

Social Innovation: towards a process-based view

Shivaang Sharma

A thesis in the John Molson School of Business

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Science (Administration) at
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

July 2018

© Shivaang Sharma

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

School of Graduate Studies

This is to certify that the thesis prepared

By: Shivaang Sharma

Entitled: Social Innovation: towards a process-based view

and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science (Administration)

complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the final Examining Committee:

_____ Mahesh Sharma _____ Chair

_____ Dr. Caroline Roux _____ Examiner

_____ Dr. Joel Bothello _____ Examiner

_____ Dr. Rajshree Prakash _____ Co - supervisor

_____ Dr. Raymond Paquin _____ Co - Supervisor

Approved by

Chair of Department or Graduate Program Director

_____ 2018

Dean of Faculty

ABSTRACT

Social Innovation: towards a process-based view.

Shivaang Sharma

Innovative solutions to address the ‘wicked problems’ of society such as poverty, inequality and illiteracy have attracted increased attention from scholars and practitioners. Such novel solutions to social challenges are referred to as social innovations (SI). As a concept, SI has witnessed a remarkable increase in its conceptual scope as various research communities continue to examine the complex phenomenon. However, the literature on SI is also forced to negotiate with an ever-expanding breadth of what constitutes as SI. In addition, insights are fragmented across studies and there is a lack of clarity on SI as a process of change. This study attempts to address these concerns by adopting a longitudinal view which discusses the conceptual evolution of SI which is unlikely to remain static in its contemporary form. Next, the author suggests boundary conditions in order to ‘put a fence’ around the concept and distinguish it from commercial innovations. Furthermore, the literature on SI from four research communities is analysed to discuss emerging themes and directions for future research. The themes are distilled into core components of SI for conceptual clarity on our contemporary view of the phenomenon. The author also discusses the three defining features of the process-based view of SI as dynamic, negotiated and iterative. To achieve these goals, the author examined the factors and stakeholders of SI in 83 peer-reviewed articles. These factors were termed as the antecedents, enablers, limiters and consequences of social innovation. In addition, an interview study of 5 social innovators was conducted to provide preliminary empirical support for the process-based view of SI. The study also analysed the congruencies and differences amongst factors of SI with those found in existing literature.

Acknowledgements

There are several faculty, friends and well-wishers who helped me focus, overcome obstacles and grow during the thesis process. However, I would like to thank a few people in particular, without whom, my new identity as a researcher would not have come to fruition. Most of all, I thank my supervisors and thesis committee members Dr. Rajshree Prakash, Dr. Raymond Paquin and Dr. Joel Bothello. Without their support I would not be in a position to pursue doctoral studies nor would I be able to find balance in my life.

Dr. Prakash has been an exceptional mentor in nurturing my intellectual development as a budding research scholar. Her emphasis on academic rigor and the importance of grounding insights into existing literature helped me graduate from a student to an author. Dr. Prakash's patience and belief in my ability also helped me focus and overcome tribulations in my personal life as I discovered meaning in my research.

Dr. Paquin has provided me with excellent advice on the quality of my research and on the practicalities of scholarly life. He has always encouraged me to engage in research projects that develop my analytical and methodological skills. At the same time, Dr. Paquin guided me to take on a reasonable level of work when I stretched myself over several tasks. His support and trust instill me with confidence in realizing my potential.

Dr. Bothello's role extended well beyond being my thesis committee member. His early feedback on my research enabled me to submit work that was recognized and rewarded. In addition, it was a joy and an experience to engage with Dr. Bothello in framing and writing our research together. His proactive support towards my further studies also gives me hope and drives me to be a better scholar.

I also thank the District 3 Innovation center (Concordia University) for providing me with interviewees for my study on social innovators. In addition, I thank all interviewees for their time and insights in sharing their stories.

Finally, I thank my wife, Duhita, who has been my guiding star throughout my graduate study. I live to share your intellectual curiosities and grow with your unconditional love. To my friends Sarah, Roba – you gave me a home and the warmth of a family.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Research Agenda	2
3. Longitudinal view: Origins and Evolution	4
3.1 As a spillover effect.....	4
3.2 Outcome-based view.....	5
3.3 Process-based view	6
4. Boundary Conditions of social innovation	8
4.1 Social Innovations are not by-products of commercial innovations.....	8
4.2 Social Innovations are not tools for generating positive business outcomes	9
5. Social Innovation in academic disciplines	10
5.1 Social Innovation in Management	11
5.1.1 Behavioural aspects of social innovation	11
5.1.1.1 Ethics.....	11
5.1.1.2 Leadership	12
5.1.2 Structural aspects of social innovation	13
5.1.2.1 Collaboration and learning	13
5.1.2.2 Knowledge and tensions in learning process.....	14
5.1.2.3 Organizational forms of social innovation.....	15
5.1.2.4 Importance of context.....	16
5.1.3 Discussion on social innovation in Management.....	18
5.1.4 Future directions in Management.....	20
5.2 Social Innovation in Strategy	21
5.2.1 Developing corporate social innovation strategies.....	21
5.2.2 Social Innovation in cross sector partnerships.....	23

5.2.3	Diffusion of roles and responsibilities.....	25
5.2.4	Discussion on social innovation in strategy.....	26
5.2.5	Future directions in Strategy.....	27
5.3	Social Innovation in Social Entrepreneurship.....	28
5.3.1	The role of the Social Innovator or Entrepreneur.....	28
5.3.2	The role of social enterprises.....	29
5.3.3	Discussion of social innovation in Social Entrepreneurship.....	31
5.3.4	Future directions in Social Entrepreneurship.....	32
5.4	Social Innovation in Development studies.....	33
5.4.1	Organizational forms created for empowerment of communities.....	33
5.4.2	Role of the government.....	35
5.4.3	Changes in roles and relationships.....	36
5.4.4	Discussion of social innovation in development studies.....	37
5.4.5	Future directions in development studies.....	37
6.	Core components of social innovation.....	39
6.1	Primary social purpose.....	39
6.2	Collaborative efforts.....	40
6.3	Transformative social outcomes.....	40
7.	Conceptual issues and building towards a process-based view.....	41
7.1	Conceptual issues.....	41
7.2	Building towards a process-based view.....	43
8.	Methodology.....	45
9.	Factors according to levels of analysis and stakeholder groups.....	47
9.1	Antecedents.....	48
9.2	Enablers.....	49
9.3	Limiters.....	50
9.4	Consequences.....	50
10.	Social Innovation as a dynamic, negotiated and iterative process.....	51
10.1	As a dynamic process.....	52
10.2	As a negotiated process.....	53

10.3 As an iterative process.....	53
11. The two approaches in SI literature.....	53
11.1 Grassroots Social Innovation (GSI)	54
11.2 Corporate Social Innovation (CSI)	57
12. Study of social innovators.....	61
12.1 Introduction.....	61
12.2 Methods.....	62
12.3 Themes.....	63
12.3.1 Role of social purpose in reframing social challenges into business opportunities.....	64
12.3.2 Embedding and protecting social purpose via organizational practices and selection of stakeholders.....	65
12.3.3 Developing broad social sector identities and consistently educating the sector.....	67
12.3.4 Multi sectoral partnerships - negotiating and collaborating on social challenges and solutions.....	70
12.4 Discussion.....	73
12.5 Future research.....	76
12.6 Limitations.....	77
12.7 Conclusion.....	78
13 References.....	79
14 Appendices.....	96
14.1 Appendix A: List of tables.	96
14.2 Appendix B: Information and Consent form.....	104

List of Tables.

Table 1: Various definitions of Social Innovation.

Table 2: The common factors and sub factors of Social Innovation.

Table 3 (a): Antecedents and Enablers of Social Innovation at Individual, Organizational, and Institutional Levels.

Table 3 (b): Limiters and Consequences of Social Innovation at Individual, Organizational, and Institutional Levels.

Table 4: The most common stakeholders of a Social Innovation.

Table 5 (a): Factors of Social Innovation across stakeholders: antecedents and enablers.

Table 5 (b): Factors of Social Innovation across stakeholders: limiters and consequences.

Table 6 (a): Grassroots Social Innovation (GSI).

Table 6 (b): Corporate Social Innovation (CSI).

Table 7 (a): General organizational details of the study on social innovators.

Table 7 (b): The social challenges and innovation solutions of social innovators.

Table 8: Primary Social Purpose – Institutionalization and Protection.

Table 9: Broader social identity of innovators - beyond traditional organizational boundaries.

Table 10: Collaborative process of innovators - problem identification and solution discovery.

Table 11: Social Innovator study: Antecedents, Enablers, Limiters and Consequences of SI.

1. Introduction.

The last 40 years witnessed a phenomenal increase in the quantity and quality of innovations that directly address the wicked problems of society such as poverty, world hunger and climate change. In first decade of the 21st century such social purpose-based solutions gripped our imagination and became mainstream names. The Nobel prize winning Grameen Bank (2006) lifted millions out of poverty and Certified fair trade (2002) became one of the most credible procurement certifications and proof of community empowerment. Innovative, socially constructed solutions such as these have disrupted conventional assumptions about business. The 21st century is witness to numerous examples that prove the prioritization of a social purpose over profit making can result in scalable solutions that empower communities as well as ensure financial sustainability of the innovating enterprise. Such solutions are termed as social innovations (SI) – novel solutions to complex social challenges that are motivated by a social purpose and characterized by collaborative processes that lead to transformative social outcomes. Social Innovations challenge our views of prevalent business models and champion alternative value creation systems for both practitioners and academics.

The emergence and proliferation of such novel value creation models have caught the attention of researchers whose increased attention to the phenomenon has contributed it into becoming a separate stream of literature. Social innovation as a term appears to have emerged with the intention to separate it from conventional notions of technological and business innovations. The literature on social innovation developed to explain three distinct aspects of this complex phenomenon – the social motivation to address complex social challenges, the co-creative process of developing novel solutions and the transformative impacts of such solutions on beneficiaries. The study of this phenomenon is not restricted to management alone. It spreads across various research communities such as sociology, community psychology and development studies. One of the core notions of SI is the idea of reinventing value creation approaches that address social problems rather than propagate models that contribute to them. The emergence of social innovation literature signals the inability of conventional innovations, organizational forms and processes to solve complex social problems such as socio-economic inequalities, political marginalization and cultural appropriation by commercial enterprises.

2. Research Agenda.

The literature on social innovation is in its growth stage and spans across several research communities that employ a diverse range of theories and perspectives to study the phenomenon. Recent literature reviews have attempted to categorize SI literature (Tracey & Stott, 2017a), synthesise the findings of different research communities (van der Have, Robert P & Rubalcaba, 2016) and link the literatures of social innovation with social entrepreneurship (Phillips, Lee, Ghobadian, O'Regan, & James, 2015). While the efforts of previous authors have helped in bringing together the fragmented literature, some key gaps in our knowledge require further attention.

First, there is a lack of clarity on the conceptual evolution of social innovation in literature. More clarity is needed on tracing the origins of the term and its development into the contemporary form we understand today. This is necessary because social innovation is not a static term. It has evolved from being understood as a spillover effect of technological evolution, to the modern view - a co-creative process of addressing complex social problems. As the term continues to evolve, it becomes necessary to trace its origins, understand the allied concepts that it has borrowed from and shed light on where our understanding of the concept is heading.

