterans, Anura embarked on a quest to retrieve his phone, only to encounter roadblocks at every turn.

Conflicting Advice and Bureaucratic Hurdle

Ravi, a retired IT engineer with over four decades of experience, outlined a standard procedure: file a police report, present it to the mobile network provider, and let the Telecommunications Regulatory Commission (TRC) handle the rest. Siri, a board member of a prominent telecom network, confirmed that bypassing the police was not an option due to legal requirements [21].

Despite their expertise, neither expert was aware of a critical fact: the phone-tracking system had been compromised in 2022. Anura's initial attempts at the police station were equally disheartening. Officers refused to provide him with a copy of his complaint, citing outdated practices, and he spent hours navigating red tape before finally obtaining a certified copy.

The TRC Encounter

With the police report in hand, Anura visited the TRC in Narahenpita about 20km away from his office. The experience was no less frustrating. Initially directed back to the police by security staff, Anura had to argue his way into the premises. Inside, a polite but unhelpful officer informed him that the system for tracing lost phones had not been operational since 2018 [22].

The officer defended the TRC's actions, stating they had informed the Inspector General of Police (IGP) about the changes, expecting the information to trickle down to individual stations. Anura, however, was unimpressed. "This top-down communication approach is ineffective," he argued, highlighting the needless time, effort, and money wasted by citizens due to a lack of public awareness.

Hacking Revelations and Concealed Truths

- During his discussions, Anura uncovered an unsettling truth: the phone-tracking system had been hacked in 2022. The authorities, presumably, fearing a rise in crimes involving mobile phones, had opted to keep this information under wraps, leaving the public in the dark about the system's shortcomings.
- "Your problem," Anura told the TRC officer, "is sending people here and there without telling them the truth. If criminals know the system is down, they might exploit it—but hiding it isn't the solution."

Anura's Call for Transparency

Frustrated but undeterred, Anura vowed to bring the issue to light. He criticized the TRC for its lack of accountability, calling for a more proactive approach to public communication. "If I were the minister or the PM, I would prioritize making citizens' lives easier and saving public resources," he said.

On his way out, Anura ensured he had proof of his visit by photographing the TRC's logbook, documenting yet another step in his relentless pursuit of accountability.

Lessons from the Saga

Anura's experience serves as a cautionary tale about the consequences of poor communication and systemic inefficiencies. It underscores the urgent need for:

- **Transparent Communication:** Regulatory bodies like the TRC must ensure critical updates reach all stakeholders, including the public, in a clear and accessible manner.
- **Streamlined Processes:** Citizens should not have to endure unnecessary delays and expenses to resolve simple issues.
- **Accountability:** Authorities must take responsibility for addressing systemic failures instead of deflecting blame.

Narrative analysis

The Incident Reveals Three Critical Lessons

- **Reinvention is Limited:** Tweaking old systems is a short-term solution that often fails to address root causes.
- **Innovation is Essential:** Inventing new systems is a proactive approach that prepares institutions for future challenges.
- **Communication Matters:** Transparency about system changes and their implications is vital for maintaining public trust.

For example, had authorities openly acknowledged the hacking of the phone-tracing system and communicated new protocols effectively, citizens would have been spared the frustration of navigating a broken process. A new, transparent system could have restored confidence and delivered better outcomes.

Why Reinventing the Wheel Persists?

Despite its limitations, reinventing the wheel persists because it appears easier and less costly in the short term. Decision-makers often fear the risks and disruptions associated with building new systems. However, this mindset ignores the long-term costs of inefficiency and the missed opportunities for innovation.

The Path Forward

To break free from the cycle of reinvention, we must adopt a mindset of innovation:

- **Invest in Research and Development:** Allocate resources to design and implement systems that meet modern needs.
- **Foster Collaboration:** Engage stakeholders, including citizens, experts, and policymakers, to create inclusive and effective solutions.

Embrace Change

Recognize that bold decisions to build anew are often necessary for meaningful progress.

Reinventing the wheel may feel familiar, but it is not sustainable in an era of rapid change. The challenges of today require us to invent systems that are resilient, efficient, and responsive. As the incident with the lost phone demonstrates, clinging to outdated frameworks not only wastes resources but also erodes public trust.

By embracing innovation, we can create systems that not only solve current problems but also anticipate and adapt to future challenges. It is time to stop patching the cracks and start building the foundations for a better tomorrow.

The debate between inventing new systems and reinventing the wheel is not merely theoretical; it has real-world implications for efficiency, equity, and progress. The cases of Estonia's e-government, Singapore's urban planning, and Rwanda's healthcare delivery illustrate the transformative potential of systemic innovation. Conversely, failures like the Sri Lankan phone-tracing debacle and the IRS's legacy systems highlight the limitations of tweaking outdated frameworks.

