International Journal of Creative and Open Research in Engineering and Management
ISSN: 3108-1754 (Online)
Volume 02 Issue 11 November-2026 | Impact Factor: 3.5



A Study on Aerospace and Defence Industry: Competitive Intelligence on Disruptive Technologies and Market Growth

Abhishek Rathaur, Prof. Kasturi Dutt

School of Business, Indira University, Pune

Keywords: aerospace and defence; competitive intelligence; disruptive technology; market research; secondary data; innovation

How to Cite this Article:

Rathaur, A. (2026). A Study on Aerospace and Defence Industry: Competitive Intelligence on Disruptive Technologies and Market Growth. International Journal of Creative and Open Research in Engineering and Management, 02(11), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.55041/ijcope.v2i11.010

License:

This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and the source are credited.

© The Author(s). Published by International Journal of Creative and Open Research in Engineering and Management.







https://doi.org/10.55041/ijcope.v2i11.010

Abstract

This paper examines competitive intelligence on disruptive technologies and market growth in the aerospace and defence industry, drawing on a two-month industry research internship at Global Market Insights Pvt Ltd from 1 June to 31 July 2026. The research covered aerospace and defence alongside related technology-intensive markets. Activities included market definition, segmentation, company profiling, analysis of growth drivers and constraints, regional comparison, and monitoring of investments, partnerships, acquisitions, and product developments. The study used exploratory and descriptive secondary research, drawing on company websites, annual reports, investor presentations, government publications, international organizations, industry associations, and technical literature. Its findings are qualitative rather than statistical, no respondent sample, survey, hypothesis test, market-share model, or sales-conversion dataset was documented.

The analysis identifies four connected themes: technological ecosystems are interdependent, innovation, intellectual property, partnerships, and specialist capabilities influence competitive positioning; public policy and procurement shape strategic markets and source validation is essential when market definitions and reporting periods differ. The paper's contribution is an applied synthesis of how structured secondary research can organize fragmented public evidence without overstating its implications. It recommends traceable sources, consistent market definitions, confidence labels, and a maintained competitive-intelligence register. Interpretations remain limited by the available evidence and documented research.

Introduction

Aerospace and defence is a strategically significant industry in which technological capability, national security priorities, public procurement, industrial capacity, and international competition intersect. Its products and systems typically involve long development cycles, high engineering complexity, rigorous testing, certification, and continuing maintenance requirements. Competitive position therefore cannot be assessed through product announcements or company size alone. A meaningful analysis must consider the operational problem a technology addresses, its readiness for deployment, its compatibility with existing platforms, the procurement environment, and the capacity of suppliers to deliver and sustain systems over time. These characteristics make reliable competitive intelligence important to manufacturers, technology suppliers, investors, policymakers, and market researchers.

The industry is also being reshaped by advances in technologies that may originate outside traditional aerospace and defence boundaries. Artificial intelligence, advanced semiconductors, high-performance computing, sensors, robotics, quantum technologies, advanced communications, and data-processing systems can contribute to capabilities across



surveillance, navigation, electronic warfare, autonomous platforms, command systems, and aircraft. The strategic importance of an innovation may therefore arise not only from a new platform, but from improvements to components, software, integration, or the relationships among system elements.

The present study is based on research activities undertaken during a two-month industry internship at Global Market Insights Pvt Ltd between 1 June and 31 July 2026. The work covered aerospace and defence technologies as well as adjacent markets, including semiconductor packaging, power semiconductors, optical input/output for AI chips, processing-in-memory, neuromorphic chips, quantum navigation, neutral-atom quantum computing, NV-diamond magnetometers, inspection robots, foldable OLED displays, analogue front-end integrated circuits, sports officiating technologies, AESA radar systems, and trainer aircraft. This wider research exposure is relevant because modern aerospace and defence capabilities depend on technologies, components, and industrial ecosystems that cross conventional sector boundaries.

Competitive intelligence provides a systematic means of converting publicly available information into decision-relevant understanding. It involves identifying relevant competitors, monitoring their products and technology portfolios, tracking partnerships and investments, evaluating geographic presence, and interpreting market and policy developments. It also requires disciplined source evaluation. Corporate announcements may reveal strategic intent but can emphasize positive developments; government sources can clarify policy and programmes; annual reports provide corporate and financial context; and technical or academic publications help explain technology characteristics. Combining these sources can strengthen an analysis, provided that differences in definitions, reporting periods, geography, and measurement are recognized rather than concealed.