Second, due to the evolving nature of the term, scholars have critiqued social innovation to mean everything and nothing (Pol & Ville, 2009). The term has been described in the context of a broad range of organizations, different institutional contexts tangible and intangible innovations and global & local social problems. Therefore, it has become increasingly necessary to understand what social innovation is not. This effort helps in preventing the concept from sprawling further and diluting its meaning. In addition, the examination of SI by various research communities has contributed to its broad view. More research is needed on which aspects of SI have been studied by different research communities. A synthesis of the 'state of the art' on social innovation helps understand the conversation within and across academic disciplines. By identifying dominant themes within research communities, future research can be guided on the complex phenomenon and concept.

Third, there is still a lack of conceptual clarity on the definitional components of social innovation. The literature makes parallels between social innovation and allied research concepts such as social enterprises, social entrepreneurship, creating shared value, corporate social innovation etc.

However, to distinguish SI as a phenomenon that transcends boundaries, sectors and levels of analysis it is necessary to identify its core components. The themes emerging from the study of various research disciplines are distilled into core components of social innovation. In addition, these components are further critiqued on their conceptual issues.

Fourth, there is a lack of understanding on the features of the contemporary process-based view of social innovation. More recently, research has evolved from viewing SI as tangible innovations that lead to positive social outcomes, to a multifaceted interactive process of social problem solving amongst diverse stakeholders. This study identifies the ‘essential’ features of the process-based view of SI as dynamic, negotiated and iterative and sheds light on why these are essential features of the phenomenon. These core features provide social innovations their ability to impact transformative social change. To justify the saliency of these features, this study discusses the stakeholders and factors that contribute to SI into becoming a dynamic, negotiated and iterative process of social change. In addition, the study uses interview data as a valuable resource to help develop a more refined conceptualization of the phenomenon. In this context, a study of five social innovators was conducted to understand their process of developing and implementing novel solutions to local, social problems.

Finally, in addition to the discussion of factors and stakeholders in literature, scholars have also deliberated over which organizational form is better suited for social innovations. For instance, strategy scholars argue that commercial enterprises can leverage their resources and skills to scale social innovations better than NGOs and social enterprises. In contrast, studies in social entrepreneurship argue that social purpose organizations are better suited than commercial organizations due to a primary social purpose. To address this concern, the study explains the similarities and differences between the two ‘schools of thought’ in terms of purpose, process and outcomes.

3. Longitudinal view: origins and evolution of social innovation

Extant literature suggests that Social Innovation is not a static term and our conception of the phenomenon has advanced with time. In this light, it becomes important to understand the origins and evolution of the term. More recently, our contemporary views on SI have also been shaped by a confluence of perspectives and allied concepts. As our conceptualization of the term evolves, a historical overview helps in gauging the changing scope and applicability of the term in different research disciplines.

Some studies discuss SI as a new concept or an emerging area of study (Mulgan, 2006; Mulgan, Tucker, Ali, & Sanders, 2007). However, our understanding of SI has been evolving ever since Joseph Schumpeter discussed the positive social effects of technological innovations (Schumpeter, 1908; Schumpeter, 1942). Academic understanding of SI has not been inert ever since and the concept is likely to continue evolving as scholars from different academic disciplines continue to examine it.

Academic views of SI have progressed from defining the concept as a by-product of technological innovation (Ogburn, 1969; Schumpeter, 1942) to positive social outcomes (Drucker, 1987; Taylor, 1970) to a process of collaborative engagement amongst a system of actors (Lawrence, Dover, & Gallagher, 2014; Phillips et al., 2015). Over the last 20 years, SI has also richly borrowed from the literature on social enterprise, social entrepreneurship and development studies (Nicholls & Murdock, 2011; Nicholls, Simon, & Gabriel, 2015; Westley & Antadze, 2010). Furthermore, increased interest in allied concepts and management approaches such as innovation at the bottom of the pyramid, creating shared value, CSR and innovation have further shaped our understanding of the concept.

3.1 As a spillover effect.

The first reference in academic literature to the social impact of innovations emerged in the context of being corollary to technological innovation. Joseph Schumpeter (1908), one of the founding fathers of innovation and entrepreneurship, noticed a new social phenomenon emerging through entrepreneurial action. Using an economic perspective, he was the first to lay the groundwork for a distinction between technological and social views of innovation (Moulaert, Martinelli,

Swyngedouw, & Gonzalez, 2005; Schumpeter, 1942). However, in accordance with the parlance of the times, the *context of discussion was also influenced by politics*. The term ‘social’ was used synonymously with a communist system of value creation. Therefore, social innovation was deemed to be no more than a peripheral effect to technological innovation and that it has no obvious value in capitalist society.

This narrow view of value creation did not evolve until much later as academic thinking was shaped by the mechanistic confines of scientific management and early economic thinking. The dominant focus of most studies was on technological solutions to economic problems by disruptive entrepreneurs. Even studies that explored the social effects of business and technological innovations did not place equivalent value on addressing social problems (Ogburn, 1969), which is considered an ‘assumed’ component of social innovations by contemporary studies (van der Have, Robert P & Rubalcaba, 2016).

3.2 Outcome based view.

In the latter half of the 20th century, social innovation was reimagined with a focus on addressing social problems that lead to positive social outcomes for intended beneficiaries. The concept was defined as a novel collaboration approach to solution discovery that can have implications in several sectors and lead to positive social outcomes. George Fairweather (1967) was the first to use the term in the context of the medical profession. He coined the term to articulate a collaborative process of solution making amongst scientists, medical practitioners and community leaders. Fairweather emphasised that such an interactive process would result in a solution that is “acceptable and meaningful for those who are acquainted with the problem”.

A few years later, James Taylor (1970) took a broader view of the phenomenon to explicitly state the importance and outcomes of ‘social inventions’ on society. He referred to these as “an innovative kind of school, a new way of dealing with poverty, a new procedure for resocializing delinquents...- all are likely to disrupt complex and valued roles, identities and skills. The disruption may have widespread and ramifying effects...” on society (Taylor, 1970pg 70) . Peter Drucker (1987), later imported the term into management to introduce a new social dimension into decision making. He urged managers in commercial enterprises to consider the long-term

outcomes of purposeful technological innovations and grassroots movements in American society. Drucker set the stage for contemporary managerial thinking that social innovations require managers to become social innovators by leveraging their skills and knowledge to design solutions for social problems in their business contexts (Drucker, 1987).

The advent of the social innovation concept into management literature (albeit through a practitioner context) encouraged future scholars to consider the mutually beneficial outcomes for the innovator and society. By adding a focus on positive social outcomes, early management scholars paved the way for later studies which examine social problems that intersect with business goals. This outcome-oriented view was spearheaded by literatures on CSR and innovation, creating shared value (CSV) and more recently, corporate social innovation (Herrera, 2015; P. Mirvis, Herrera, Googins, & Albareda, 2016; Porter & Kramer, 2011).

However, research was lacking on 'how' social innovation was carried out or incorporated. Scholars still needed to shed light on two questions: how does the innovating entrepreneur or enterprise embed the social purpose into their organization? And, how does the innovator mobilize community resources and knowledge to address social problems. The outcome-oriented view also resulted in a debate between scholars who championed the corporate centric view of social innovation and researchers who emphasised social purpose enterprises. To resolve this dilemma, research on social innovation adapted its focus towards a process-based view in recent years.

3.3 Process based view.

The diffusion of social innovation in management literature reached a critical mass in early 2000s with most studies taking either outcome or process-based views. SI evolved into a composite concept that was increasingly discussed in the context of a primary social motivation to address social problems, a co-operative process of solution discovery amongst social groups and positive outcomes for target communities (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014; Mulgan et al., 2007; Pol & Ville, 2009). Extant studies have employed a range of theories such as organizational theory, institutional theory and stakeholder theory to explain the unique mechanisms of value creation and collaborative processes of embedding solutions into the lives of beneficiaries (van der Have, Robert P & Rubalcaba, 2016). More recently, studies have discussed social innovation in the context of

organizational processes, community mobilisation efforts, systems of innovation and multi stakeholder initiatives (Lawrence et al., 2014; Phillips et al., 2015; Westley & Antadze, 2010).

Our contemporary view of SI has been guided by studies that synthesise and direct research towards the view of SI as a complex process which impacts all groups. Although extant literature tends to discuss SI as a process and outcome interchangeably, studies are increasingly recognizing the importance of the collaborative process in determining which social problems are worth pursuing (Phills, Deiglmeier, & Miller, 2008). Recent studies emphasise the co-creation process amongst stakeholders which is composed of intensive interactions, knowledge sharing and resource pooling to address complex challenges (Phillips et al., 2015; Tracey & Stott, 2017a).

In addition, the process-based view of SI became increasingly complex as scholars borrowed from allied concepts in social sciences to explain the phenomenon. The broad view of SI, namely – novel solutions to a social problem that are more sustainable, just and embedded than existing market solutions, developed a strong resemblance to existing concepts such as innovation at the base of the pyramid (BOP) (Prahalad, 2012), CSR and firm innovation (Luo & Du, 2015), eco-innovation (Rennings, 2000), creating shared value (Kramer, 2011), to name a few. Each of these concepts also held in common that benefits of innovative solutions that have positive social impacts cannot be fully appropriated by the innovators. For instance, research on BOP innovations also discusses that there is no universal solution to socio-economic problems and each solution needs to be specific to the local context in which it is implemented (Brugmann & Prahalad, 2007; Prahalad, 2012). Similarly, there are parallels between SI and CSR & firm innovation. Extant literature shows that firms can innovate more effective solutions when they build broader and deeper networks with stakeholders (Luo & Du, 2015). Additionally, eco-innovation discusses the need to engage in composite innovation that is composed of technological, social and institutional innovation. The literature on creating shared value widely also overlaps with SI in that there is the possibility of no trade-offs between enhancing social wellbeing while meeting firm objectives (Porter & Kramer, 2011). By redefining innovation and firm productivity, commercial enterprises can create products and services that benefit the society and environment at large.

Therefore, the longitudinal view explains how the contemporary conceptualization of social innovation came into existence and evolved. The concept originated in the study of technological innovation as a by-product of the efforts of commercial entrepreneurs. Over time, it has borrowed

and co-evolved with different concepts and approaches. Therefore, the concept and phenomenon of social innovation has become very broad – it covers a range of organizational forms, different institutional contexts, tangibles (new idea) and intangibles (products, services, models). Due to this issue, some scholars have criticized the phenomenon as being everything and nothing (Pol & Ville, 2009). Although the longitudinal view helps distinguish SI from technological innovation and explains what it is, it does not help explain what it is not. To address this concern, the author attempts to formulate some boundary conditions around the concept of SI.