The future belongs to those who dare to imagine and build anew. By prioritizing invention over reinvention, societies can create systems that are resilient, adaptable, and capable of meeting the challenges of a rapidly changing world. As Schumpeter and other scholars remind us, true progress lies in creative destruction—the courage to let go of the past and embrace the possibilities of the future.

Conclusions

The comparative analysis of innovation and reinvention reveals that systemic innovation often delivers transformative results while reinvention struggles to address foundational inefficiencies. As evidenced by case studies such as Estonia's e-government system, Singapore's urban mobility innovations, and

Rwanda's drone-based healthcare delivery, the proactive creation of new systems not only overcomes existing limitations but also anticipates future challenges. Conversely, the pitfalls of reinventing outdated frameworks, such as those observed in Sri Lanka's phone-tracing system and the United States' IRS legacy tax processing systems, underscore the inefficiencies and public dissatisfaction inherent in relying on incremental updates.

The analysis also highlights the barriers to systemic innovation, including institutional inertia, resource constraints, and cultural resistance. Overcoming these challenges requires visionary leadership, transparent communication, and strategic investment in research and development. The lessons drawn from the narrative of Anura's experience in Sri Lanka further emphasize the urgent need for transparent processes, accountability, and innovation- driven policymaking to rebuild public trust and optimize resource utilization.

In conclusion, the path forward demands a shift in mindset—from perpetually patching outdated systems to boldly inventing new ones. By prioritizing systemic innovation, societies can create resilient and adaptable frameworks that meet contemporary needs while preparing for future complexities. The debate between reinvention and innovation is more than theoretical; it is a critical determinant of societal progress, equity, and efficiency. As Schumpeter's principle of creative destruction advocates, the courage to dismantle and rebuild is essential for achieving sustainable development and long-term success.

In conclusion, the literature collectively supports the premise that innovation, rather than reinvention, is the key to creating resilient and future-ready systems. The case studies and theoretical insights reinforce the urgency of embracing systemic innovation to address contemporary challenges and secure long-term societal benefits.

References

1. Schumpeter, J. (1942). Capitalism, socialism, and democracy. Harper & Brothers.
2. Christensen, C. M. (1997). The innovator's dilemma: When new technologies cause great firms to fail. Harvard Business Review Press.
3. Kalvet, T. (2012). Innovation: The Estonian experience. Technology Innovation Management Review, 2(1), 6-12.
4. Gadepalli, K. (2020). Drone delivery systems in developing countries. Technology in Society, 63, 101370.
5. Phang, S. Y. (2013). Singapore's transport policies: A case for integrated planning and execution. Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice, 50, 53-62.
6. Jones, R., & Weller, C. (2016). Tax systems in transition. Tax Policy Analysis Journal, 38(4), 489-505.
7. Heeks, R. (2001). Understanding e-governance for development. Institute for Development Policy and Management.
8. Kuhn, T. S. (1962). The structure of scientific revolutions. University of Chicago Press.
9. DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. American Sociological Review, 48(2), 147-160.
10. Gil-Garcia, J. R., & Helbig, N. (2006). Exploring e-government success factors. Government Information Quarterly, 23(3), 187-216.
11. Saliya, C. A. (2021). Conducting case-study research: A concise practical guidance for management students. International Journal of KIU, 2(1), 1-13
12. Saliya, C. A. (2022). Doing social research and publishing results: A guide to non-native English speakers. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-3780-4
13. Saliya, C. A. (2023a). Integrated-flexible research methodology: An alternative approach. In C. A. Saliya (Ed.), Social research methodology and publishing results: A guide to non-native English speakers. DOI: 10.4018/978-1-6684-6859-3.ch001
14. Saliya, C. A. (2023b). Research philosophy: Paradigms, worldviews, perspectives, and theories. In C. A. Saliya (Ed.), Social research methodology and publishing results: A guide to non-native English speakers.
15. Saliya, C. A. (2023c). Social research methodology and publishing results: A guide to non-native English speakers. DOI: 10.4018/978-1-6684-6859-3.ch001
16. Saliya, C. A., & Pandey, S. K. (2021). Financial battle against climate change – assessing effectiveness using a scorecard. Qualitative Research in Financial Markets,13(2),141-160
17. Aqeeq, F., Arsalan, M., Tahir, A., & Waqas, H. (2023). Developing nations, sustainable economic development, and the role of energy transition.
18. Saliya, C. A., & Jayasinghe, K. (2016). Cultural politics of bank lending for development financing in Sri Lanka. Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies,), 449-474.
19. Saliya, C. A., & Yahanpath, N. (2016). Petty-bourgeois nationalism – A case study. Qualitative Research in Financial Markets, 8(4), 359-368.
20. Saliya, C. A. (2010). The role of bank lending in sustaining income/wealth inequality in Sri Lanka. PhD Thesis, Auckland University of Technology, New Zealand.
21. Kotter, J. (1996). Leading change. Harvard Business Review Press.
22. Daugbjerg, C. (2003). Reforming the common agricultural policy. Policy Studies Journal, 31(2), 275-295.