The research problem addressed here is how to construct defensible competitive insights from fragmented public evidence in a rapidly changing technology environment. The gap is practical rather than a claim that the subject has not been studied: established literature explains competitive forces, innovation, and knowledge absorption, but an applied research process must still show how these ideas can be brought together in company and market analysis.

Literature Review

Competitive Strategy and Industry Structure

Porter's (2008) five-forces framework offers a foundation for examining the competitive structure of an industry through rivalry, buyer power, supplier power, the threat of substitutes, and the threat of new entrants. In aerospace and defence, these forces operate within a distinctive institutional environment. Government agencies and armed forces are often influential buyers, while procurement decisions can involve long evaluation cycles, stringent technical specifications, security requirements, and complex contracting arrangements. These conditions may increase buyer influence while also creating high barriers for suppliers that lack certifications, established relationships, production capability, or the resources required for long development programmes.

Absorptive Capacity and Technology Intelligence

Cohen and Levinthal (1990) explain absorptive capacity as an organization's ability to recognize the value of external knowledge, assimilate it, and apply it commercially. This concept is relevant to competitive intelligence because information collection alone does not create an advantage. Analysts must understand the technical and commercial significance of a development, relate it to existing knowledge, and identify its implications for competitors, customers, and suppliers. In a technology-intensive industry, this may require connecting an announcement about a sensor or processor to platform integration, operational requirements, procurement timing, and the capabilities of competing firms.

Architectural Innovation and System Interdependence

Henderson and Clark (1990) distinguish architectural innovation from changes confined to individual components. Their analysis shows that altering the relationships among established components can challenge firms even when the components themselves remain familiar. This insight is particularly relevant to aerospace and defence systems, where performance depends on the interaction of sensors, software, communications, computing, propulsion, navigation, and control technologies. A component-level improvement may have limited value if it cannot be integrated into a platform; conversely, a change in system architecture may create new competitive opportunities for firms with integration



expertise. This perspective supports analysis of enabling technologies as part of an ecosystem rather than as isolated market categories.

Innovation, Business Models, and Value Capture

Teece (2010) argues that innovation and business models are interdependent and that invention does not automatically translate into economic value. Firms may need complementary assets such as manufacturing capacity, distribution, systems integration, intellectual property, service networks, and customer relationships to capture value from technological advances. In aerospace and defence, this distinction is important because a prototype or technical demonstration is not equivalent to a qualified product, a contract award, operational deployment, or scaled production.

The Meaning of Disruption and the Quality of Evidence

Christensen, Raynor, and McDonald (2015) caution that disruptive innovation has a more specific theoretical meaning than simply introducing a new or advanced technology. An innovation may be technically sophisticated without following a disruptive trajectory or displacing established suppliers. This distinction is important in defence markets, where adoption is influenced by mission requirements, reliability, security, institutional processes, and national industrial priorities. In addition, intelligence quality depends on source provenance, recency, relevance, and comparability. Company statements, government documents, financial disclosures, industry publications, and academic studies serve different evidentiary purposes and should be triangulated. Interpretations remain limited by the available evidence.

Research Objectives

The study is guided by five objectives, each aligned with the documented research activities and the broader purpose of competitive intelligence.

1. To examine the structure and major trends of the aerospace and defence industry. This objective involves understanding the industry's principal segments, applications, geographic dimensions, technology shifts, and the policy and procurement environment. It provides the context required to interpret market opportunities and competitive pressures.

2. To identify emerging and disruptive technologies relevant to aerospace and defence. The focus is on understanding the basic function, applications, development status, and potential strategic relevance of technologies such as advanced radar, AI, sensors, robotics,

3. To analyse key companies and the competitive landscape. This includes comparing company portfolios, technology capabilities, geographic presence, partnerships, investments, acquisitions, and product developments, while distinguishing global firms from regional and specialized participants.

4. To examine market growth drivers and constraints. The analysis considers technological progress, government initiatives, investment, demand, and research and development alongside development costs, regulation, supply-chain constraints, cybersecurity, and skills availability.