4. Boundary Conditions of Social Innovation

Boundary conditions are important for three additional reasons – first, they help in limiting the generalizations associated with the concept; second, they prevent further fragmentation of the literature and finally, they bring together bifurcations in the field of study. This study proposes two boundary conditions to the study of social innovation:

4.1 Social Innovations are not by-products of commercial innovations.

There is general agreement amongst scholars that social innovations entail a social purpose rather than a commercial purpose. The view of social purpose being a core component of SI has been adopted by several academic disciplines (Dees, Anderson, & Wei-Skillern, 2004; Herrera, 2016; Smith & Woodworth, 2012). In comparison, Tech or business innovations that emerge through commercialization logic may have unintended positive spillovers on society. Not all value from tech innovations can be fully appropriated by the innovator (Lawrence et al., 2014; Mulgan et al., 2007). Therefore, it is reasonable to suggest that such novel solutions do not fall under the ambit of social innovations. For instance, studies have discussed technological innovations may result in the creation of employment opportunities and reduce poverty or make convenient consumer lifestyles (Brown & Wyatt, 2010; Cajaiba-Santana, 2014). However, it is argued that such innovations are intended to provide economic surplus for the innovator rather than to have a positive impact on society. For instance, Durden, Davis and Boulton (1988) provide the example of cigarette manufacturing that lifted economically depressed areas and opened up an array of allied industries. However, in hindsight such innovations are viewed as detrimental to the health

and well being of society (Durden, Davis, & Boulton, 1988). Following this line of reasoning, in terms of primary motivation, social innovations are distinct from technological or business innovations. Thus, the reading of literature suggests that social innovations are not by products of business innovations but are a separate paradigm (van der Have, Robert P & Rubalcaba, 2016). Literature on SI has evolved from the old view that social innovation is a by product of tech innovation to being proactively driven by social motivation. Contemporary research also suggests that there can be overlaps between technological and social innovations (Nicholls et al., 2015; Pol & Ville, 2009) and the same organizational form can engage in the development of both categories of innovation (Herrera, 2015; H. Mirvis, Googins, & Kiser, 2012).

4.2 Social innovations are not tools for generating positive business outcomes.

From the first boundary condition, it follows that SI is intended to lead to positive social outcomes for beneficiaries rather than to realise business goals of the innovating enterprise. It is implied in most conceptualizations of SI that novel solutions have the effect of alleviating social ills such as poverty, lack of education, empower women and other marginalized groups (Mulgan et al., 2007; Phills et al., 2008). Scholars have discussed that the innovator may benefit from the SI in terms of reduced transaction costs with stakeholders, supply chain efficiencies and access to new markets (Herrera, 2016; H. Mirvis et al., 2012; P. Mirvis et al., 2016). However, these economic outcomes are considered as a by-product of social innovations. Therefore, this excludes examples of organizations that use base of the pyramid markets to generate economic rent while doing lip service to the communities in terms of temporary social benefit. Studies in the Base of the pyramid (BoP) literature suggest that firms can commercialize products back into developed world markets without having any sustainable positive impact on communities in the developing world (Chatterjee, 2016). It is also possible to exclude studies of Multinational corporations (MNCs) that use BoP markets to ‘dump’ older produce or Microfinance institutions that ‘capture’ local communities in debt trap through high interest rates. Such examples do not constitute social innovations as they foster dependency of communities on the supplier and inhibit socio-economic development of marginalized communities. This boundary condition can also be extended to MNCs that use CSR programs for positive reputational effects but have no lasting positive impacts.

The boundary conditions explain the conceptual limitations of social innovation and address the problem of generalizability in usage of the term/applicability of the concept. They also help reign back the phenomenon's scope which appears to be increasing, as indicated in the longitudinal discussion. The next section examines the key research communities which have contributed to the all-inclusive view of SI. The section also addresses the issue of fragmentation in social innovation literature by synthesising the key themes discussed by each research community and how they contribute to the current view of the concept.

5. Social Innovation in academic disciplines.

Several research communities and diverse perspectives have examined social innovation. Although this has led to a rich understanding of the phenomenon, but it has inadvertently contributed to the fragmented state of research (Have and Rubalcaba, 2016). This section details a thematic analysis of four core academic disciplines that have examined social innovation - management, strategy, social entrepreneurship and development studies. Thematic analysis is essential to outline what is known in the current state of literature, to synthesise the themes into the core components of a concept and identify fruitful avenues for future research (Phillips et al., 2015). The four academic disciplines were selected for thematic analysis based on previous literature reviews on social innovation. Previous studies have identified the different research communities studying the phenomenon (van der Have, Robert P & Rubalcaba, 2016) and the alignment of literatures on social innovation and social entrepreneurship (Phillips et al., 2015).

Scholars in Management, social entrepreneurship and development studies tend to adopt a more comprehensive and process-oriented view of SI. These disciplines understand SI as novel solutions that are designed through a social purpose and have positive social outcomes for communities who play an active role in their development and implementation. Strategy scholars take a more outcome-oriented view of SI as innovative products and services that are designed by a complementary relationship between commercial and social purposes. The field discusses SI as having positive social outcomes for communities while ensuring economic benefits for the innovating enterprise. This discipline tends to take a firm centric view of the innovation.

5.1 Social Innovation in Management.

SI has been examined by management scholars in the context of the behavioural and structural aspects of the phenomenon. For instance, the behavioural aspects include studies on ethics and leadership. These areas examine the effects of a core social purpose on the innovator and the personality traits that make social innovators visionary and collaborative leaders. Similarly, the discipline also examines the structural aspects of SI including collaborative learning and innovation, organizational forms of social innovation and the importance of context. Management scholars have also examined SI through theories such as institutional theory, stakeholder theory and organizational theory.

5.1.1 Behavioral aspect of social innovation.

5.1.1.1 Ethics.

The literature on ethics is centered around one of the core aspects of social innovation – the primary social purpose. Social innovation and social innovators are considered as effective social entities that have the necessary ethical motivation to empower communities (Carrigan, Moraes, & Leek, 2011; Chakrabarty & Bass, 2014). This discussion takes place in the context of entrepreneurs, managers in social purpose organizations and in a few cases, intrapreneurs who lead Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) initiatives. These views build on existing research on the role of entrepreneurs and SME owners who embed their ethical values and practices into organisational policies and practices (Carr, 2003; Lawrence et al., 2006; Carrigan et al., 2011). Following this line of thinking, researchers have continued to further interlink literatures on business ethics and social innovation. For instance, Nicholls and Murdock (2011) have further emphasised the need to bridge conceptual understanding of social innovation with ethics. Interestingly, some studies suggest that the ideals of social responsibility, social justice and equality inspire socially motivated entrepreneurs to develop innovative solutions that address social problems. In turn, the resulting social innovations may propagate the ethical motive which enabled them in the first place.

At an organizational level, studies have examined the likelihood of social purpose firms adopting a formalized written code of positive organizational ethics (POE). To study this, research has

focussed on microfinance institutions (MFIs) that serve women borrowers at the base of the economic pyramid. For instance, Chakrabarty and Bass (2014) found that MFIs can build positive ethical strength in negative contexts. The alignment between literatures on social innovation and ethics has also been fostered in the context of commercial enterprises that are socially responsible. Also, scholars have discussed via multi-level theoretical studies that stakeholders can pressure organizations to behave more responsibly. Theories of organizational justice and corporate governance can help explain how organizations are pressured to engage in CSR initiatives around community challenges (Aguilera, Rupp, Williams, & Ganapathi, 2007).

5.1.1.2 Leadership:

Behaviour oriented studies have discussed the role of personality traits that make social entrepreneurs more effective leaders in managing social purpose organizations and projects (Llewellyn and Wilson, 2003). More recently, studies have explained that personality traits such as agreeableness and openness positively influence integration of a social purpose into developing innovative solutions (Shamuganathan & Nga, 2010; Tracey & Phillips, 2007). These studies distinguish social entrepreneurs by their ability to imagine, enable and implement system level changes even in the absence of resources, institutional support, operational risks and in diverse local contexts (Griffiths, Gundry, & Kickul, 2013; Thompson, Alvy, & Lees, 2000). Over time, studies have also distinguished between commercial and social entrepreneurs in terms of social vision and social networking. The social entrepreneur is discussed as an individual who is driven by a keen sense of duty towards fulfilling human needs and challenges (Barendsen & Gardner, 2004; Brooks, 2009).

Recent studies have focused on the qualities of social entrepreneurs to inspire collaborative solutions by providing a vision to local actors (Kickul, Terjesen, Bacq, & Griffiths, 2012; Mulgan et al., 2007). Generally, these studies agree that visionary founders should be utilized to facilitate the development of social innovations. However, Mulgan et al., (2007) also provide a critique of this view by emphasising the necessity to put visionary social entrepreneurs in the background if they lack the necessary management skills or become inflexible in their thinking. More recently, other papers have also examined the impact of the social vision in social entrepreneurs for institutionalizing ethical behaviour in their social businesses. Studies have discussed how a

visionary leader's ethical principles and codes of conduct are institutionalized in microfinance institutions and social businesses (Griffiths et al., 2013; Smith & Woodworth, 2012). Similarly, studies have also discussed that a strong sense of social responsibility enables social innovators to operate in unstable settings or weak institutional environments that require an integrative leadership style (Maak, Pless, & Voegtlin, 2016). These studies suggest that a strong sense of responsibility enables social innovators to bridge societal divides through collaborative arrangements amongst local actors (Herrera, 2015).

5.1.2 The structural aspects of social innovation.

5.1.2.1 Collaboration and learning.

The discipline of management has for long emphasised the importance of collective learning and consistent interactions related to the identification of social problems and co-construction of their solutions (De Liso & Metcalfe, 1996; Freeman, 1988; Lundvall, 1988;). More recent literature reviews in management have discussed that the development of social innovations is best viewed as a collaborative system of innovation which is an interactive and systematic process amongst actors, resources and contexts (Lawrence et al., 2014; Nicholls & Murdock, 2011). Management scholars have discussed two core aspects/elements to the process of collaborative learning in the context of social innovation.

First, the interactive learning process amongst stakeholder groups is centred around problem identification and solution discovery. Studies emphasise the complexity of defining and placing boundaries around social problems which requires the knowledge and expertise of several actors (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014; Lawrence et al., 2014). Research has explained how complex social problems can be jointly addressed through mutually beneficial collaborations usually between two groups - local actors who are best acquainted with the problem, and external agents or enterprises who have resources and skills (Mulgan, 2014). Sharing of tacit knowledge and mutually beneficial learning occurs between these two sets of actors (P. Mirvis et al., 2016). Additionally, studies indicate that social development projects may require longer term collaborations that can take the form of public private partnerships and cross sector partnerships (Mulgan et al., 2007; Mulgan,

2014). Some social challenges require the involvement of a more diverse set of actors such as government institutions, nongovernmental organizations, commercial enterprises and civil society groups.

Extant research points to complications in the learning process due to the overlapping nature of social problems. These social challenges cannot be treated as disparate categories that are addressed by a single product or service. For instance, several studies have examined the case of Patrimonio Hoy, a multi stakeholder initiative in Mexico that collectively addressed the lack of house building materials for low income households by also providing access to saving and microfinance schemes (Chakrabarty & Bass, 2014; Perrot, 2017; Segel, Chu, & Herrero, 2006). This process of solution discovery required knowledge exchange and mutual learning over a sustained period of time amongst corporations, government agencies, local banks and beneficiary households.

