Available online at www.sciencedirect.com
SCIENCE DIRECT®
Research Policy 33 (2004) 551–562
research policy
www.elsevier.com/locate/econbase

Identifying innovation in surveys of services: a Schumpeterian perspective

Ina Drejer [a,b,*]

[a] *Department of Business Studies, Aalborg University, Fibigerstraede 4, DK-9220 Copenhagen, Denmark*
[b] *Centre for Economic and Business Research, Ministry of Economic and Business Affairs, Aalborg O, Denmark*

Received 2 January 2003; accepted 20 November 2003

Abstract

In order to compensate for decades of neglect of services in innovation studies, a strand of literature has emerged, which emphasises alleged distinctive features of service innovation. These studies apply innovation concepts developed especially for services, thereby contributing to the existing divide between manufacturing and services. The present paper demonstrates that Schumpeter's original innovation concept is indeed broad enough to encompass services and manufacturing, and that a more direct reference to Schumpeter, in particular innovation as a contrast to activities based on routine systems, in service oriented studies would add a needed theoretical and conceptual strengthening to service innovation studies.

JEL classification: O31

Keywords: Schumpeter; Innovation; Services; Learning; Knowledge

1. Introduction

The vast majority of innovation studies focus on technological innovation within manufacturing, reflecting that innovation theory has its roots in a time where manufacturing was still the major economic activity. Thus decades after services outdistanced manufacturing from an employment perspective, manufacturing has continued to dominate innovation studies. Studies of service innovation are still in a relatively early development phase, where approaches applying a traditional manufacturing logic to service innovation exist alongside approaches that view services as distinctive activities. The development of an approach that takes the blurring boundaries between manufacturing and services into account, and thus applies a perspective on innovation that is not restricted to the traditional manufacturing-services dichotomy, is a natural next step. Such a synthesis approach (Coombs and Miles, 2000) can apply findings from service innovation studies in bringing to the fore aspects of innovation, which have hitherto been neglected in relation to manufacturing innovation, but are in fact widely distributed across the economy.

The studies of service innovation as distinctive activities have the potential of contributing to the development of such a synthesis approach to innovation by pointing to features of innovation that have been largely ignored in studies taking a traditional, technology-focussed manufacturing approach to innovation. But it is argued in the following that the service specific studies tend to stress the peculiarities

* Tel.: +45-9635-8255; fax: +45-9815-6013.
E-mail address: id@business.auc.dk (I. Drejer).

0048-7333/$ – see front matter © 2003 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.respol.2003.07.004

of services too much, thus neglecting the generality of their findings, e.g. in terms of the importance of codification of knowledge for innovation. Furthermore the theoretical foundation underlying service innovation studies could be strengthened, as is illustrated by confronting the notions of innovation proposed in service specific studies with the original Schumpeterian perception of innovation as a contrast to operating in routine systems.

As service and manufacturing activities are becoming increasingly more intertwined, it is necessary to work towards developing a common framework for studying these activities instead of maintaining the dichotomy between the two. Conceptual work goes hand in hand with empirical analysis, as conceptual clarifications contribute to improving data collection as well as analysis. Likewise, empirical findings can point towards the need for further conceptual and theoretical investigation. The focus of the present paper is, as indicated above, on the conceptual side, but the goal is to improve the foundation for carrying out empirical analyses of innovation in services as well as manufacturing.

2. The rise of services

The United States was the first economy to become a 'service economy'. Fuchs (1965) illustrated that since the mid-1950s only a minority of the employed US population has been involved in the production of tangible goods, and accordingly introduced the term 'service economy' to describe this state of employment-dominance by the service sector. The gap in relative employment between the two main sectors has increased ever since—in 2000 75% of the US labour force was employed in services.[1] Although other countries are lagging behind the United States to a varying extent, this is a worldwide tendency.

The continuously increasing size of the service sector relative to manufacturing spurred a range of studies of the consequences of the increased 'servicification' of the economy in the United States in the 1950s and 1960s.

The above-mentioned study by Fuchs (1965) of 'The Growing Importance of Service Industries' was just one of the early American studies of the service economy. In his analysis Fuchs drew parallels to the consequences of the shift from primary to secondary production during the period of industrialisation causing land to loose and physical capital to gain importance as inputs in economic models. Fuchs saw the importance of the consumer as a co-operating agent in the production process, and the labour embodiment of technological change, as major implications for economic analysis of the shift to a service economy.

Other examples of studies of the emerging service economy, carried out in the United States under the auspices of the National Bureau of Economic Research in the 1950s and 1960s, are Stigler (1956) and Greenfield (1966). Stigler among other things points to the importance of employee knowledge and skills, as well as organisational change, for technological advance in the service industries. Greenfield focuses on 'producer services', i.e. service industries that are mainly producing intermediate service inputs rather than consumer services. An important point in Greenfield's work is the investment value of purchasing producer services.

Even though these early service studies do not focus on innovation, several of their findings are directly related to what is identified as characteristic features of service innovation, and the contribution from services to users, in recent studies. The role of the consumer as a co-operating agent in the production process—and therefore also in the innovation process—in services, and the labour embodiment of technological change, including the importance of organisational change, thus receives a great deal of attention in service specific innovation studies.

The acknowledgement of services as important—and in some cases peculiar—economic activities is thus not entirely new. But empirical studies of the development of services through innovation surveys are a relatively new phenomenon. As illustrated below, different avenues for studying service innovation have been explored, ranging from approaches that view services from a manufacturing perspective, to approaches that treat service activities as something distinctly different from other types of economic activity.

