Research Article

Don Bosco Institute of Technology Delhi Journal of Research
Year 2024, Volume-1, Issue-2 (July - Dec)

Exploring the Interplay of Scale and Innovation: A Multidisciplinary Perspective

Nabil Ahmad Afifi,

Ph.D Scholar, Centre for Studies in Science Policy, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi,

ARTICLE INFO

Scale, Innovation, Strategy, Policy, Management

doi:10.48165dbitdjr.2024.1.0201

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the dynamic interplay between the concepts of scale and in-novation, emphasizing the multifaceted and interdisciplinary nature of their re-lationship. Drawing insights from human geography, political ecology, and eco-nomics, the study delves into how scale—understood as hierarchical, relational, and fluid—shapes and is shaped by innovative processes. It argues that innovation is not only about the introduction of new products or processes but also about their diffusion and adaptation across various scales. By examining theories like "scale jumping" and "scale bending," the paper illustrates how organizations and innovators navigate different levels of operation to optimize resources, align with socio-political contexts, and address market demands. Through case studies the paper highlights the relational and strategic dimensions of scale in innovation. It also addresses challenges such as resource standardization, control dynamics, and localized policy needs. Ultimately, the paper underscores the critical role of scale as a tool for fostering sustainable and inclusive innovation, advocating for a nuanced understanding of its implications in a globalized world.

Introduction

The concept of innovation and scale is not new to the world, but the conceptualization of both concerning each other is rarely studied or taken into consideration. It is impossible to think of the world without innovation, without a computer, without electricity, the list will go on, and without them, there would be no knowledge economy. Though 'scales' are everywhere, we do not seem to recognize it in the fashion as to know its implications. Concept of scale appears in the various literature ranging from sociology, political ecology to geography. The meaning of scale is often restricted to the level, size, and relation, but it has more to offer (Neumann, 2009). To take forward the discourse in innovation, the concepts of scales can be used. Economics has a lot say about scaling up or scaling down the operation of any production process, but it is crucial to get an understanding from other viewpoints for these processes. This paper aims explore the interplay of the concepts about scales in various domain and find certain arguments that can be viewed in light of innovation.

*Corresponding author.
E-mail address: nabil58_sse@jnu.ac.in(Nabil Ahmad Afifi)

Firstly, it is essential to have an understanding of innovation, then will move on to the literature on the scale and its implications on innovation. It is important to address why there is a need to understand scale in the context of innovation. The concept of scale has been taken into consideration for innovation in economics term. Even Schumpeterian hypothesis in simple terms inquire about scale by formulating the questions between the size of firms and incentive to innovate; market power of the firm and willingness to invest in innovation (Mandel, n.d.). Though the concept scale is little ambiguous in the above inquiry but still have its essence, the Schumpeterian inquiry was more economic, but we will take a more sociological approach to it.

Innovation

Joseph Schumpeter was one of the first person to draw attention towards innovation. Later Nelson and Rosenberg refined the definition of innovation, but it was more technical in a sense. Schumpeter defined innovation simply as the setting of a new production function. This includes the case of a new product or setting of a new form of organization or even a formation of a new market ("Systems of Innovation," 2014). OECD (2002) comprehended the definition of innovation as "an introduction of a new product or qualitative change in an existing product; process innovation new to the industry; the opening of a new market; development of new sources of supply for raw materials or other inputs; change in industrial organization." The OECD definition is also based on Schumpeter's argument, and both of them are on broad. Nelson and Rosenberg (1993) defined innovation as "the processes by which firms master and get into practice product designs and manufacturing processes that are new to them," whether or not they are new to the universe or the nation," which was much narrower than Schumpeter's definition.Another point to consider about innovation is that it is not only about the first introduction but also about diffusion. The major difference between the two definitions which Nelson and Rosenberg pointed out was that "the first firm to bring innovation to the market is to the one to reap most of the benefits"(Nelson & Rosenberg, 1993). We can see in these definitions; there are two themes which are emerging, i.e., product and process innovation. Now product innovation can be either an improved or new product which is different from its predecessor in terms of knowledge, technology, or material that is used. Process innovation, on the other hand, is about an improved or new method of production or delivery of a product. Innovation though can be bifurcated into many smaller themes as grassroots innovation or frugal innovation, but here we will take a more general approach on innovation as to find the connection between innovation and concepts of scale from the various discourse. Moving ahead to the literature survey of scale to find precise ideas that can be taken about innovation.