Therefore, Social innovation is an interactive process shaped by the collective sharing of knowledge between a wide range of organizations and institutions that influence developments in certain areas to meet a social need or to promote social development.

5.1.2.2 Knowledge and tensions in learning process.

Second, studies have also discussed the type of knowledge acquired through collaborations with partners and tensions in learning activities which take can place in local contexts. Several studies have discussed how tacit knowledge can be acquired by multinationals through consistent interactions with locally embedded NGOs and social enterprises (P. Mirvis et al., 2016)

Apart from cross sector partnerships, this form of interactive learning is also described as the central tenet of the systems of innovation approach, with respect to both the dynamics and the cohesion of the system, occurring not only through transactions between organizations but also via the continual flow of new knowledge throughout the system and through non-market learning activities (Phillips et al., 2015; Phills et al., 2008).

Scholars have also discussed how local knowledge is acquired through the process of being embedded in local contexts. Studies discuss the process of entrepreneurial learning about social

problems can be realised through immersion in local contexts. Authors explain this process of learning is shaped by local actors and first-hand experiences (Cornelissen & Clarke, 2010; Hall, Matos, Sheehan, & Silvestre, 2012). However, scholars have also discussed the inherent tensions in the learning process within collaborative arrangements of social innovation. Studies have discussed the process of knowledge acquisition may be characterized with tensions and negotiations amongst actors. The process of acquiring new capabilities through knowledge sharing is dynamic and takes place across sectoral boundaries (Phillips et al., 2015; Tracey, Phillips, & Jarvis, 2011).

5.1.2.3 Organizational forms of social innovation.

Studies have discussed various forms of organizations in the context of social innovation, ranging from multinationals to social enterprises and foundations. However, most studies in the field pay attention to microfinance institutions which are often described as quintessential SI (Brown & Wyatt, 2010). Research on Microfinance institutions (MFIs) indicates that this particular organization form is usually built on a primary social purpose, entails a collaborative process with a range of stakeholders and leads to positive social impacts for marginalized communities. Discussion on each of these aspects is summarized below:

First, MFIs are built with a primary social purpose to enable the financial inclusion of marginalized communities. Several studies describe microfinance as a social business that institutionalizes this social purpose in its mission, business activities and process of stakeholder engagement. Scholars have discussed how the microfinance business model is constructed to scale the empowerment of women groups in patriarchal societies and facilitate the economic integration of marginalized communities (Kickul et al., 2012; Yunus, 2007; Yunus, Moingeon, & Lehmann-Ortega, 2010).

Second, MFIs exhibit a collaborative process towards problem identification, solution discovery and implementation in their communities. Studies have discussed how microfinance initiatives can foster collaborations amongst previously unconnected actors to build social capital. Scholars explain that building a new network of connections around complex social challenges helps beneficiaries gain access to a wide pool of resources that were not possible in previous institutional arrangements (Di Domenico, Haugh, & Tracey, 2010). More recently, research has discussed the

role of trust groups in creating a system of social accountability where members offer a supportive role to each other in the repayment of loans (Chliova & Ringov, 2017). Studies have also emphasised the unique ownership structure of MFIs (Haigh, Walker, Bacq, & Kickul, 2015; Kickul et al., 2012). As beneficiaries can also become co-owners, they can have a voice in the operations and policies of the institutions.

Finally, studies suggest that activities undertaken by MFIs result in positive social outcomes such as improved socio-economic wellbeing and status of women groups and rural communities. Research on MFIs argues that the organizational form also promotes tolerance and creates stronger community ties (Stephan, Patterson, Kelly, & Mair, 2016). Generally, authors agree that the economic and social value generated by MFIs accrues primarily to communities than to the innovating organization.

The aforementioned reasons demonstrate why it is not surprising that management literature on social innovation is primarily focused on studies about the role of microfinance institutions in alleviating poverty, enabling financial inclusion of marginalized groups and empowering women in traditionally patriarchal societies. MFIs are a notable example of a ‘new’ system of innovation which replaces an ‘old’ system that relied on asset collateral, developed registries of past credit history with kinship ties and social pressure to enable the economic empowerment of communities (Khanna & Palepu, 2000; Kickul et al., 2012).

5.1.2.4 Importance of context.

Management literature takes the view that the novelty of social innovations is determined by the context in which the solutions are implemented. Hence the innovative solutions are characterized by more effective and collaborative processes and outcomes in a local setting rather than being ‘disruptive’ innovations at a market level. In this way, the literature also discusses SI as combinations of new and old solutions (Phills et al., 2008). The field characterized these combinations as leveraging ‘new’ technological innovations that are disseminated through ‘old’ social structures, networks and communal ties in local contexts. Most studies discuss two aspects – the contextual factors that enable or inhibit the spread of SI and the type of ‘insertions’ or ‘external’ technologies that are reapplied in the context of local problems.

5.1.2.4.1 Role of contextual factors.

Extant literature discusses the contextual factors that enable or inhibit the acceptability and spread of ‘new’ solutions in communities. These factors are commonly alluded to as local sensitivities, local ties and local infrastructure. Studies have demonstrated the role of local sensitivities which are governed by socio-cultural, historical and religious beliefs that may hamper or enable the insertion of technological solutions. For instance, scholars have examined the inhibiting role of religious beliefs in disseminating mobile technology platforms (Bhatt & Ahmad, 2017). In contrast, studies have also examined aligning technology with religious beliefs to enable its spread (George, Rao-Nicholson, Corbishley, & Bansal, 2015).

Several studies also discuss the importance of local ties in the scaling of social innovations. These indicate that in the absence of market infrastructure and government institutions, community ties and informal networks can be leveraged to disseminate social innovations geographically and within communities (Brugmann & Prahalad, 2007; P. Mirvis et al., 2016). Microfranchising has been commonly discussed as a successful strategy by several research streams (Berger & Nakata, 2013; Ireland, 2008).

In addition, authors have discussed the importance of local infrastructure and the strength of institutions as another factor that can make technological solutions insertable in various institutional contexts. For instance, studies have explained the importance of locally sourcing and developing social innovations (Ramachandran, Pant, & Pani, 2012; Reficco & Márquez, 2012). By leveraging local resources, innovative products can become more sustainably sourced and readily consumed in communities. Scholars have also mentioned local sourcing an added advantage as it curbs the insertion of foreign substances in communities (Viswanathan & Sridharan, 2012).

5.1.2.4.2 Reapplication of technologies in institutional contexts.

In the background of contextual factors, the literature discusses existing technological solutions that are re-applied with a social purpose. Studies have explained how mobile technology, Internet of Things (IoT), Information and Communication technologies (ICT) have been creatively applied to address social challenges in different local contexts (Berger & Nakata, 2013; George et al.,

2015). Some scholars explain this form of application as a combination of old and new practices i.e. insertion of 'new' technology by taking account of 'old' socio-cultural ties, religious beliefs and relationships (Le Ber & Branzei, 2010a; Mulgan et al., 2007).

For instance, several studies have discussed the case of M-Pesa, a mobile phone-based program that enables financial inclusion of communities across Kenya (Berger & Nakata, 2013; Plyler, Haas, & Nagarajan, 2010; Wooder & Baker, 2012). The success of this social innovation was attributed to recycling and simplifying a 'new' technology (SMS based service) and using 'old', established networks of users to enable its diffusion (Le Ber & Branzei, 2010a). Management scholars have used examples of similar SIs to describe the process of developing and implementing technological solutions for local challenges.

The E-choupal system has been consistently studied by management and strategy scholars over the last decade. Early studies attributed its success to product-based characteristics such as high trialability at low costs (Chitnis, Kim, Rao, & Singhal, 2007). However, scholars have reasoned that it was the effective and acceptable insertion of new technology that made the E-Choupal system a BOP success story. Some studies attribute its success to the placing of internet kiosks in the homes of influential villagers who were authorized to offer a conditional price quote for sale directly to ITC at a nearby purchasing hub (Chatterjee, 2016; Hammond & Prahalad, 2004).

5.1.3 Discussion of Social Innovation in Management.

The review of social innovation in management literature reveals that the concept has been widely studied across different topics in the field. The review of literature on ethics suggests that the ethical motivation of social entrepreneurs plays a key role in initiating social innovations. The primary social purpose seems to enable social entrepreneurs to redefine problems as opportunities, which in turn helps them develop solutions to improve the well being of marginalized communities. Studies on leadership highlight the specific personality traits that make social entrepreneurs unique from commercial entrepreneurs. Scholars who have examined the structural aspects of social innovation discuss that organisational forms exhibit a collaborative process of problem identification and solution discovery. The literature suggests that microfinance organizations are a prime example of a social innovation. Such socially driven enterprises are well

positioned to negotiate complex institutional contexts and co-create solutions that can result in sustainable positive impacts on communities.

Therefore, management literature suggests three core components of social innovation – a primary social purpose, collaborative process towards solution discovery and positive impact on communities. Studies in this research discipline portray social innovation as a dynamic process, that is shaped by several actors, and leads to positive social impact on communities.

5.1.3.1 Theories in Management.

Existing research suggest that social innovation transcends levels of analysis, sector boundaries, traditional role divisions and organizational forms. This complexity has attracted management scholars to employ a range of theories to explain the phenomenon. Therefore, a discussion on the use of theories is also adds to our understanding of this complex phenomenon. Amongst the most commonly applied theories in the study of social innovation are Institutional theory, Organizational theory and Stakeholder theory.

Studies on institutional theory have discussed the complexities in defining social problems, the novelty of social innovations, the institutional dynamics of the innovation context, processes of negotiating conflicts and compatibilities in the innovation process (Lawrence et al., 2014; Lindberg & Portinson Hylander, 2017). Some of the most well cited conceptual articles in the field have also employed institutional theory to explain that the phenomenon is inspired by the need to engage in collective action for social change (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014). The Institutional approach views social innovation as the result of a collaborative process which mobilizes resources, knowledge and social agents to engage in legitimation activities (Lawrence et al., 2014).

Organizational theory has been employed to discuss the internal processes of various commercial and social purpose organizations that engage in social innovation (Stern & Barley, 1996; Hinings & Greenwood, 2002). Previous literature has discussed the central question for organizational theory as understanding how organizations can affect the local socio-economic systems in which they are embedded and how they are in turn affected by them. Several studies have explained how social innovations have a transformational effect on the innovating organizations in addition to their intended beneficiaries (Ebrahim, Battilana, & Mair, 2014; Herrera, 2015). Recent studies

indicate that firms that engage in positive social change through deep stakeholder engagement tend to have lasting positive effects on their communities (Stephan et al., 2016).