[1] Defined as ISIC Rev. 2 sectors 6 (Wholesale and Retail Trade and Restaurants and Hotels), 7 (Transport, Storage and Communication), 8 (Financing, Insurance, Real Estate and Business Services) and 9 (Community, Social and Personal Services). Source: ILO Bureau of Statistics Labour Statistics Database (LABORSTA).

3. Different approaches to analysing service innovation

There is an ongoing debate on whether service innovation can be analysed using the same concepts and tools as innovation in manufacturing. Coombs and Miles (2000) distinguish between three different approaches to defining and studying innovation in services: (i) an assimilation approach, which treats services as similar to manufacturing; (ii) a demarcation approach, which argues that service innovation is distinctively different from innovation in manufacturing, following dynamics and displaying features that require new theories and instruments; and (iii) a synthesis approach, which suggests that service innovation brings to the forefront hitherto neglected elements of innovation that are of relevance for manufacturing as well as services.

The two first of these approaches can be related to two main characterisations of innovation surveys proposed by Djellal and Gallouj (2000): (i) subordinate surveys, which basically take an assimilation approach to innovation; and (ii) autonomous surveys, which take a demarcation approach to innovation. The third approach, the synthesis approach, is still in its infancy, and this perspective on innovation has thus not been widely applied in empirical surveys. Contributions to a synthesis approach to innovation can however be found in Gallouj and Weinstein (1997), who aim at developing an integrative approach to innovation which encompasses both manufacturing and services, and which applies to technological as well as non-technological innovation. Gallouj and Weinstein build their approach on a model that represents a product or a service as a system of competences, technical characteristics and final characteristics. Innovations thus consist of changes in one or more of these elements. As is illustrated below, Gallouj and Weinstein's approach allows for a very broad perception of innovation, just as it is the case with the demarcation approach to service innovation.

Preissl (2000) also contributes to the development of a synthesis approach to innovation in an analysis that takes the blurring boundaries between manufacturing and services as the point of departure for assessing what makes service innovation distinctive. Even though Preissl identifies a range of factors peculiar to services, she ends up concluding that it might turn out that "new boundaries have to be drawn across service and manufacturing sectors to categorise industries according to characteristics in innovation dynamics, since some services may be more similar to certain manufacturing industries than to other services" (Preissl, 2000, p. 145).

In empirically based analyses of innovation in services the demarcation and assimilation approaches are still dominant however. These two approaches are discussed in further detail below.

3.1. Subordinate surveys (assimilation)

The second European Community Innovation Survey (CIS II) carried out in 1997 is an example of a subordinate survey, i.e. a survey confined to applying definitions of and questionnaires for services, which were intended for manufacturing activities, focusing solely on technological innovation (Djellal and Gallouj, 2000). This survey was a follow-up on the CIS I survey, carried out in 1993, which explored manufacturing firms' technological product and process innovations during the period 1990–1992. The limitation to product and process innovation in the CIS I survey is criticised in Archibugi et al. (1994), who suggest a distinction between different types of innovative activities, i.e. 'innovation of product', 'innovation of process', 'innovation of organisation', 'innovation of design', 'innovation of packaging', etc. This did not result in any changes in the way innovation was defined in CIS II however, as in the first round reference was only made to product or process innovation. A new addition in CIS II was the inclusion of service firms in the survey.[2] A special questionnaire was developed for the service firms, but the focus remained on technological innovation in a narrow sense. Also in the third round of the survey (CIS III), initiated in 2001, product and process innovation are the main innovation types dealt with.

Coombs and Miles (2000) criticise analyses taking an assimilation (subordinate) approach to service innovation for being too limited in their perception of innovation, although these types of analyses do confirm that services are innovative. One such anal-

[2] Some individual countries did also experiment with including service firms in the first round of the Community Innovation Survey, even though it was not part of the common set-up.

ysis is Sirilli and Evangelista's (1998) analysis of technological innovation in services and manufacturing. Comparing data from two surveys—a survey among service firms, covering the period 1993–1995, and a survey among manufacturing firms covering the period 1990–1992[3]—Sirilli and Evangelista find that service and manufacturing sectors show more similarities than differences with respect to a range of basic dimensions of innovation processes (regarding propensity to innovate, sources of information, objectives of and obstacles to innovation). Along the same line of reasoning Hughes and Wood (2000), based on a (subordinate) survey among 576 small and medium sized manufacturing and service firms, also find that differences within manufacturing and service sectors, respectively are greater than between the two groups. These findings of similarities between the two groups could be a direct cause of the assimilation approach though, as it takes a technological approach to innovation, and thus is likely to ignore possible differences related to non-technological innovations.

Through focussing on technological innovations, economically important developments in for instance customer relations, new package solutions, etc. are ignored, thus distorting the view on the variety of activities that can contribute to driving economic development. An example is organisational innovation. Stigler (1956) finds that mechanical advances have tended to overshadow organisational changes in manufacturing, perhaps because economists are prone to underestimate their influence relative to advances in natural science technology. But studies of service industries illustrate that organisational changes can have a substantial influence on the trend of employment, and suggest that these changes may also play a considerable role in commodity-producing industries (Stigler, 1956, p. 159). In accordance with this, Gjerding (1996), based on a survey of organisational innovation in the Danish business sector, reports that organisational innovation actually is more frequent in manufacturing than in services. Sixty-eight percent of the manufacturing firms, compared to 43% of the service firms participating in the survey, reported to have carried out organisational innovation (defined as 'important organisational changes') within the 3-year period (1993–1995) covered by the survey.[4] Lundvall (1999) discusses the importance of mode of organisation, and applies Danish data for manufacturing as well as services to demonstrate that firms that are functionally flexible in terms of mode of organisation achieve a higher level of productivity compared to the non-flexible firms.