Multidisciplinary perspective on Scale

The scale is neither a new concept or is confined to a single discipline; thus, we have taken references primarily from human geography, political ecology, and geography, although not in a restricted sense. The main idea of this review is to put light on specific major themes which came up during the review. *Meanings of Scale*One of the first definition on the scale can be traced to cartography[1] were scale referred to the ratio of a distance on a map with respect to real distance on the earth (Nathan F., 2009). This definition of scale is more related to the size, i.e. a quantitative measurement unit. But as Edward J. Rykiel Jr.(1998) says, "space and time cannot be quantitatively observed unless they are divided into specific units that can be used for measurement." Thus, the implication of cartographical scale is in the way we perceive the world around us. In simple terms is about viewing the world in a quantitative manner. The second concept of scale is about the hierarchical structure or when it is considered as a level. In an epistemological sense, it is about what is observed and what is not (Quan Gao, 2019). The scale here is more about qualitative analysis, which may be referred as the level where the process takes place and is a valuable tool to analyze socio-spatial conducts. The third concept views scale as a relation or network. The argument emerges that scale cannot be considered as linear or hierarchical in understanding, but it is relational. To exemplify this Quan Gao (2019) in his paper talks about the musical scale, and makes a point that "quality of symphony is not about the individual note but how one note is positioned in relation to others." Thus, any change in the note will affect the whole scale of the symphony. Now Neil Brenner has highlighted the fact that evolution of scales takes place relationally, which are hierarchically intertwined and dispersed across the network (Marston, Jones, & Woodward, 2005). This points out that any scale comes to live only about the other scale, for example, if there is no regional or global scale then the local scale does not exist, it is level (Born & Purcell, 2006).

Theories of scale in various disciplines

Human Geography

Neil Smith and Peter Taylor are the critical thinkers of this discipline, who were of the view that the emergence of the scale is due to the rutted capitalist mode of production (Quan Gao, 2019). Taylor's conceptualization about scale was more hierarchical in its description. He gave a three structure model of scale starting with micro scale which is about domain of experience; meso scale which is concern about sphere of ideology and lastly the macro scale which he terms as 'scale of reality' which is derived from the

materialist position focus on the economy (Marston et al., 2005; Taylor, 1982). Thus, macro scale can be referred to global, meso scale as national and micro scale as urban. Taylor even emphasized on the global scale and argued that it is the scale that 'matters' (Taylor, 1982). The reason for this emphasis is due to his believe that the concept of scale arises from the capitalist mode of production (Marston et al., 2005). Smith carries forward the conceptualization of Taylor and observed geographical scale as something that specifies the boundaries and where control is exercised or challenged in order to restrict the identities (Marston et al., 2005). This if further escalated leads to developments like 'scale jumping' or 'scale bending'(ibid.). Scale jumping is where one geographical scale is stretched out as a result of struggle or political or power claims (Prytherch, 2007). In words of MacKinnon (2011), "it is the ability of a social group or organization to move higher levels of activity."An example of this could be when certain social group or organization have concern for environmental issues pertaining to the local level is not getting traction then they try to align their interest with an organization or non-governmental organization at the regional or national level to get their voices heard thus jumping the scale. Whereas scale bending is about when particular social group or individuals contest a prevailing arrangement specific to scales and bounded by certain activities (MacKinnon, 2011). This concept of scale by Smith is more about social and culture. Erik Swyngedouw's also contributed to theorizing scale; he enlarged the scope by adding the questions about nature. His line of reasoning is that social and nature are intertwined in the formation and contestation, which is hierarchical and spatial(Marston et al., 2005).