Stakeholder theory has been widely used in literature on social innovation, social entrepreneurship and social enterprises. The application of stakeholder theory of the firm appears to be a natural fit to the study of social innovation as the phenomenon affects and is affected by a range of individuals, community groups, government institutions and companies (Crane, Palazzo, Spence, & Matten, 2014). This recursive bond between the stakeholder, problem identification and solution discovery enables scholars to reveal much about the mechanisms and processes that underpin the phenomenon (Segarra-Oña, Peiró-Signes, Albors-Garrigós, & Miguel-Molina, 2017; Sun & Im, 2015). In addition, studies have also discussed the value of a decentralised stakeholder model that enables various groups to negotiate the scope of the social problem and collectively seek opportunities to discover novel solutions (Calton, Werhane, Hartman, & Bevan, 2013).

5.1.4 Future directions in Management.

Although the literature on Social innovation has struggled with boundary conditions and conceptual issues (Pol & Ville, 2009), it remains a topic of consistent attention in management studies and has exciting potential for future research, some of which are discussed below.

First, researchers can attempt to shed light on the complexities of understanding what constitutes ‘social’. The term seems to underpin all key components of social innovation (social motivation, collaborative processes and outcomes for society) and our understanding of the term adds dynamic energy’ to this field of study (Nicholls & Murdock, 2011). Future work can further explain the contested and socially constructed nature of a social need amongst a diverse group of stakeholders (Lawrence et al., 2014; Phills et al., 2008). In this light, further studies can examine the process of negotiation and iteration amongst stakeholders when it comes to defining the scope of social problems to be addressed and the process of implementing solutions for those problems.

Second, more studies are needed to explore the process of innovation in communities rather than on which organizational form is best suited to ‘carry out’ social innovations. This shift in focus

enables the conversation to move out from the debate of commercial vs social enterprises. Recent literature reviews have suggested that the role of commercial organizations is overlooked in the study of social innovation relative to NGOs and social enterprises (Phillips et al., 2015). While this may be true, Management literature studies the role of commercial enterprises under allied terms of innovation at base of the pyramid, creating shared value, CSR and firm innovation and, more recently, corporate social innovation.

5.2 Social Innovation in Strategy.

The literature on strategy takes a firm centric view of social innovation with the discussion centered on the firm level effects of engaging in the social innovation process. Research on the topic is focused on the themes of corporate social innovation strategies, forms of cross-sector partnerships and the diffusion of roles and responsibilities. Studies have also examined social innovation as an overlapping concept with related topics of creating shared value (CSV), corporate social responsibility (CSR), innovation at the base of the pyramid (BoP) and, the emerging domain of corporate social innovation (CSI) (Herrera, 2015; Herrera, 2016; Porter & Kramer, 2011). The following themes are dominant in strategy literature:

5.2.1 Developing corporate social innovation strategies.

Several studies discuss how firms can evolve from CSR philanthropy to CSI by reconceptualizing the social sector and the overlapping boundaries between firm and community (Kanter, 1999; Porter & Kramer, 2011). Research explains that by leverage core competencies and resources, organizations can develop innovative solutions that benefit communities as well as generate business payoffs (Herrera, 2015). Over time, studies have also evolved to accept that social innovation is not seen as a charitable program, but rather as a strategic business investment (Herrera, 2015; Herrera, 2016; Kanter, 1999). Strategy scholars have discussed three core aspects on the development of social innovation strategies: identification of new markets in the social sector, effective market entry strategies and institutionalization of social innovation into a company's strategy and operations.

5.2.1.1 Identification of new markets.

Over time, studies have emphasised the ‘why’ and ‘how’ of identifying new markets that lie in the intersection of business and society (Brugmann & Prahalad, 2007; Hammond & Prahalad, 2004; Prahalad, 2012). Early literature on innovation at the BoP had successfully reframed the perceived trade-offs between profit and community responsibility into a complementary relationship between the two (Brugmann & Prahalad, 2007; Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2002). Literature in this stream has discussed such BoP markets as hotbeds for innovation that can be utilized to address intractable social challenges as well as gain access to a large pool of untapped consumer base. More recently, literature on CSV re-emphasised this view by reimagining the intersection between business and society as a source of innovation and growth (Porter & Kramer, 2011). The view that multinationals can leverage unconventional markets, social problems as drivers of innovation and growth has continued to gain traction in literature on social innovation (P. Mirvis et al., 2016).

5.2.1.2 Market entry strategies.

Second, many studies have also discussed the effects of different market entry strategies on the success or failures of social innovations. The field has offered divergent views on type of strategies to attract and retain BoP ‘consumers’. For instance, some studies advocate a traditional CSR or philanthropic approach (Le Ber & Branzei, 2010a; Le Ber & Branzei, 2010b) while others have suggested different forms of for-profit strategies (Hart & London, 2005; Karnani, 2007). More recently, empirical studies have compared these differing entry strategies to determine the most effective approach that promotes the sustainable use of SIs. Scholars have conducted a longitudinal field experiments to compare the effectiveness of a discounted price strategy relative to a philanthropic strategy (Jones Christensen, Siemsen, & Balasubramanian, 2015).

5.2.1.3 Institutionalizing social innovation.

Finally, recent research has also focused on preliminary frameworks for institutionalizing social innovation into a company’s strategy and operations. Studies advocating the ‘BoP 2.0’ approach

to create cost effective solutions, discuss the organizational mechanisms for incorporating a social purpose. For instance, studies have discussed the importance of developing an eco-system to identify social problems and develop innovative solutions (Prahalad, 2012). More recently, CSI studies have taken the view of SI as a replicable initiative that can create ‘shareholder and social value’(Herrera, 2015). This emerging sub domain emphasises the importune of the two processes in the institutionalization process – the active sensing of business & social environments, and active stakeholder engagement with intended beneficiaries (Herrera, 2015; Herrera, 2016).

In conclusion, this stream of research discusses both commercial and social purposes as being potentially complementary. By incorporating a social purpose, commercial enterprises can take a more proactive role in addressing societal concerns while reimagining the ‘social sector’ as a market for innovation and growth.

5.2.2 Social Innovation in cross sector partnerships.

The field takes the view that engaging in SI requires skills, knowledge that firms can acquire through collaborative partnerships with NGOs and social enterprises. Studies discuss that cross-sector partnerships can be mutually beneficial when there is scope for collaboration and knowledge sharing on complex social problems (H. Mirvis et al., 2012; P. Mirvis et al., 2016). In such arrangements, firms utilize their resources and capabilities while social enterprises share their tacit knowledge by virtue of being embedded in the institutional contexts that can appear foreign to firms. Studies also discuss the positive outcomes for communities when cross-sector partnerships drive economic growth in the absence of conventional market mechanisms and institutional support(Le Ber & Branzei, 2010a; Manning & Roessler, 2014). In the context of social innovation, studies on strategy discuss cross sector partnerships based on two core aspects: process of frame tensions and alignment, and mutually beneficial outcomes.

5.2.2.1 Process of frame tensions and alignment.

Within strategy, cross sector collaborations are discussed as fruitful for innovation and learning. However, some studies also argue that the exchange of ideas and integration of different approaches can cause internal tensions amongst partners.

Studies have discussed that conflicting interests may emerge in cross sector partnerships due to the opportunity seeking behaviour of social entrepreneur relative to the risk avoiding behaviour of corporate partners (Phillips et al., 2015). Cross sector partnerships can also stall social innovations due to clashing purposes and conflicting identities (Le Ber & Branzei, 2010a). Furthermore, scholars have discussed that tensions may result due to divergent value creation approaches and resource constraints amongst partners (De Liso & Metcalfe, 1996; Phillips et al., 2015).

However, other studies suggest how inherent incompatibilities amongst for-profit and non-profit partners can be resolved through a process of frame fusion and purpose alignment. These studies focus on how partners can engage in a process of negotiation where they recognize and reconcile differing value creation frames (Le Ber & Branzei, 2010a; Le Ber & Branzei, 2010b). The frequency and transparency of interactions, breadth and depth of resource commitment can sustainably resolve fundamental tensions amongst partners. The resolution of such tensions is said to result in a free flow of ideas, talent, resource pooling and co-construction of innovative solutions for complex social challenges. Some scholars have also discussed the role of external intermediaries in facilitating integration amongst for profit and non-profit entities. Such neutral actors are described as a ‘bridging agency’ in the process of resolving tensions and are considered useful for longer term alliances (Manning & Roessler, 2014).

5.2.2.2 Mutually beneficial outcomes.

The literature describes several tangible and intangible benefits that accrue to participants of fruitful cross sector partnerships. For instance, scholars discuss the creation of new networks that emerge from longer term cross sector partnerships. The frequency and intensity of interactions amongst partners can lead to increased levels of trust and reciprocity in resource sharing (Reficco & Márquez, 2012). There are also benefits of knowledge sharing for MNCs. As corporate partners are not usually embedded in local communities, they acquire tacit knowledge about the

institutional context from local partners such as NGOs and civil society groups. Acquisition of such knowledge can help MNCs to develop capabilities to scale social innovations in different institutional contexts (P. Mirvis et al., 2016). Authors have also discussed how collaborative arrangements between rural farming communities and BoP serving MNCs can lead to hybrid value chains (Budinich, Manno Reott, & Schmidt, 2007). In arrangements where for-profit firms, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and communities work closely, new markets may develop that are mutually beneficial for all participants.

5.2.3. Diffusion of roles and responsibilities

The field discusses different logics at play through cross sector partnerships, networks and alliances. Through the process of mitigating internal tensions amongst partners with competing logics, partners experience a recalibration of roles and responsibilities. Engaging in social innovation has this effect because partners transcend conventional market boundaries to co-construct social challenges.

SI in this stream involves a range of institutional logics across sectors such as public benefit for civil society organizations, profit maximizing for private organizations and collective democracy for public sector institutions (Le Ber & Branzei, 2010a; Nicholls & Murdock, 2012). These logics are said to intermingle in cross sector partnerships or multi stakeholder initiatives, which results in redefining of conventional roles as for profit or non-profit entities. For instance, social enterprises that extend across the civil society and the private sectors, combine social motivation and ownership structures (such as co-operatives and mutual societies) with business logics and models (P. Mirvis et al., 2016; Nicholls et al., 2015). Similarly, scholars have discussed the effects of engaging in SI for commercial enterprises. Managerial perception towards the value creation process can become more holistic as non-profit partners and internal change agents influence the firm to institutionalize a social purpose (Perrot, 2017). Incorporating a social purpose helps firms to pivot their vision and leverage their skills and resources to co-develop innovative products that target social needs. This shift in perception causes companies to discover new ways to internally assemble their core competencies and knowledge to address such markets successfully (Hart & Christensen, 2002; Hart & London, 2005; Simanis & Hart, 2009).

Much of the strategy research in SI describes firms that span across public-private boundaries to address complex social challenges as hybrid organizations. Such organizations embody a collective responsibility towards society that is visible in their social innovation strategies (Vickers, Lyon, Sepulveda, & McMullin, 2017). Authors have also discussed other indicators of a hybrid organization such as change in relationships with existing groups and development of new key stakeholders such as BoP service users, delivery partners and public-sector funders (Battilana & Dorado, 2010; Doherty, Haugh, & Lyon, 2014).