A technology-focussed perception of innovation, like the one expressed in subordinate surveys, thus appears to be too narrow for understanding the dynamics of services as well as manufacturing.

3.2. Autonomous surveys (demarcation)

Opposed to the assimilation approach is the demarcation approach, which is the foundation for carrying out specialised studies of innovation in services. The demarcation approach to service innovation can thus be directly linked with 'autonomous' surveys of service innovation. The primary focus of autonomous innovation surveys is, per definition, not to compare innovation in services directly with innovation in manufacturing, but rather to study distinctive features of service innovation. The danger of such an approach lies in inferring that particular features are unique for services, although they might actually be just as characteristic of manufacturing, despite having been ignored in traditional analyses limited by the product/process dichotomy.

An example of an autonomous survey of service innovation is a survey carried out in France in 1997 as part of the European project on "Innovation in Services

[3] This questionnaire applied in this survey is highly comparable with the standardised CIS I questionnaire.

[4] Gjerding (1996) proposes that the lower proportion of organisationally innovative service firms might be explained by a different perception of organisational change in the service sector. Firms in the service sector may, e.g. have higher tolerance for organisational change compared to firms in the manufacturing sector, implying that organisational change has to be rather pervasive to be considered 'important' in the service sector. Alternatively the difference between manufacturing and services might just be a reflection of the service firms in the sample being smaller in terms of employees than the manufacturing firms. More interesting, from the point of view of the blurring boundaries between manufacturing and services, is the observation that there are no significant differences between manufacturing and services with regards to the purpose of the organisational changes, which leads Gjerding to suggest that the strategic issues and contingencies facing firms are becoming similar across the manufacturing and service sectors.

and Services in Innovation" (SI4S).[5] Results from this survey are reported in Djellal and Gallouj (2001). In this survey the innovation concept is broadened to encompass not only product and process innovation, but also internal organisational innovation and external relational innovation. The analysis confirms a range of hypotheses regarding service innovation, including the importance of clients, the multiplicity of possible actors involved in innovation and the pre-eminence of interactive models of innovation (as opposed to the linear model of innovation), as well as the problem of protecting innovation in services.

The above-mentioned features of services innovation are admittedly often neglected in relation to manufacturing innovation. This does not mean that they are not relevant for manufacturing though. Kline and Rosenberg (1986) have illustrated that the linear model of innovation is just as inadequate and oversimplified in relation to innovation in manufacturing as it is in services. In relation to the multiplicity of possible actors involved in innovative activities, DeBresson et al. (1998), based on data for manufacturing firms in 10 countries collected for the first Community Innovation Survey (CIS I), show that information networks are the rule and seem to be almost universally required in the innovative process. Innovative achievements attained by individual firms in isolation are a very small minority. Regarding the importance of clients or customers for product innovation, Madsen (1998), based on a survey of collaboration on product development amongst Danish manufacturing firms, found that although suppliers of materials and components are just as frequent collaboration partners as private customers, customers are identified by the innovating firms as the most important type of collaboration partner. Madsen further confirms DeBresson et al.'s findings concerning the variety of partners involved in product development, as well as the frequency of collaboration: only 3% of the participating product developing firms had no experience with collaboration on product development, and 44% of the product developing firms had collaborated on all their development projects during the 3 years covered by the survey. Interactive models of innovation are thus by no means unique for services.

Regarding the appropriability issue, Evangelista (2000) finds the surprising result that appropriability conditions seem to be more important determinants of technological change in manufacturing than in services. This is based on the finding that manufacturing firms rank the risk of being imitated by competitors as a much more important factor hampering innovation than do service firms.[6]

Many peculiarities of service innovation pointed out by autonomous (demarcation) service studies thus appear to be just as important in manufacturing—even though they might not be studied very often in relation to manufacturing. One obvious example is organisational innovation, which Gjerding (1996), as mentioned above, finds to be as at least as frequent in manufacturing as in services. The interplay between different types of innovation is another important element, which is often stressed in relation to services, whereas it tends to be ignored in the technology-focussed product-produces dichotomy applied in manufacturing studies. Foss and Laursen (2002), e.g. find a relation between firms' use of new types of organisation and their ability to produce product innovations. The debate about IT use and organisation (see, e.g. Bresnahan et al., 2002), indicates a similar interdependence between organisational innovation and process innovation.

The demarcation approach thus has the possibility of contributing with a broadened knowledge about service activities *as well as* about innovation in general, and thereby lead the way towards developing a synthesis approach to innovation that applies to all sectors of activity. But inherent in the demarcation approach, and in the related autonomous innovation studies, is a challenge of traditional perceptions of innovation, and thereby also possibly the theoretical foundation for innovation studies. The autonomous innovation studies' distance from traditional perceptions of innovation is among other things illustrated by the development of innovation concepts specifically aimed at capturing the peculiarities of services. Below the most frequently

[5] The findings of SI4S project are reported in three synthesis reports: Hauknes (1998), Sundbo and Gallouj (1998), and Bilderbeek et al. (1998).

[6] The comparison is based on surveys covering different periods of time for manufacturing and services. Comparisons should thus be carried out with caution. The difference in ranking is however so outspoken that it is assessed to be valid: manufacturing firms rank the risk of being imitated by competitors as obstacle no. 5 of 15, while service firms rank this risk as obstacle no. 15 of 15.

used of these concepts are discussed in relation to a traditional Schumpeterian perspective on innovation as well as in relation to the concepts of learning and codification of knowledge.