Political Geography

According to political geographers, different constraints pertaining to actors (social) make them shift or crate scales or levels to oblige their welfares (Lebel, Garden, & Imamura, 2005). Though they can work at different scales by changing the power and authority they have. Thus scale can be a tool for inclusion or exclusion. Delaney and Leitner (1997) mention that understanding of the actors shapes the scale, so actors behave strategically to take advantage. Even though the ability to shift scales is a function of a social movement, the power to utilize the scale lies among the stakeholders of that scale (Williams, 1999)such as proximity to hazardous sites, tend to be inequitably borne by poor Americans in general, and by Americans of color in particular. So argues a loose coalition of grassroots organizations and public-interest groups known as the Environmental Justice (EJ. But the choice of scale is constrained overtly by politics and subtly technologies, institutional designs, and measurements. Lebel et al. (2005) assert that representation of a scale depends on the capacity of the state which is exhibited through its policies and laws primarily, though the state can reinforce it too by means of threat or use of force. The current phenomena of data gathering, analyzing and distribution by the state can be considered as an example. The point that stands out is how the problem which is experienced or discussed at a certain scale might not be the scale where decision-making bodies reside, i.e., the decision on them are made at a different scale (Kurtz, 2003)and environmental justice politics are permeated by considerable debate over the nature and spatial extent of both problem and possible solutions. This paper theorizes the politics of environmental justice as a politics of scale in order to explore how environmental justice activists respond to the scalar ambiguity inherent in the political concept of environmental justice. With a case study of a controversy over a proposed polyvinylchloride production facility in rural Convent, Louisiana, I develop the concept of scale frames and counter-scale frames as strategic discursive representations of a social grievance that do the work of naming, blaming, and claiming, with meaningful reference to particular geographic scales. The significance of scale is expressed alternatively within these frames as an analytical spatial category, as scales of regulation, as territorial framework(s. Geography
Even though the scale is often citied as the foundational concept in geography, keeping aside space and place, it has not been extensively theorized. Scale as in geography is about the similarities and variance in the geography created by social processes (Jonas, 1994). The classification of scale varies from local to national to international in the spectrum, though it can also include region even home and body (Williams, 1999)such as proximity to hazardous sites, tend to be inequitably borne by poor Americans in general, and by Americans of color in particular. So argues a loose coalition of grassroots organizations and public-interest groups known as the Environmental Justice (EJ. When scale is considered in terms of place, it is about a specific space which in unique (Hayden, 1997). In order to give an imprint of belongingness, certain social groups use their insignia to proclaim their identity like in the case of tribal people (Williams, 1999)such as proximity to hazardous sites, tend to be inequitably borne by poor Americans in general, and by Americans of color in particular. So argues a loose coalition of grassroots organizations and public-interest groups known as the Environmental Justice (EJ. Doreen Massey (1994) reveals that societal processes cannot be effectively explained with the help a single scale. She even remarks that even if an activity is associated with a place, it is not necessary that it bounded to it (scale)(ibid.). Now a question arises that is scale natural, or it is socially produced? One view on it is that due to policy making efforts of governments, the political system remains stable at various scale (local, state, national), thus creating an illusion that scale is natural. But Herod (1991) states that "scale is at once socially produced and socially

producing." He goes further to argue that due to struggle to represent the spatial opportunity by the dominant groups or to create a hegemony the production of scale occurs for example how labor unions try to negotiate their contracts by trying to insert themselves into management. Also, due to capitalism, as Smith argues, he believes that local, state, or national scale arises due to the conflict between the capitalist (Smith & Harvey, 2008). The scale is also socially producing in the sense it facilitates various resources for political and social needs. Now when scale is produced it can empower some group at the cost of others, thus also concurring the believe that scale is socially producing. But there lies a paradox of scale as Taylor (1987) describes it "capital flows between countries, but politics is territorially bound." He explains this in context of how workers have the common interest of evading exploitation around the world, but they do not or cannot organize due to the difference between their ideology or nationalistic character, but capital sees no boundary (Taylor, 1987).