5.2.4 Discussion on social innovation in strategy.

Extant literature on strategy suggests that engaging with social innovation leads to mutually beneficial outcomes for the innovating firm and for its beneficiary communities. This outcome-based view of social innovation is not surprising considering that the field adopts a similar approach towards a variety of allied concepts in strategy. Some of these include CSR, CSI and Innovation at the base of the pyramid (BoP); all of which take a firm centric view. Studies suggest that commercial enterprises can achieve a complementary relationship between social and commercial logics by reimagining their role in society. By innovating new products and services in collaboration with non-profit partners, firms gain access to new markets, develop new capabilities to address social challenges and even gain competitive advantage.

Thus, these studies highlight the importance of collaborative efforts towards solution development and, coexistence of social and commercial purposes as essential components of social innovation. The process of developing complementarity through cross sector collaborations can lead to economic benefits for the enterprise and social benefits for targeted communities.

In contrast, extant literature also portray MNCs as heroic enterprises that are the driving force behind innovative products and services that address otherwise intractable social challenges in weak institutional environments (Hammond & Prahalad, 2004; Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2002). Such a view tends to imply that the 'poor' need to be rescued and made less dangerous through socio-economic inclusion by market-based activities. Studies have critiques this is a mere replacement of our caricatures of 'poor' from being groups that desperately need help to groups that are awaiting entrepreneurial opportunities to lift themselves out of poverty (Chatterjee, 2016).

Several studies have critiqued the view that agents of capitalism are best suited to lift the poor out of their predicament when the same economic system has perpetuated these social problems (Harvey, 2011; Chatterjee, 2016)

5.2.5 Future directions in Strategy.

In strategy literature, future research can add to the emerging field of corporate social innovation by conducting case studies on how the process of social innovation is institutionalized commercial enterprises. More studies are required on how the processes of active stakeholder engagement and social capital building leads to co-creation with target beneficiaries (Herrera, 2015). In this emerging domain, rich descriptive case studies can be more helpful in building theory. Case studies can also provide a nuanced understanding of the different phases of ideating and implementing social innovations within companies.

There is also much scope for future research on the replication of scalable social solutions in base of the pyramid communities (Chliova & Ringov, 2017). Future studies can theoretically and empirically examine mechanisms that enable organizations to engage in social innovation and the success of replicating these mechanisms in different contexts. Some factors worth considering include local embeddedness, type of motivation or the interaction amongst these factors. Replication strategies can also be studied in an ‘unconventional’ direction i.e. from Base of the Pyramid (BoP) to Top of the Pyramid (ToP). Future research could conduct qualitative case studies of innovative solutions or models that were replicated and scaled ‘upwards’. Such innovations that were originally developed in BoP environments as cost effective solutions could be commercialized and repriced for ToP markets.

The role of tacit knowledge and knowledge transfer amongst partners of cross sector relationships is also worth studying. Previous studies emphasise the growing need to theorize the unique enablers, limiters, and mechanisms of knowledge exchange in corporate social innovation partnerships and contrast them with traditional innovation arrangements (P. Mirvis et al., 2016).

Following a similar line of inquiry, studies also encourage research into the risk frames and readjustments in varying understanding of social purpose amongst social innovation partners (Le Ber & Branzei, 2010b). Previous literature has argued that partners can increase their tolerance for

relational risks when they increase their commitment towards the ‘target’ of the social innovation (Brickson, 2007; King, 2007). Therefore, future research can conduct a longitudinal study to examine how the risk perception reduces due to increased trust and commitment of resources during the social innovation process.

5.3 Social Innovation in Social Entrepreneurship.

The discussion of social innovation in the literatures on social entrepreneurship and social enterprises is comprehensive and extensive. The concept has been studied by in the context of individual social innovators or entrepreneurs and the innovating social enterprise. Therefore, the literature takes multi level view of the phenomenon – the role of the individual entrepreneur and the role of the social enterprise. The discussion on social entrepreneurs is centered on how they leverage the primary social purpose to redefine problems as opportunities. While the literature on social enterprises focusses on balancing financial and social objectives, bricolage and negotiating complex institutional settings.

5.3.1 The role of the Social Innovator or Entrepreneur.

Social entrepreneurship literature emphasises that the primary social motivation is a core attribute of social innovators and entrepreneurs (Phillips et al., 2015). Extant literature has made the primary social purpose, one of the key distinguishing features between social and commercial entrepreneurs. Social entrepreneurs tend to be discussed as individuals who aim to address social challenges and are inclined towards markets that are characterized by a scarcity of resources in addition to unique local challenges (Mair & Marti, 2006). In contrast, commercial entrepreneurs are motivated by profit and seek to operate in markets that has sufficient carrying capacity for economic growth.

Studies on social innovators and entrepreneurs explain that such individuals reconceptualize social problems and limitations as opportunities. Such reframing of social challenges leads to the development of new scope for collaborations and creative solutions (Phills et al., 2008). Scholars have attributed this ability to reframe social challenges as opportunities to the design thinking

process, existence of egalitarian beliefs, experiencing personal hardships and personal fulfillment (Brown & Wyatt, 2010; Elmes, Jiusto, Whiteman, Hersh, & Guthey, 2012).

Studies discuss the design thinking process of social entrepreneurs as one that is experiential and optimistic. The process is said to enable innovators to improvise solutions in places where people tend to be different in their thought process, consumption choices, and lifestyles (Brown & Wyatt, 2010). The collaborative process of design thinking is considered an essential tool for seeking novel solutions through the process of inspiration, ideation and implementation. More recent studies have also discussed that social innovators are able to reframe social challenges as opportunities as they are motivated by egalitarian beliefs. For instance, studies on microfinance have found that social entrepreneurs initiate microfinance ventures due to the core belief that access to credit is a fundamental human right (Kickul et al., 2012; Yunus, 2007; Yunus et al., 2010). The role of personal hardships is also considered important for inspiring social innovators to co-develop innovative solutions. Studies discuss that when social innovators embed themselves into the context of social problems, they can experience at first hand the hardships faced by communities (Phillips et al., 2015; van der Have, Robert P & Rubalcaba, 2016). The experience of such hardships can inspire individuals to leverage their skills and knowledge to develop social innovations along with community members. Some studies also discuss that personal fulfillment from helping society is a key motivating factor for social entrepreneurs (Germak & Robinson, 2014). Such motivation allows entrepreneurs to adopt a non-monetary focus and embed themselves into the context of the social problem.

5.3.2 The role of social enterprises.

Social enterprises are often positioned as the ideal organizational form to engage in developing social innovations as their objective is to scale their social mission rather than to increase profits (Defourny & Nyssens, 2008; Defourny & Nyssens, 2010). The literature discusses social enterprises in the context of balancing financial and social objectives, social bricolage and negotiating complex institutional settings.

5.3.2.1 Balancing financial and social objectives

Several studies have discussed the ability of social enterprises to strike a desirable balance between social and commercial objectives. One of the key challenges for this organizational form is to seek economically sustainable solutions centered around a social problem without suffering from mission drift (Dees, 1998; Dees et al., 2004; Nicholls & Murdock, 2012). The literature on social enterprises discusses how such organizations can overcome the problems of resource constraint by seeking sustainable market-based sources of revenue. Studies discuss several configurations of social enterprises that can strike a desirable equilibrium between its social and commercial goals. Extant literature has outlined a spectrum of social enterprises that can exist, ranging from the purely philanthropic to the purely commercial (Dees, 1998). Due to a rich diversity of social enterprise models, innovators can ensure their own desirable levels of financial sustainability without compromising on the social mission.

5.3.2.2 ‘Social’ Bricolage – leveraging community resources for social value.

Recent studies have explained how social enterprises can develop social innovations in resource scarce environments through social resourcing, improvisations and collaborative networks. Studies in this stream commonly refer to the process of utilising scarce resources to develop new solutions for addressing ‘problems and opportunities’ as bricolage (Baker & Nelson, 2005; Hayes & Hayes, 1970). More recently, the literature on social entrepreneurship has extended the study to that of ‘social bricolage’ – utilising scarce resources and social networks to create social value in communities (Di Domenico et al., 2010). Bricolage is considered a facilitator of social innovation as it fosters the development of novel solutions in conjunction with local actors (Westley & Antadze, 2010). Similarly, studies have also explained how social enterprises can leverage community support to ‘build missing links’ in the social innovation process (Lettice & Parekh, 2010). Social enterprises can link up previously unconnected parts of the community thereby discovering new opportunities for co-creating solutions.

5.3.2.3 Negotiating complex institutional settings.

The literature on social innovation highlights several institutional_barriers social enterprises ‘evolve’ to overcome in their local contexts. Studies have described the ability of social enterprises to negotiate complex institutional contexts as critical in ensuring the success and scalability of social innovations (Nicholls & Murdock, 2011; Nicholls & Murdock, 2012). Some studies discuss that social enterprises need to continually negotiate their ‘social equilibriums’ in dynamic environments that challenges their innovation strategies and engagement processes (Goldstein, Hazy, & Silberstang, 2010). Such dynamic environments are often characterised by weak institutional support, information asymmetry and resource scarcity.

Studies also discuss the challenges in working with stakeholders who can be risk averse and therefore unwilling to accept new solutions (Lettice & Parekh, 2010). For instance, NGOs and governmental organizations can be in favor of incremental improvements rather than radical, disruptive solutions to social challenges. The literature describes the difficulty in implementing innovative solutions as they may not be accepted by target communities (Chalmers, 2013). To overcome these challenges, recent studies have referred to the option of engaging in ‘open social innovation. Scholars refer to it as a creative way of negotiating institutional challenges through collaborative solution discovery. As social problems can be highly complex and multidimensional, multi-stakeholder cooperative efforts become necessary to understand the scope and depth of challenges (Brown & Wyatt, 2010; Phillips et al., 2015).

5.3.3 Discussion of social innovation in Social Entrepreneurship.

A review of literature on social entrepreneurship shows that there is considerable conceptual overlap amongst literatures on social innovation, social enterprise and social entrepreneurship. Some studies have distinguished social innovation from these other areas of study by describing it as an all-encompassing phenomenon that transcends organizational forms, sectors and traditional boundaries (Phills et al., 2008). Others suggest that social innovators are primarily driven by a social purpose which can be diffused through organizational practices. Social Entrepreneurship studies suggest the process of developing innovative products and services is a collaborative and iterative process amongst a range of actors and resources. Social purpose organizations organize

community resources and local agents around a social problem thereby becoming embedded within their communities in this process. Such deep engagement in social innovation initiatives leads to sustainable positive social impacts in societies, once social enterprises learn to negotiate the complex institutional contexts (Phillips et al., 2015).

Hence, the social entrepreneurship stream emphasises the primary social process, a collaborative process towards problem identification and solution discovery, and positive social outcomes as the chief components of social innovation. The phenomenon is described as a negotiated process amongst local actors which results in positive social change.

5.3.4 Future directions in Social Entrepreneurship.

The research on social entrepreneurship and social enterprises is arguably the most closely allied research discipline with social innovation (Phillips et al., 2015; van der Have, Robert P & Rubalcaba, 2016). Future research can be directed towards micro (individual social innovator or entrepreneur) and organizational (social enterprises or social businesses) levels of analysis.