4. A Schumpeterian perspective on service specific innovation concepts

Coombs and Miles (2000) stress that the demarcation approach to service innovation, which implicitly lies behind autonomous innovation studies, is still under development. The number of analyses drawing on autonomous surveys is thus limited. But Gadrey et al. (1995), Sundbo (1998, 2000), Sundbo and Gallouj (1998, 2000), Gallouj (2000), and Djellal and Gallouj (2001) are notable examples of studies taking a demarcation approach to innovation.

As mentioned above, demarcation studies have, in their focus on the particular characteristics of services, developed context-specific concepts for service innovation. These concepts serve to direct the attention towards features that are perceived as distinctive for service innovation, implicitly stating that these features do not apply to manufacturing—at least not to the same extent. It still remains to be systematically studied whether services and manufacturing do in fact differ to the extent proposed by these studies, or whether the perceived difference largely is a consequence of manufacturing studies' bias towards technological innovation.

The major point of reference for assessing the service specific innovation concepts in the following is Schumpeter's original notion of innovation. Innovation is closely related to development in Schumpeter's theory of economic development: economic development is driven by the discontinuous emergence of new combinations (innovations) that are economically more viable than the old way of doing things (Schumpeter, 1934). The role of innovations in creating development is expressed in the focal shifts that they produce, "which is replete with vitality, motivated by a small circle of personalities, and which does not consist in continuous adaptation" (Schumpeter, 1912/2002, p. 103).

Schumpeter's innovation concept covers five areas: (i) the introduction of a new good or a new quality of a good (product innovation); (ii) the introduction of a new method of production, including a new way of handling a commodity commercially (process innovation); (iii) the opening of a new market (market innovation); (iv) the conquest of a new source of supply of raw material or intermediate input (input innovation); and (v) the carrying out of a new organisation of industry (organisational innovation) (Schumpeter, 1934, p. 66). It is an essential feature of innovation that it is something that is carried into practice, and further that the entrepreneur leads others in the same branch to follow, i.e. the innovation gets diffused through imitation (op cit., pp. 88–89).

In his later work Schumpeter puts less emphasis on the role of the individual entrepreneur in the process of innovation[7] compared to his original theory of economic development, just as he stresses that innovation does not have to be radical and unpredictable to be considered a true innovation. Schumpeter (1939/1989, p. 181) thus acknowledges the importance of the cumulative nature of knowledge by stating that a technical revolution cannot be understood without reference to the development that led up to it. And in Schumpeter (1942, p. 132) it is claimed that it has become much easier to do things that lie outside the familiar routine, and accordingly innovation itself can be perceived as being reduced to routine in the sense that technological progress has become the business of trained specialists. Although Schumpeter sees the innovation process as being increasingly more institutionalised, depersonalised and automatized, this does not imply that innovation itself has seized being a break with 'business-as-usual'. Schumpeter (1942, p. 83) thus describes innovation as a "process of industrial mutation (. . .) that incessantly revolutionizes the economic structure from within". The incessant character of innovation should not be taken too literally, as the actual revolutions occur in discrete rushes—it is the process as a whole that works incessantly (Schumpeter, 1942, p. 83, footnote 2).[8]

The reason for putting such emphasis on Schumpeter's notion of innovation in the present

[7] This view on innovation is commonly known as Schumpeter Mark II, as opposed to Mark I, which refers to Schumpeter's early belief in the crucial role of the individual entrepreneur (expressed in Schumpeter, 1934).

[8] Schumpeter does however see the increased automatisation of innovation as a threat to the survival of capitalism because he fears that bureaucracy and experts will suppress individual initiative.

context is that innovation is defined as an economic concept through the economic meaning that Schumpeter attaches to innovation in relation to economic development. If innovation did not exist "movements towards the superior methods in production in the economy would also exist in a static state, but [. . .] more slowly in an infinitesimal way would the mass of the statistical economic agents [. . .] sink towards the center of gravity [i.e. equilibrium]" (Schumpeter, 1912/2002, p. 103). Innovation is thus what pulls the economic system away from these infinitesimal movements towards the more abrupt changes that are associated with development. An important implication of focussing on traditional Schumpeterian concepts for a better understanding of service innovation would thus be that the economic impact factor gets a much-needed attention. The understanding of innovation in services has suffered from the popular notion that since many services are performed with a particular customer in mind, and sometimes in a close interplay with the customer, every service delivery is unique. This has led to a confusion regarding whether all services or no services represent the creation of something new. The notion of standardised services (see, e.g. Tether et al., 2001) has relieved at least part of the services from this uniqueness-characterisation, but even customer-fitted services consist of combinations of well-defined elements which can remain unchanged or which can be subject to development and thus innovation. As long as the elements remain unchanged they may be part of high-quality services which meet the needs of the customers, but they are not sources of additional value added for the producing firm. An innovation, which can contribute to economic development and promote growth and welfare, has only taken place when a new element is developed, which can be applied in relation to several customers. An example of a service that has activated and created additional sources of value added is the introduction of self-service concepts in banks, which at the same time is a labour saving process innovation for the producer and a product innovation for the user, e.g. in terms of 24 h access to own accounts.