Other Related Concepts

The scale is both Fluid and Fixed

When scales are the result of social effort, and not ontologically permanent, it is thus fluid (Born & Purcell, 2006). Erik Swyngedouw (1997) put this as "scale and scalar relationships are constantly in the process of being made and remade." He reasons that this manifestation of scale as natural and external is due to consideration that scale is fixed as in the case of local or national scale. Thus when governments are passing their functioning to the European Union, World Trade Organization, etc. as a part of global restructuring gives the evidence that even national scale is not fixed (Delaney & Leitner, 1997). But when scale once produced, follows a routine and thus creating a hegemonic structure for some time, i.e. getting fixed for a time.

Local Trap and Scale as a Strategy

The local trap is mainly the propensity of some people to assume that there is something innate regarding the local scale (Born & Purcell, 2006). That is, the local scale is preferred above any other scale, and the notion of democracy, social justice is usually attached to it. Though the argument is not against local scale per se. It is important to understand the nuances of the local trap. Firstly, the assumption that the local scale is always desired. Though it might create greater democracy but can also lead to oligarchy like in the case of a few farmers having large land having greater control than the others. Secondly, it confuses ends with means, i.e. local is treated as an end in itself rather than a means to achieve justice or sustainability, etc. thus, it may distract us from the real goal. Lastly, it covers the other options which are available, i.e. at times even law can be an option, for example, EU came up with a law for sustainable agriculture methods instead shifting their focus on a local scale. These explanations also give the sense that scale is a goal but a strategy to achieve it. To add on to this when it is considered that scale is socially constructed or produced that the outcome of a scale is not dependent on the inherent qualities of it but on the agendas that empower it (Sallie A. Marston, 2000).
Scale is RelationalIt is known that the notion of scale infers to the interscalar relationships (Born & Purcell, 2006). We have earlier discussed that any scale comes to live only in relation with the other scale, but the embeddedness is also a point to consider, i.e., the local scale is embedded in the national scale and so on. Hegemony created by a scale is not due to the reason of size but due to the dominant nature required as in case sovereignty of a state. If a scale is singular, it cannot be considered as scale due to the fact that scale is a relational concept. Thus it can be seen as a level (Delaney & Leitner, 1997). It is considered that the study of scale is not about analyzing the scale but studying the interrelationship between various scales.

Interplay of Scale with Innovation

Many of the concepts in scale can have implications on innovation. The shift in scale can have both positive and negative impact on innovation. If innovation is trying to move up the scale, then it needs to think of the resources it is going to utilize at that scale. As if we consider the case of grassroots innovation, an innovator might be using resources which are not standardized but when they scale up the project, resources need to be standardized thus it may even affect the cost or the market which it was trying to affect. The concept of scale jumping is also relevant in case of innovation as innovators try to jump the scale, moving upward or downward. If we take the case of Arunachalam Muruganantham, a social entrepreneur from Tamil Nadu, India who innovated the low-cost sanitary pads and machine to make it. He used the narrative of gender empowerment, homemade and social justice to scale up his innovation even though it he imported some resources from foreign but used a different narrative or a narrative which was recognized by the national scale thus, jumping the scale.Similarly, in the case of Budweiser, a brand under transnational corporation Anheuser-Busch InBev. Budweiser has a global presence, but when it entered the United States, it claimed that all the raw material used in making the beer is American, and thus the beer is American. Thus, they created a narrative by downscaling themselves from the global level to national level in order to benefit. This is also an indication that scale is used as a strategy to function.