Future research can conduct qualitative research to better understand the role of social motivations of innovators in the process of addressing community challenges. Although several descriptive case studies discuss the visionary and collaborative qualities of entrepreneurs, there is a lack of research on the personalities of social entrepreneurs and how these may be ‘moulded’ through prolonged engagement with a social problem over time. Another curious line of future enquiry would be to study the role played by business schools in providing interdisciplinary social business education to budding social entrepreneurs. Studies have discussed the importance of understanding the extent of government and social sector involvement in developing relevant social business curriculum that impacts graduate students (Kickul et al., 2012).

A potentially important contribution to social entrepreneurship literature would be to extend the model of social bricolage (Di Domenico et al., 2010). Research would benefit from a better understanding of the persuasive practices of social enterprises as they create their ‘resource portfolios’. Furthermore, the influence of other practices including altruism and benevolence could add another unique contribution to the area of study.

Further, studies can also explore how hybrid enterprises configure bundles of organizational elements internally. Usually, the internal embeddedness of complementary logics is not visible for those outside the organization (Powell & Sandholtz, 2012). The effects of embeddedness in terms of organizational structure, decision making can be of particular relevance to the collaborative partners of a social innovation, particularly, the beneficiaries. Future research can also examine the different situations that can enable or limit organizations from combining competing logics and evolving into a more effective organizational form. Existing literature has emphasised the need to investigate whether the process of bridging institutional entrepreneurship is different when the competing logics emerge from the same field rather than across sectors (Tracey et al., 2011).

5.4 Social Innovation in Development studies.

Studies on rural and urban development examine social innovation in the context of community empowerment. The literature on development studies takes the view that communities can become self dependent by collectively engaging in the process of innovating solutions for local problems. Recent studies have discussed different forms of such collectives including as charter schools, community cooperatives and locally funded educational foundations (Gerometta, Haussermann, & Longo, 2005; Moulaert, Martinelli, González, & Swyngedouw, 2007). Scholars in this field view SI as a process that satisfies human needs through an empowering change in the relations between local civil communities and their government institutions (van der Have, Robert P & Rubalcaba, 2016). The literature is centered around three key themes - community empowerment, the role of government as enabler or limiter of social innovations and change in roles and relationships across public and private boundaries.

5.4.1 Organizational forms created to empower communities.

The discussion of social innovation in development studies is centered around the empowerment of local communities and citizens. Several studies examine the collaborative role of community groups in facilitating social innovations in local contexts. Although most studies are situated in a local setting, recent articles in the field are also discussing SI in the context of large scale networks and globalisation(Phillips et al., 2015; van der Have, Robert P & Rubalcaba, 2016).

Scholars have also emphasised the key role of social movements and grassroots organizations in problem identification and solution discovery. It has been suggested that such movements lead to the creation of ‘community wealth building forms’ that address specific social challenges through the collective participation of locally embedded actors (Di Domenico et al., 2010; Doherty et al., 2014). Platforms created by local groups are said to engage in a negotiated process of developing solutions to the defined social problems. Examples of such forms include community development finance organizations, co-operatives, municipal entities and social enterprises (Dubb, 2016; Tracey & Stott, 2017a).

Development studies scholars also discuss the role of microfinance institutions in empowering women groups (Phillips et al., 2015). Although nearly every research discipline examining SI has discussed some aspect of MFIs, development studies scholars have focussed on the socio-economic upliftment of women groups in historically patriarchal societies. Studies have explained how MFIs can facilitate the empowerment through institutionalization of ethical codes, and even sharing co-ownership of MFIs with beneficiaries.

One of the negative outcomes explored by this stream is the potential of unethical behaviour towards women groups in rural communities by MFIs. Studies suggest that MFI agents can be capable of turning to aggressive behaviour towards women borrowers, such as stealing or even physical abuse (Cons & Paprocki, 2010; Swain & Wallentin, 2009). To curb these negative outcomes, it has been discussed that MFIs internalize a code of ethics (Cons & Paprocki, 2010; Cudd, 2015). Such a code minimizes the potential of women borrowers from becoming victims of patriarchal mindsets of loan agents employed by MFIs. Apart from individual agents, scholars have also discussed how traditional customs, legal and religious institutions can prevent women from participating in transactions with MFIs (Mair, Martí, & Ventresca, 2012). Studies have discussed that MFIs negotiate such socio-cultural barriers to reach women groups through proactive engagement programs.

Studies have also extended the discussion of empowerment to rural communities in a European context (Defourny & Nyssens, 2010). These discuss how the social innovation process in collaborative platforms can impact entrenched views of gender norms and create more equitable communities (Lindberg, Forsberg, & Karlberg, 2016; Lindberg & Portinson Hylander, 2017). For instance, research positions how local networks as effective organizational arrangements that can

enable the social inclusion of previously marginalized sections of society. Such local networks are found to promote women's employment, foster entrepreneurial ventures through consistent and intensive collaboration and knowledge sharing amongst participants (Chakrabarty & Bass, 2014; Kickul et al., 2012).

5.4.2 Role of the government.

Studies on rural and urban development take critical and favorable views on the role of government on communities (Phillips et al., 2015; Westley & Antadze, 2010). This pattern of discussion has also been extended to the study of social innovation in the research discipline. Government institutions, at local and national levels, are examined as an facilitator and inhibitor of social innovation.

As inhibitor, the role of government is frequently discussed in the context of politically unstable, developing and underdeveloped societies. Studies that who take a critical view of governments claim that weak government institutions and unstable societies make it difficult for conventional market forces from penetrating such societies. These suggest that communities are discussed as unlikely to benefit from economic integration when they suffer from low social stability caused by weak public-sector institutions (Stiglitz, 2002). The literature also describes the lack of political motivation and corruption as factors that can intensify social inequalities such as race and gender (Sen, 1997; van der Have, Robert P & Rubalcaba, 2016). Government corruption and apathy are said to compound negative social outcomes such as unemployment, food shortages, lack of education and even family crisis. Several studies have examined the inhibiting role of government oversight and apathy in the development of social innovations (Franz, Hochgerner, & Howaldt, 2012; Hall et al., 2012). Development scholars have also discussed misdirected government tourism campaigns, lack of institutional support for local industries as factors that inhibit the socio-economic well being of local communities (Piscitelli, 2013; Pruth, 2007).

In contrast, other studies in this stream also examined the role of governments in facilitating the development and scaling of social innovations. Studies taking this view argue that governments can take a supportive role and provide legitimacy for local entrepreneurs and social enterprises. For instance, studies discuss how local governments help social innovators to implement and scale

social innovations by collectively overcoming entrenched religious beliefs (George et al., 2015). Similarly, scholars have explained how federal level public servants can support social innovations by providing resources for pilot studies, encouraging experimentation and setting strategy for public service innovations (Vickers et al., 2017). Some papers suggest that public officials can leverage their authority to integrate social innovations with other market providers thereby creating integrated public services for communities. Earlier studies have also explained that social entrepreneurs can be empowered through market-based principles when governments reduce their own role in creation of public services (Windrum & Koch, 2008). Scholars have also emphasised that a decentralized approach can encourage the spread of social innovations in both developing and developed world contexts (Von Jacobi, Edmiston, & Ziegler, 2017; Ziegler, 2017).

5.4.3 Changes in roles and relationships.

Development studies suggest that social innovation is a dynamic process that leads to the blurring of public and private boundaries for its participants. A vast array of research is focussed on what the boundaries of public and private activity are for social innovations, social entrepreneurs, and what are the socio-economic impacts of the boundaries (Hart & London, 2005; Mahoney, McGahan, & Pitelis, 2009).

Extant research also emphasises the diffused role of social enterprises that innovate public goods and services (Doherty et al., 2014; Pache & Santos, 2013). ‘Hybrid’ social enterprises span across the boundaries of the public and private space while simultaneously retaining the logics that are perceived as distinctive to each space. The field discusses that the process of social innovation necessitates the overlap of boundaries for all collaborative participants where some can take on quasi-government roles in weak institutional environments. More recently, studies have examined the effect of changing roles and relationships on a new generation of social innovators and entrepreneurs (Elmes et al., 2012). Experiencing such role diffusions enables nascent entrepreneurs to develop a deeper understanding of the overlapping nature of public and private boundaries when tackling social challenges.

Other studies have emphasised the role of place-based thinking by borrowing from literatures on anthropology and geography (Barca, McCann, & Rodríguez-Pose, 2012; Gruenewald, 2014). Some

studies have claimed that social innovators should experience social problems by directly engaging with communities and reflect on the difficulty in defining roles and boundaries. The literature explains that such a process aids in problem identification and helps identify local actors and resources needed for initiating social innovations.

5.4.4. Discussion of social innovation in Development Studies.

Development studies suggests that social innovations are developed to empower marginalized communities. The process of empowering such sections of society requires co-operation amongst a range of local actors who may form new organizational forms to address local challenges. Studies have discussed such forms as co-operatives, platforms, multi stakeholder initiatives, all of which are united by a common prosocial vision. The social motivation enables individuals, enterprises and other local agencies to collaborate across traditional boundaries, share knowledge and iteratively develop social innovations (Dees, 1998; Dees et al., 2004; Westley & Antadze, 2010). This stream of literature suggest that the effects of such engagement can be transformative for participants who may experience changes in their societal roles and in relationships with stakeholders. Furthermore, the transformative effects can extend to society as the process of developing new solutions results in positive social impacts within communities.

Therefore, this field of research emphasises three core components of social innovation – a social motivation to address local challenges, co-operative process towards solution development and implementation, and transformative effects on participants and communities.

5.4.5 Future directions in Development studies.

Future research can examine the ‘demand’ for social innovations and what makes innovations desirable in a community. Due to the multidimensional nature of the phenomenon it is unlikely that researchers can claim that there are clear market signals to indicate its level of desirability. However, the demand and diffusion can be examined through, for instance, the existence of social innovation policies that make provisions for marginalized sections of society (Pol & Ville, 2009; van der Have, Robert P & Rubalcaba, 2016).

Future research can examine the facilitating role of government in aiding the replicability of successful social innovations in small local communities to a boarder level. In addition, the sustainability of government enabled social innovations in a community can be studied. Future research can theorize and empirically examine if interaction deficits can occur amongst governing bodies, functions, relationships and agents of innovation systems (van der Have, Robert P & Rubalcaba, 2016). Such deficiencies can hinder social innovation from attaining its socially desirable level. This can be contrasted with the enabling role with the various impediments to achieving socially optimal levels of SI. Conceptual or empirical explanations as well as theories that pertain to social construction and socio-technological structuration can be used to address this line of query.

Much attention has been paid to role diffusion and knowledge transfer. Future research can also examine the positive social effects of the recombination of networks and the resulting cohesion amongst network actors such as the effectiveness in implementing social ventures. Quantitative studies can be conducted to measure such effects but relevant metrics may still need to be developed. Despite this limitation, future research can utilize a range of bifurcation metrics and social network measures that indicate the extent and directionality of a recombination of network ties (Goldstein et al., 2010).