It is in light of the original interpretation of the inherent characteristics and effects of innovation as a promoter of growth that the service specific innovation concepts are discussed in the following. The studies focussing particularly on service innovation have as their primary goal to describe how innovation is carried out in services, and how it takes many other forms than just product and process innovation. It is this focus on the peculiarities of services that has led to the development of these new innovation concepts specifically aimed at services.

One such concept developed in relation to service innovation is *ad hoc innovation* (e.g. Gadrey et al., 1995; Sundbo and Gallouj, 1998, 2000; Gallouj, 2000). Gallouj and Weinstein (1997, p. 549) present the concept as developed to describe an "interactive (social) construction to a particular problem posed by a given client", and it is a concept particularly relevant for consultancy services. Ad hoc innovations help to produce new knowledge and competencies that have to be codified and formalised so that they might be reused in different circumstances (ibid.). Mamede (2002) describes the most important feature of ad hoc innovation as adaptive capacity.

The concept 'ad hoc innovation' challenges the basic principle that innovations by definition, through their associated diffusion, have more than one specific application (Schumpeter, 1934, p. 228). This issue is discussed by Sundbo and Gallouj (1998), who argue that even though an ad hoc innovation as such is not reproducible, it is sufficient that it is indirectly reproducible through codification and formalisation of part of the experience and competence developed in constructing the particular solution. This amounts however to equalising learning, competence development and knowledge codification with innovation. There is no doubt that learning occurs through the process of innovation (see e.g. Kline and Rosenberg, 1986), and that learning strengthens the potential for further innovation, but this does not imply that learning equals innovation (see also below in relation to formalisation innovation). Learning is not a concept dealt with specifically by Schumpeter, but he does touch upon the creation of new knowledge in relation to invention and innovation in stating that this new knowledge is economically irrelevant if the invention is not carried into practice (Schumpeter, 1934, p. 88). In the present context it can be argued that unless the learning taking place in relation to adapting a consultancy service to a specific customer results in a radical or even incrementally new or changed product, process, way of organising, etc., which represents a new business opportunity, it is not of any particular importance for economic development.

Another concept developed especially for services is *external relationship innovation* (see also Section 3 above), defined as the establishment by a firm of particular relationships with partners (customers, suppliers, public authorities or competitors) (Djellal and Gallouj, 2001). This type of innovation can be characterised as a subset of organisational innovation as it has been interpreted in recent innovation studies. Whereas Schumpeter's original concept included the organisation of industry (e.g. the transition in to or out of a monopoly situation), the concept of organisational innovation has later been broadened to cover processes for gathering, managing and using information, as well as for the implementations of decisions based on such information (OECD/Eurostat, 1997). And Schumpeter (1912/2002, p. 111) does mention outdated management forms, alongside old products and methods of production, as factors that prevent some economic agents from prospering from development, i.e. Schumpeter does, at least indirectly, broaden the concept of organisational innovation to encompass more than the organisation of industry.

The processes for gathering, managing and using information can concern the internal organisation of a firm, as well as a firm's external organisation of relations. But organisational innovation, including external relational innovation, has been faced with the problem of a lack of tools for measuring this type of innovation. Lately survey tools for identifying organisational and inter-organisational innovations have been developed though, in Denmark in relation to the DISKO-project (see Lundvall, 2002) and at the EU-level the CIS III-survey supplemented the questions about technological innovation with a question about other types of "changes", including strategy, management and organisation. Because of the large fraction of firms reporting that they have implemented other changes than technological innovation there are considerations about broadening the definition of innovation to include non-technological innovations in a fourth round of the CIS survey.

OECD/Eurostat (1997, p. 43) finds that organisational innovation is highly firm specific, which makes it difficult to sum up to an aggregate level. This could imply that the broad interpretation of organisational innovation could conflict with the requirement of more than a specific application of an innovation. Past experiences with the diffusion of new ways of firm organisation point in the opposite direction though, as e.g. the diffusion of 'Japanese' forms of organisation with subcontracting taking off in the 1970s. With reference to the Japanese organisation forms Helper et al. (2000) illustrate that organisational innovation, including external relational innovation, is also highly relevant for manufacturing firms, their analysis focussing on automakers. These types of innovation are often closely related to process innovation, either because new process technology requires new ways of organising work, or because new ways of organising opens up the possibilities for introducing new processes.

Formalisation innovation is introduced as a heterogeneous type of innovation, which aims to lend 'material' form to services (Gallouj and Weinstein, 1997; Gallouj, 2000). Formalisation innovation is described as "putting the service characteristics 'into order', specifying them, making them less hazy, making them concrete, giving them shape" (Gallouj and Weinstein, 1997, p. 553). Examples given by Gallouj and Weinstein are the modulation of functions in the cleaning industry, the organisation of work at McDonald's, and the formalisation of legal services into a well-defined product, such as, e.g. 'legal audit'. Parallels can thus be drawn to the process of codifying or making knowledge explicit (Nonaka, 1994; Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995) which creates perceptual and conceptual categories that facilitate the classification of phenomena, i.e. formalisation innovation can be described as formalising or making explicit hitherto informal, implicitly known actions. The process of formalisation can be related to the 'service solutions' discussed in relation to service strategies by Leiponen (2002). A 'service solution' is a pre-defined service product as opposed to, e.g. the service provider functioning as an outside expert. Leiponen emphasises that it is an implication of Nonaka's (1994) theory of knowledge creation that codification is a prerequisite for innovation, and finds empirical support for innovative services firms being slightly more likely than non-innovative firms to offer 'service solutions' as opposed to non-codified services. Leiponen's findings that firms that formalise knowledge are more likely to innovate is in accordance with Nonaka and Takeuchi's theory of innovation emerging out of the interaction between tacit and explicit knowledge, but the act of making knowledge explicit is only a step towards creating new knowledge. And it is knowledge

creation that fuels innovation, not knowledge per se (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995, p. 235). The formalisation procedures[9] discussed by Gallouj and Weinstein can thus contribute to innovation, but cannot be singled out as being a particular type of innovation in itself. Formalisation is however an important element in all processes aiming at applying the creation of new knowledge in innovations, and in relation to services it has the additional benefit of contributing to lifting services from being perceived as 'single case events'.