5. To assess the role of market research and competitive intelligence in strategic decision-making. This objective evaluates how validated secondary information can help identify opportunities, understand competitors, monitor change, and support informed business judgments.

Research Methodology

The study follows an exploratory and descriptive research design. It is exploratory because it examines emerging and technology-intensive markets in which terminology, company boundaries, and commercialization pathways may be evolving. It is descriptive because it organizes information about market structure, segmentation, companies, applications, geographic presence, trends, drivers, and challenges. The research period relevant to the internship activities was 1 June to 31 July 2026, and the present paper focuses on aerospace and defence while retaining adjacent technology markets where they help explain the industrial ecosystem.



The study relies primarily on secondary data. The sources identified in the research record include official company websites, annual reports, investor presentations, corporate press releases, government departments and agencies, international organizations, industry associations, academic publications, and technical publications. Examples of institutional sources include the Ministry of Defence, Department of Defence Production, DRDO, ISRO, MeitY, OECD, World Bank, IMF, SIPRI, IEEE, and relevant industry associations. Microsoft Excel was used to organize research information.

The analytical process involved defining a market, identifying keywords, locating relevant sources, collecting information, cross-verifying claims, classifying companies, comparing regions, and interpreting developments. Market analysis considered product type, technology, component, application, end-use industry, and geography where appropriate. Company analysis considered headquarters, geographic presence, products and services, technology capabilities, strategic developments, investments, partnerships, acquisitions, and competitive positioning. Porter's Five Forces and PESTEL were used as organizing frameworks. Findings were synthesized thematically into technology interdependence, competitive capabilities, government influence, and source reliability. All interpretations remain carefully limited to the evidence available within this research scope.

Data Analysis and Results

The results are qualitative and comparative. The research record identifies recurring activities including market research, secondary research, company profiling, competitive analysis, segmentation, driver and challenge analysis, trend analysis, regional analysis, and monitoring of recent developments. Company websites, annual reports, press releases, government sources, and international organizations were classified as highly important sources; industry associations and academic or technical sources were considered moderate to highly important. These classifications describe the research process rather than measured market outcomes.

Table 1. Summary of evidence-supported results

The first result is the interdependence of emerging technology markets. Research assignments covered aerospace and defence alongside semiconductors, AI hardware, sensors, robotics, and quantum technologies. The areas listed included AESA radar systems, trainer aircraft, quantum navigation, semiconductor packaging, optical I/O for AI chips, neutral-atom quantum computing, and NV-diamond magnetometers.

The second result concerns competitive advantage. Company profiles compared portfolios, technology capabilities, geographic presence, partnerships, investments, acquisitions, and product launches. These indicators help identify strategic direction and potential areas of differentiation. The research findings indicate that firms compete through innovation, research and development, intellectual property, technology capabilities, and strategic partnerships, in addition to price.

The third result concerns the influence of government and institutional conditions. Research tracked policies, investment, manufacturing initiatives, defence programmes, and technology-development activities. These factors can shape demand, market access, and the direction of strategic industries. However, the research did not isolate the contribution of any individual programme or estimate its causal effect on market growth. Government support should therefore be interpreted as an important contextual factor rather than a measured growth coefficient.

The fourth result relates to research reliability. The study identified difficulties in obtaining consistent information, particularly for private companies and specialized technology providers that may not disclose revenue, market share, customers, production capacity, or business strategies. Sources can also differ in market definitions, reporting periods, product classifications, and geographic boundaries.

No numerical outreach or conversion analysis is possible from the documented material. There are no lead counts, prospect responses, follow-up records, sales outcomes, or course-value objections. Accordingly, conversion rates and causal claims are excluded rather than estimated.



Theme	Evidence from the research	Interpretation
Technology interdependence	Research covered aerospace and defence, semiconductors, AI hardware, sensors, robotics, and quantum technologies.	Defence capability depends on interconnected technology ecosystems; effects were not quantified.
Competitive positioning	Profiles considered portfolios, technology, geography, partnerships, investments, acquisitions, and launches.	Innovation, intellectual property, integration, and specialist capabilities can support differentiation.
Government influence	Research tracked policies, investments, defence programmes, and technology initiatives.	Policy and procurement shape the environment; no causal growth contribution was estimated.
Evidence quality	The research identified differences in statistics, definitions, reporting periods, and company disclosure.	Cross-verification and traceable source records are necessary for reliable comparison.
Market constraints	Challenges included development costs, regulation, supply chains, cybersecurity, and skills availability.	These are recurring constraints, not a ranked or statistically tested list.