Another implication of scale change is on the control of innovation, there have been many cases when the innovation scaled up, but the innovator lost the control of their innovation, the case of Housing.com, where its founder lost control over the innovation after it reached the national scale. Another point is about deciding making power, at times the policies require a more localized approach as national policies will not be able to cater every audience thus has to be customized to the local or regional needs.Patagonia, a clothing company, exemplifies the fluidity of scale by balancing its global operations with local and regional commitments to sustainability. The company's emphasis on environmental ethics and social justice showcases its ability to scale up innovation without compromising its core values. Patagonia's approach aligns with the idea of "scale as a strategy," where its global reach enables it to influence supply chains and promote sustainable practices while its local collaborations foster grassroots initiatives. This interplay highlights how a company can use scale to empower communities and achieve larger environmental goals, demonstrating the relational nature of scale in innovation.Tesla, an automotive company on their innovation journey illustrates the dynamic relationship between scale and innovation. Initially targeting niche markets, Tesla leveraged process and product innovations to scale its electric vehicle production globally. This transition aligns with the paper's discussion on how scaling up requires standardization of resources, such as lithium batteries, and adapting to regulatory frameworks across regions. Tesla's global operations demonstrate "scale jumping" as the company shifted from a localized luxury market to a worldwide player influencing energy policies and supply chains. By embedding its innovations within multiple scales—local (charging networks), national (tax credits), and global (climate goals). Tesla exemplifies the interconnectedness of scales in fostering sustainable innovation.Amul, which started as a co-operative organization has shown growth from a regional dairy cooperative to a national brand is a classic example of scaling innovation while retaining its local roots. The cooperative model enabled farmers at the local scale to participate in and benefit from the broader economic system. Amul's success reflects the concept of "scale as relational," where local contributions are embedded in regional and national frameworks. By standardizing processes like milk collection and quality control, Amul achieved economies of scale, aligning with emphasis on how scale impacts resources and market strategies. Its ability to function seamlessly across scales—local, regional, and national, highlights the fluid yet structured nature of scale in innovation.Last but not the least, Unilever, a fasting moving consumer good company whose approach demonstrates the strategic use of scale to balance global and local priorities. Its adaptation of products like Lifebuoy soap for the Indian market reflects "scale bending," where a global corporation aligns its offerings with local needs and cultural contexts. By employing localized marketing campaigns, such as hygiene awareness drives, Unilever leverages the "local trap" to its advantage—enhancing social justice while maintaining global production efficiencies. As discussed in the paper, the ability to scale innovation both upward (global branding) and downward (regional adaptation) showcases the relational and strategic nature of scale, reinforcing the importance of tailoring strategies to diverse market scales for successful innovation.

Conclusion

The interplay between scale and innovation is a multifaceted and dynamic relationship that influences how innovations are developed, adapted, and implemented across different contexts. This paper explored the concept of scale through various disciplinary lenses, highlighting its relational, hierarchical, and strategic dimensions. From cartography to human geography, scale serves as a critical framework for understanding socio-spatial processes. When applied to innovation, it offers unique insights into the challenges and opportunities associated with scaling up or down.

Theories such as "scale jumping" and "scale bending" reveal how organizations and innovators navigate different levels of operation to optimize resources, align with market demands, and respond to socio-political contexts. Examples such as Arunachalam Muruganantham's grassroots innovation, Budweiser's localized branding, and Tesla's global market influence illustrate how scale is not static but fluid, shaped by the interactions between social, political, and economic factors.Innovation, as discussed, is not confined to the initial introduction of new ideas but extends to their diffusion and adaptation across scales. However, this process could be more complex, involving resource standardization, loss of control, and the need for localized policy alignment. By viewing scale as both a constraint and an opportunity, this paper underscores its critical role in shaping the trajectory of innovation.Ultimately, the conceptualization of scale offers valuable tools for strategizing innovation in a globalized world. As innovation continues to intersect with diverse socio-political landscapes, a nuanced understanding of scale will be indispensable for navigating these complexities and fostering sustainable and inclusive growth. This study serves as a foundation for further exploration of scale in disciplines beyond those discussed, reinforcing its relevance in the ever-evolving landscape of innovation.Though not everything about scales can be conceptualized in terms of innovation, it is evident that scale has an implication on innovation. The is study limited in the sense that few disciplines were touched in the context of scale. The other limitation is the vagueness in the connection though the connection exists.