The concept of *expertise-field innovation* has been applied to describe innovations that consist of detecting new needs and responding to them through a procedure of accumulating knowledge and expertise within services (Gallouj, 2000). These types of innovations are described as potential, where the actual innovation will only be materialised in an interaction with a client. In that sense one could be led to believe that expertise-field innovation is just a special case of 'ad hoc innovation'. But Gallouj (2000, p. 133) stresses that the essential results of expertise-field innovation are the "opening of new markets, diversification (internal and external) or renewal of product ranges, and creation of a competitive advantage or monopoly in terms of knowledge and expertise", i.e. results that are close to being identical to the characteristics of innovation described by Schumpeter (1934),[10] i.e. expertise-field innovation is true innovation in a Schumpeterian sense.

The service specific innovation concepts discussed above are not a complete list of new concepts developed in relation to service innovation. But they serve to illustrate how service innovation studies—and in some cases also attempts to contribute to the synthesis approach, such as Gallouj and Weinstein (1997)—develop new concepts in their effort to illustrate how traditional innovation studies are too limited in their focus. Whereas most of the new concepts are only a rephrasing of established innovation concepts, others are clearly stretching the concept, not only beyond the traditional product/process dichotomy, but also beyond the limits of the actual act of innovation to include processes related to or leading to innovation in their definition of innovation.[11]

The contribution from the new innovation concepts launched in relation to the service studies lies in the attention they direct toward the multiplicity of ways through which innovations can be carried out (i.e. different characteristics of innovation processes). This is hardly unique for services though. More important, the concepts also distinguish between different types of innovation in relation to their degree of newness—and to their degree of being a true innovation:

- Expertise-field innovation is clearly an innovation, also viewed from a Schumpeterian perspective, as it consists of detecting new needs, responding to them and thereby possibly opening up new markets.
- External relational innovation is in fact a particular type of organisational innovation. There has in the past been a lack of survey tools for identifying and measuring organisational innovation, but there are recent successful examples of surveys of this type of innovation (e.g. Lundvall, 1999, 2002).
- Formalisation implies codifying and making explicit knowledge and processes, which have hitherto been informal and tacit. Formalisation is thus an important step towards innovation, but it is rarely an innovation in itself, unless it can be directly related to new marketable products or new ways of organising production or carrying out processes.
- The concept that poses the largest problem in autonomous service studies is ad hoc innovation, which is a rather controversial concept. Ad hoc innovation challenges the requirement of discontinuity and possibilities of diffusion of an 'innovation',

[9] Parallels can also be drawn to Nonaka's (1994) concept of 'conceptualization', which refers to a process where tacit, 'field-specific' perspectives are converted into explicit concepts that can be shared beyond the boundaries of a limited team of people.

[10] Regarding detecting new needs, opening new markets and renewing product ranges Schumpeter states that: "It is, however, the producer who as a rule initiates economic change [. . .], [consumers] are, as it were, taught to want new things, or things which differ in some respect or other from those which they have been in the habit of using". (Schumpeter, 1934, p. 65). The competitive advantage or monopoly in terms of knowledge and expertise is inseparably related to Schumpeter's entrepreneurial profit (1934 p. 128ff).

[11] Even though Gallouj and Weinstein (1997), in their attempt to develop a synthesis (or integrative, in their words) approach to innovation, present a method to identify innovation based on in which elements a change might occur, they do not confront the innovation concepts applied with a Schumpeterian perspective on innovation. Their contribution is however an important step towards a more coherent approach to innovation in services as well as manufacturing.

as it consists of a specific, non-reproducible solution to a specific problem, primarily carried out within consultancy businesses.

Those subscribing to a demarcation approach to innovation would probably claim that the traditional Schumpeterian perspective on innovation is too narrow to cover the specificities of service innovation because Schumpeter clearly had manufacturing in mind when he developed his theory of economic development (1934). But, as empirically supported by Marklund (1998), Schumpeter's definition of innovation is in fact rich enough to encompass innovations in services. And the point raised here is that if innovation is reduced to the emergence of context-specific solutions, then the concept looses its economic meaning. First, the innovative endeavours can no longer be claimed to be driven by the strive towards (temporary) extraordinary profit and interest, which are the "fruits of the process of development" (Schumpeter, 1912/2002, p. 111). As pointed out by Andersen (2003), it is the concept of entrepreneurial profit, which supplies Schumpeter's analysis of innovation with its specific economic theoretical character. Second, the direct link between innovation and economic development dissolves when innovation is reduced to the emergence of context-specific solutions. This last element relates to the fundamental distinction between growth and development, which characterises the Schumpeterian school of thought. Schumpeter does not consider the mere growth of an economy to be a process of development, since it does not call forth any qualitative new phenomena, but only processes of adaptation within a routine system. Small changes are frequently a condition for development in a Schumpeterian sense, but even though they make development possible, they do not create it out of themselves (Schumpeter, 1934, pp. 62–63). Learning, as a process of continuous adaptation to small changes, including coming up with specific solutions to specific problems, can be perceived in the same way: learning is a condition for, an input to, as well as an outcome of, innovation, but it does not constitute innovation in itself.