Discussion and Findings

The findings are consistent with absorptive capacity theory: external information becomes useful when analysts can recognize, interpret, and apply it (Cohen & Levinthal, 1990). A corporate announcement has greater intelligence value when it is linked to a market segment, competitor capabilities, technical dependencies, procurement context, and the stage of development. The structured research process provides a practical means of making these connections and reducing the risk of treating isolated announcements as definitive evidence.

The results also support a systems perspective on innovation. As Henderson and Clark (1990) suggest, changes in component relationships can have strategic consequences. In aerospace and defence, a new sensor, processor, communications architecture, or software capability may matter because of how it integrates with a platform. However, technological novelty does not guarantee disruption.

Porter's framework helps structure questions about rivalry, supplier dependence, buyer power, substitutes, and entry barriers. Yet the available research does not provide consistent quantitative evidence to rate each force across every aerospace segment. The findings should therefore be read as a structured market scan, not a definitive company ranking or forecast. Competitive intelligence is strongest when it is traceable, comparative, and explicit about uncertainty.

AIDA, personal selling, and sales-funnel analysis are not applied because the available research concerns industry and competitor intelligence rather than a sales campaign. Applying these frameworks would require separate evidence on audience exposure, enquiries, qualified leads, follow-up, objections, and conversion. The appropriate analytical framework must follow the research question and the evidence available. Interpretations remain limited by the available evidence.

Recommendations and Limitations

Organizations conducting technology-market intelligence should maintain a centralized register recording source URL, publisher, publication and access dates, market definition, geography, units, claim type, corroboration status, and confidence level. Standardized company and technology templates would improve comparability. Analysts should



distinguish announced, tested, contracted, deployed, and commercially scaled technologies, and maintain a change log when definitions or evidence are revised. Official government, regulatory, company, and technical sources should be prioritized, with secondary commentary used as a research lead rather than sole proof.

The study is limited by its two-month duration, purposive source selection, reliance on public secondary information, absence of extensive primary research, and lack of a fixed numerical source sample. Confidential programmes and private-company disclosures may be unavailable. Findings are not statistically generalizable. Future research should focus on one defence segment, define measurable indicators, archive dated evidence, and supplement secondary research with appropriately designed expert interviews.

Conclusion

This study examined competitive intelligence on disruptive technologies and market growth in aerospace and defence through a structured review of markets, technologies, companies, policy developments, drivers, and constraints. The findings indicate that advanced technology markets are interconnected, competitive positioning involves innovation and specialist capabilities, government activity shapes strategic sectors, and source validation is essential for reliable analysis.

The contribution is an applied synthesis rather than a causal test or market forecast. Its practical value lies in connecting established strategy and innovation concepts with a transparent secondary-research process and in distinguishing documented facts from interpretation. Further research should concentrate on a clearly defined aerospace or defence segment, use comparable quantitative indicators, and combine dated public evidence with carefully designed primary research. Such work would support more specific conclusions while preserving the evidential discipline required for credible competitive intelligence. All interpretations remain carefully limited to the evidence available within this research scope.

References

Christensen, C. M., Raynor, M. E., & McDonald, R. (2015). What is disruptive innovation? Harvard Business Review, 93(12), 44–53.

Cohen, W. M., & Levinthal, D. A. (1990). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. Administrative Science Quarterly, 35(1), 128–152. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393553

Henderson, R. M., & Clark, K. B. (1990). Architectural innovation: The reconfiguration of existing product technologies and the failure of established firms. Administrative Science Quarterly, 35(1), 9–30. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393549

Porter, M. E. (2008). The five competitive forces that shape strategy. Harvard Business Review, 86(1), 78–93.

Teece, D. J. (2010). Business models, business strategy and innovation. Long Range Planning, 43(2–3), 172–194. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2009.07.003

Global Market Insights Pvt Ltd. (2026). Aerospace and defence industry: Competitive intelligence on disruptive technologies and market growth [Unpublished industry research internship report].