References

Born, B., & Purcell, M. (2006). Avoiding the Local Trap: Scale and Food Systems in Planning Research. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, *26*(2), 195–207. https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X06291389

Delaney, D., & Leitner, H. (1997). The political construction of scale. *Political Geography*, *16*(2), 93–97. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-6298(96)00045-5

Doreen Massey. (1994). *Space, Place, and Gender*. Retrieved from https://www.upress.umn.edu/book-division/books/space-place-and-gender

Edward J. Rykiel Jr. (1998). Relationships of Scale to Policy and Decision Making. In *Ecological Scale: Theory and Application*. Columbia University Press.

Gough, J., (2004). Changing scale as changing class relations: variety and contradiction in the politics of scale. *Political Geography*, *23*(2), 185–211. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2003.11.005

Hayden, D. (1997). *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History*. MIT Press.

Herod, A. (1991). The production of scale in United States labour relations. *Area*, 82–88.

Jonas, A. E. G. (1994). The Scale Politics of Spaliality. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *12*(3), 257–264. https://doi.org/10.1068/d120257

Kurtz, H. E. (2003). Scale frames and counter-scale frames: constructing the problem of environmental injustice. *Political Geography*, *22*(8), 887–916. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2003.09.001

Lebel, L., Garden, P., & Imamura, M. (2005). The Politics of Scale, Position, and Place in the Governance of Water Resources in the Mekong Region. *Ecology and Society*, *10*(2). https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-01543-100218

Longley, P. A., Goodchild, M., Maguire, D. J., & Rhind, D. W. (2010). *Geographic Information Systems & Science* (3 edition). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

MacKinnon, D. (2011). Reconstructing scale: Towards a new scalar politics. *Progress in Human Geography*, *35*(1), 21–36. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132510367841

MandeL, M. (n.d.). *Scale and Innovation in Today's Economy*. 10.

Marston, S. A., Jones, J. P., & Woodward, K. (2005). Human geography without scale. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, *30*(4), 416–432. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-5661.2005.00180.xNathan F., S. (2009). Scale. In *Blackwell Companions to Geography*. *A companion to environmental geography*. Chichester, U.K. ; Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Nelson, & Rosenberg. (1993). National Innovation Systems: A Comparative Analysis, 1993 | Online Research Library: Questia. Retrieved May 21, 2019, from https://www.questia.com/library/85733270/national-innovation-systems-a-comparative-analysis

Neumann, R. P. (2009). Political ecology: theorizing scale. *Progress in Human Geography*, *33*(3), 398–406. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132508096353

OECD. (2002). *Frascati Manual 2002: Proposed Standard Practice for Surveys on Research and Experimental Development*. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264199040-en

Prytherch, D. L. (2007). Urban Geography With Scale: Rethinking Scale VIA Wal-Mart's "Geography of Big Things"1. *Urban Geography*, *28*(5), 456–482. https://doi.org/10.2747/0272-3638.28.5.456

Quan Gao. (2019). Scale. In *Introducing Social Geographies*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332672760_Scale_-_Introducing_Social_Geographies

Sallie A. Marston. (2000). The social construction of scale. Retrieved May 23, 2019, from https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1191/030913200674086272

Smith, N., & Harvey, D. (2008). *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space* (3rd edition). Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Swyngedouw, E., & Cox, K. (1997). Neither Global Nor Local: 'Glocalization' and the Politics of Scale. *Spaces of Globalization: Reasserting the Power of the Local*, 137–166.

Systems of Innovation: Growth, Competitiveness and Employment. (2014, October 14). Retrieved May 21, 2019, from Charles Edquist website: https://charlesedquist.com/books/systems-of-innovation-growth-competitiveness-and-employment/

Taylor, P. J. (1982). A Materialist Framework for Political Geography. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, *7*(1), 15–34. https://doi.org/10.2307/621909

Taylor, P. J. (1987). The Paradox of Geographical Scale in Marx's Politics*. *Antipode*, *19*(3), 287–306. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.1987.tb00376.x

Williams, R. W. (1999). Environmental injustice in America and its politics of scale. *Political Geography*, *18*(1), 49–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-6298(98)00076-