Applying Schumpeter's scheme of innovation in a more strict sense in services could contribute to strengthening the theoretical and conceptual foundation for studying service innovation, and thus lead the way for a synthesis approach to innovation. This would make autonomous service studies obsolete, but it would at the same time challenge the narrow perception of innovation presently characterising subordinate innovation studies. In terms of 'counting' innovation in services, a more strict Schumpeterian definition could imply that the innovation frequency would turn out to be lower than what some of the autonomous studies find—but even subordinate surveys do find a relatively high innovation frequency in services—however the economic meaning of the innovation concept would be strengthened. The alternative scenario is an infection of innovation with normal day-to-day business, in stead of activities that have the possibility of creating a competitive advantage in relation to the existing way of doing things; as well as a contribution to maintaining the existing divide between manufacturing and services. The consequences of neglecting the Schumpeterian foundation of innovation studies in relation to services could include an unjust prolongation of the treatment of services as 'underdogs' in economic analysis. Manufacturing still dominates economics, both in relation to theory and to data collection for empirical analysis, but, at least in relation to innovation studies, the Schumpeterian scheme provides a framework for studying manufacturing and services on the same terms, giving services the attention that the volume and growth of service activities justifies.

5. Conclusions

The present paper does not attempt to raise doubt as to whether services are innovative. Neither does it question that a manufacturing based technology-focussed product-process approach to innovation is too limited within services. But it is argued that many of the claimed peculiarities of services innovation, such as a strong presence of organisational innovation, involvement of multiple actors in the process of innovation, and the importance of codification of knowledge for carrying out innovation, do also apply to manufacturing. For example, the traditional technology approach to innovation is also too narrow for manufacturing. The need for a synthesis approach to innovation is thus underlined.

So-called autonomous service innovation studies have the possibility of leading the way towards such a synthesis approach to innovation. But in their efforts

to make up for the widespread disregard of services in traditional innovation studies, these studies risk perceiving services as too particular activities, neglecting that the incentives for innovation are the same in all types of economic activities, namely the creation of new possibilities for additional valued added. The service-specific studies are in strict accordance with Schumpeter when they argue that innovation is much more than technological product and process innovation—Schumpeter after all worked with five areas of innovation, also including market, organisational and input innovation. But the above discussion demonstrates that autonomous service innovation studies face a problem of mingling activities that might lead to innovation with actual innovation. In including activities that require/result in learning, but neither result in new products, processes, markets, nor organisational structures, in their definition of innovation, autonomous studies tend to neglect the Schumpeterian heritage of innovation studies. The extreme consequences of this are that the innovation concept becomes detached from the original meaning as an economically successful introduction of something new, thereby being a contrast to acting within the boundaries of routine systems.

The paper thus illustrates the need for a conceptual strengthening of service-specific innovation studies. After all, these types of studies serve an important purpose in building a bridge between the well-known narrow assimilation approach to innovation, and the development of a synthesis approach, which has a broad—and conceptually solid—perspective on innovation, regardless of whether this is carried out in manufacturing, in services, or in an expanding grey area embracing both.

Contributions to a synthesis approach to innovation have already pointed to the need for the drawing of new boundaries between services and manufacturing (a dissolution of boundaries will probably be more correct), as well as to a more formalised way of identifying innovation in services as well as in manufacturing. Such a dissolution of boundaries could also have important policy implications in terms of promoting policies and framework conditions that aim at exploiting and supporting the possible synergies between manufacturing and services.

Acknowledgements

Comments from and discussions with Esben Sloth Andersen, Jesper Lindgaard Christensen, Aija Leiponen, Peter Maskell, Bruce Tether and participants at the 9th Conference of the International Joseph A. Schumpeter Society, March 2002, as well as comments from anonymous referees are gratefully appreciated. Any remaining errors or misconstructions are mine alone.

References

Andersen, E.S., 2003. Schumpeter's Evolution, book manuscript.

Archibugi, D., Cohendet, P., Kristensen, A., Schäffer, K.-A., 1994. Evaluation of the Community Innovation Survey (CIS)—Phase 1, EIMS Publication, p. 11.

Bilderbeek, R., den Hertog, P., Marklund, G., Miles, I., 1998. Services in Innovation: Knowledge Intensive Business Services (KIBS) as Co-Producers of Innovation, SI4S Synthesis Papers S3, STEP, Oslo.

Bresnahan, T.F., Brynjolfsson, E., Hitt, L.M., 2002. Information technology, workplace organization, and the demand for skilled labor: firm-level evidence. Quarterly Journal of Economics 117, 339–376.

Coombs, R., Miles, I., 2000. Innovation, measurement and services: the new problematic. In: Metcalfe, J.S., Miles, I. (Eds.), Innovation Systems in the Service Economy. Measurement and Case Study Analysis. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, pp. 85–103.

DeBresson, C., Hu, X., Drejer, I., Lundvall, B.-Å., 1998. Innovative Activity in the Learning Economy—a comparison of systems in 10 OECD countries, manuscript. Aalborg University and Université du Québec à Montréal, Aalborg/Montréal.

Djellal, F., Gallouj, F., 2000. Innovation surveys for service industries: a review, paper presented at the DG Enterprise Conference on Innovation and Enterprise Creation: Statistics and Indicators. Sophia Antipolis, France, November 2000.

Djellal, F., Gallouj, F., 2001. Patterns of innovation organisation in service firms: portal survey results and theoretical models. Science and Public Policy 28, 57–67.

Evangelista, R., 2000. Sectoral patterns of technological change in services. Economics and Innovation and New Technology 9, 183–221.

Foss, N.J., Laursen, K., 2002. Performance Pay, Delegation and Multitasking under Uncertainty and Innovativeness: An Empirical Investigation, DRUID Working Paper 02-14. Aalborg University/Copenhagen Business School, Aalborg/Copenhagen.

Fuchs, V.R., 1965. The growing importance of the service industries. The Journal of Business 38, 344–373.

Gadrey, J., Gallouj, F., Weinstein, O., 1995. New modes of innovation. How services benefit industry. International Journal of Service Industry Management 6, 4–16.

Gallouj, F., Weinstein, O., 1997. Innovation in services. Research Policy 26, 537–556.

Gallouj, F., 2000. Beyond technological innovation: trajectories and varieties of services innovation. In: Boden, M., Miles, I. (Eds.), Services and the Knowledge-Based Economy. Continuum, London, pp. 129–145.

Gjerding, A.N., 1996. Organisational Innovation in the Private Danish Business Sector, DRUID Working Paper 96-16. Aalborg University/Copenhagen Business School, Aalborg/Copenhagen.

Greenfield, H.I., 1966. Manpower and the Growth of Producer Services. Columbia University Press, New York and London.

Hauknes, J., 1998. Services in innovation—Innovation in services, SI4S Synthesis Papers S1, STEP, Oslo.

Helper, S., MacDuffie, J.P., Sabel, C., 2000. Pragmatic collaborations: advancing knowledge while controlling opportunism. Industrial and Corporate Change 9, 443–488.

Hughes, A., Wood, E., 2000. Rethinking innovation comparisons between manufacturing and services: the experience of the CBR SME surveys in the UK. In: Metcalfe, J.S., Miles, I. (Eds.), Innovation Systems in the Service Economy. Measurement and Case Study Analysis. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, pp. 105–124.

Kline, S.J., Rosenberg, N., 1986. An overview of innovation. In: Landau, R., Rosenberg, N. (Eds.), The Positive Sum Strategy. National Academy Press, Washington, pp. 275–305.

Leiponen, Å., 2002. Intellectual Property and Innovation in Business Services: Implications for the Management of Knowledge and Supply Relationships, paper prepared for the DRUID Conference on Industrial Dynamics of the New and Old Economy. Elsinore, Denmark, 6–8 June 2002.

Lundvall, B.-A., 1999. Det danske innovations system. The Danish Development Council, Copenhagen.

Lundvall, B.-Å., 2002. Growth, Innovation and Social Cohesion: The Danish model. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.

Madsen, P.T., 1998. Den Samarbejdende Virksomhed. The Danish Development Council, Copenhagen.

Mamede, R., 2002. Does Innovation (Really) Matter for Success? The Case of an IT Consultancy Firm, paper prepared for the DRUID Conference on Industrial Dynamics of the New and Old Economy. Elsinore, 6–8 June 2002.

Marklund, G., 1998. Indicators of innovation activities in services. In: Boden, M., Miles, I. (Eds.), Services and the Knowledge-Based Economy. Continuum, London, pp. 86–108.

Nonaka, I., 1994. Dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. Organization Science 5, 14–37.

Nonaka, I., Takeuchi, H., 1995. The Knowledge-Creating Company. Oxford University Press, New York/Oxford.

OECD/Eurostat, 1997. Proposed guidelines for collecting and interpreting technological innovation data—Oslo Manual. OECD, Paris.

Preissl, B., 2000. Service innovation: what makes it different? Empirical evidence from Germany. In: Metcalfe, J.S., Miles, I. (Eds.), Innovation Systems in the Service Economy. Measurement and Case Study Analysis. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, pp. 125–148.

Schumpeter, J.A., 1912/2002. The Economy as a Whole, English translation of Das Gesamtbild der Volkwirtschaft. In: Schumpeter, J.A. (Ed.), Theorie der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung, printed in Industry and Innovation, vol. 9, Chapter 7, pp. 93–145.

Schumpeter, J.A., 1934. The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest and the Business Cycle. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Schumpeter, J.A., 1939/1989. Business Cycles: a Theoretical, Historical and Statistical Analysis of the Capitalist Process (abridged version). Porcupine Press, Philadelphia.

Schumpeter, J.A., 1942. Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy. Harper, New York.

Sirilli, G., Evangelista, R., 1998. Technological innovation in services and manufacturing: results from Italian surveys. Research Policy 27, 882–899.

Stigler, G.J., 1956. Trends in Employment in the Service Industries. National Bureau of Economic Research, New York. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

Sundbo, J., 1998. The Organisation of Innovation in Services. Edward Elgar, Aldershot.

Sundbo, J., 2000. Organization and innovation strategy in services. In: Boden, M., Miles, I. (Eds.), Services and the Knowledge-Based Economy. Continuum, London, pp. 109–128.

Sundbo, J., Gallouj, F., 1998. Innovation in Services, SI4S Synthesis Papers S2, STEP, Oslo.

Sundbo, J., Gallouj, F., 2000. Innovation as a loosely coupled system in services. In: Metcalfe, J.S., Miles, I. (Eds.), Innovation Systems in the Service Economy. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, pp. 43–68.

Tether, B.S., Hipp, C., Miles, I., 2001. Standardisation and particularisation in services: evidence from Germany. Research Policy 30, 1115–1138.