As social innovation is studied by scholars from diverse backgrounds, organizing studies as per different academic disciplines helps address the issue of fragmentation in SI literature (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014). By identifying the key themes in each research community, it becomes possible to synthesise the discussion and contribution of disparate academic fields. The next section derives the core components of SI from the dominant themes discussed by each research community.

6. Core components of Social Innovation.

A close inspection of the dominant themes in social innovation reveals that the concept has three core components – a primary social purpose, a collaborative process of problem identification & solution discovery, and transformative effects on society. Studies have emphasised the importance of achieving greater conceptual clarity on what constitutes SI for three distinct reasons. First, a general agreement on the conceptual elements helps formalize the study of SI as a legitimate stream of research similar to social entrepreneurship and social enterprises (Tracey & Stott, 2017b; van der Have, Robert P & Rubalcaba, 2016). Second, clarity on the conceptual underpinnings of SI helps establish boundary conditions on the phenomenon. Studies on SI have found it challenging to understand the broad of the phenomenon. However, it is equally important to understand what lies outside the domain of SI. Third, conceptual clarity helps guide future research into building theory around the phenomenon. Scholars have found it challenging to extend the theoretical applications of institutional, organizational and stakeholder theories in the context of SI.

6.1 Primary social purpose.

The importance of a social purpose is highlighted by scholars in management, social entrepreneurship and development studies. However, in the field of strategy, this social motivation can play a secondary role to market-based logics. The behavioral side of management literature highlights the role of ethical motivation and institutionalization of ethical practices in social enterprises through visionary and collaborative leadership (Carrigan et al., 2011; Chakrabarty & Bass, 2014). Similarly, the field of social entrepreneurship discusses the enabling role of social purpose for entrepreneurs. According to this field, a social motivation can empower social intrapreneurs and entrepreneurs to reframe social challenges as opportunities to innovate solutions (Elmes et al., 2012; Phillips et al., 2015). Such a social purpose is also embedded in social enterprises through organizational practices such as bricolage, co-ownership of social businesses with beneficiaries, transparency in accounting practices and striking a desirable balance between financial and social objectives without suffering from mission drift (Dees, 1998; Dees et al., 2004). Development studies scholars emphasise the central theme as organizing community resources to enable empowerment of rural and urban communities. This field discusses social purpose as the chief motivation for community groups to engage in concerted efforts to tackle social challenges.

6.2 Collaborative efforts: problem identification and solution discovery.

Each academic discipline also emphasises the need for collaborative efforts to build effective and innovative solutions that suit local or global social challenges. However, the views on collaboration differ across the four research streams. Strategy scholars adopt a ‘narrow’ view of collaboration in the context of cross sector partnerships between multinationals and their non-profit implementation partners. Although later studies have emphasised the need to construct an ecosystem around a problem, the dominant view is that the multinational is the lead initiator and orchestrator of such collaborations (Prahalad, 2012). In contrast, the other three research communities take a holistic view of co-creative processes amongst community stakeholders. Social enterprise and social entrepreneurship scholars discuss collaborative partnerships that result in systems of innovation amongst government institutions, community groups, NGOs and companies (Phillips et al., 2015; Phills et al., 2008). Research in development studies discusses the diffused role of social enterprises that transcend public and private boundaries, and the role of governments in decentralizing their authority by enabling or limiting the development of community ecosystems (Gerometta et al., 2005; Moulaert et al., 2005).

6.3 Transformative social outcomes.

The transformative effects of social innovations on societies are also discussed in all four streams. Some management scholars have discoursed the impacts of social innovation as system level changes (Lawrence et al., 2014; Nicholls & Murdock, 2011). Similarly, the literature on development studies highlights impacts of the phenomenon as empowerment of entire rural or urban communities through grassroots movements and community organizing (Di Domenico et al., 2010). Research on social entrepreneurship discusses economic inclusion of marginalized sections of society such as women groups or remote communities in developing economies (Berger & Nakata, 2013; Plyler et al., 2010). The three research communities describe the effects such as changes in individual belief systems, development of pro-social logics in organizations, change in roles and relationships amongst community stakeholders and diffusion of knowledge.

The literature reveals that social innovation is characterized by three core components – primary social purpose, collaborative efforts and transformative effects on society. Distillation of the themes in literature into core components provides conceptual clarity and directs future research. However, there are conceptual issues associated with these components that also demand attention. The next section aims to address these conceptual issues and emphasise the view of social innovation as a process.

7. Conceptual issues and building towards a process-based view of SI.

Despite the continued attention from scholars, studies have alluded to conceptual and analytical issues in our contemporary understanding of the concept (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014; Pol & Ville, 2009). This section hopes to shed light on three core issues with conceptualizing social innovation. These include - SI is carried out only by social purpose organizations, there is a lack of emphasis on SI as a collaborative effort amongst partners, and the resulting social change can be both - positive and negative. Scholars in most research disciplines have opted to view social innovation as a complex process of change that leads to tangible and intangible outcomes for participants and communities (Lawrence et al., 2014; Phillips et al., 2015; Tracey & Stott, 2017a). However, studies have found it challenging to develop a coherent understanding on the characteristics of social innovation as a process (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014; Nicholls & Murdock, 2011). Is it static or dynamic, Is it linear or iterative? The author attempts to address concerns about conceptualization and process view of SI by 1) addressing conceptual concerns and 2) suggesting that SI is better understood as a dynamic, negotiated and iterative process of social change.

7.1 Conceptual issues.

First, scholars emphasise the primary social motivation as a core element of SI. Various research communities are in agreement that the social purpose is a necessary driving factor for SIs. However, some studies have extended this argument to state that SI are only carried out by organizations whose primary purpose is social (Mulgan, 2006; Mulgan et al., 2007). In contrast,

strategy scholars have adopted the view that commercial organizations can engage in SI as it creates shareholder value in addition to social value (Herrera, 2015; Herrera, 2016). The review of literature reveals that a variety of organizational forms driven by different logics engage in developing SIs. These include ‘pure’ social enterprises (Dees, 1998), commercial enterprises (P. Mirvis et al., 2016), innovation platforms (George et al., 2015), community organizations (Reficco & Márquez, 2012). Hence, the author suggests that social innovation is better conceptualized on the basis of a social purpose rather than restricting our view to a specific organizational forms.

Second, contemporary conceptualizations on the phenomenon emphasise the role of social motivation and social outcomes while implying the role of the co-creative process as secondary. While this lack of emphasis does not render existing conceptualizations inaccurate, defining social innovation in such a manner inadvertently presents a reductive view of the phenomenon. The concept is characterized by collaborative engagements that enable the problem identification and solution discovery processes. Studies have discussed the development and scaling of SI through cross sector partnerships and various multi stakeholder initiatives (Le Ber & Branzei, 2010a; P. Mirvis et al., 2016; Swain & Wallentin, 2009). The literature reveals that such collaborations are highly interactive, intensive, lead to knowledge transfer and new capabilities for developing innovative solutions. Therefore, to develop a more comprehensive view of SI, it is important to directly acknowledge that SI is also defined by a co-creative process.

Third, various conceptualizations and discussions on SI emphasise positive social outcomes for beneficiaries and communities (Table 1). However, recent studies have emphasised that the impacts of SI may not always be positive for all affected groups (Lawrence et al., 2014), there are tensions amongst groups in the process of engagement and SIs may even result in failure (Brown & Wyatt, 2010). A review of recent literature indicates that SIs can have positive and negative impacts on groups that are affected by it. Some studies have explained how a social innovation can impact some groups positively, while others negatively. Therefore, the author suggests that SI is better understood by highlighting both – beneficial and detrimental effects of social innovation on stakeholders.

7.2 Building towards a process-based view of social innovation.

Recent literature on social innovation tend to view the phenomenon as a complex process of social change (Phillips et al., 2015; Tracey & Stott, 2017b; van der Have, Robert P & Rubalcaba, 2016). Some scholars have attempted to shed light on the key aspects of the process such as interactive learning (Phillips et al., 2015; Tracey & Stott, 2017b; van der Have, Robert P & Rubalcaba, 2016), social construction of issues (Lawrence et al., 2014) amongst others. A process-based view of the phenomenon provides greater scope for understanding the role of institutional contexts, dynamics of multi stakeholder initiatives and institutionalization of social purpose that lead to transformative social outcomes. However, several studies also discuss social innovation as a ‘process’ and ‘outcome’ liberally and interchangeably (van der Have, Robert P & Rubalcaba, 2016). To emphasise the importance of viewing SI as a process, it becomes necessary to highlight the process as one that is dynamic, iterative and negotiated.

7.2.3 As a dynamic process.

Some studies suggest that SI is characterised by a linear process that progresses from problem identification to solution development and scaling (Hammond & Prahalad, 2004; Herrera, 2015; Herrera, 2016). Extant literature in strategy also tends to emphasise that the outcomes of this linear process (goods and services) constitute as social innovations (Le Ber & Branzei, 2010a; Manning & Roessler, 2014; VanSandt & Sud, 2012). Such linearity of movement and emphasis on outcomes presents a simplified and static view of the complex phenomenon. While the process of SI does move from deliberating social problems to solution discovery, the process is more ‘circular’ than linear. This is because a diverse set of stakeholders, guided by different logics, alternate between collectively defining social problems worth addressing and co-creating innovative solutions that are suitable for the local context (Lawrence et al., 2014; Le Ber & Branzei, 2010a). As social problems do not affect all stakeholders uniformly, the social objectives and scope of the problem may change and evolve. Simultaneously, stakeholders can share knowledge and acquire capabilities to address the social challenges being deliberated. Recent literature reviews suggest that such a complex collaborative process involves re-examination of social problems and reshaping of innovative solutions (Phillips et al., 2015; Tracey & Stott, 2017a). Therefore, the dynamism in the SI process is a result of complex interactions amongst enabling and limiting

factors that influences the development of innovative solutions. The dynamism is also a result of transition of social groups from being against to being for SIs. Studies have suggested that institutional actors who presented barriers to the initial development of SIs can be later involved in the scaling of the same innovative solution (Battilana & Dorado, 2010; Sun & Im, 2015).

7.2.4 SI as a negotiated process.

Scholars suggest that the process of innovating for social problems involves negotiations and bargaining amongst social groups and local agents. Studies explain that this complex interactive process is responsible for shaping the course of social innovations and outcomes, positive or negative, on communities (Brown & Wyatt, 2010; Defourny & Nyssens, 2010; H. Mirvis et al., 2012). The literature suggests that negotiations can manifest in two ways. First, groups that develop SIs can engage in an ‘external’ bargaining process with groups that are not favorable towards the development or scaling of SIs (Cudd, 2015; Kistruck, Beamish, Qureshi, & Sutter, 2013). Second, groups that develop SIs can negotiate ‘internally’ over the scope and nature of social problems worth addressing (Lawrence et al., 2014; Phillips et al., 2015). This socially constructed view of problem identification also sets the tone for the solution discovery process that follows. The negotiation process is characterised by intensive interactions, knowledge and resource sharing, commitments and tensions amongst social groups.

7.2.5 SI as an iterative process.

The socially constructed social problems are an essential precursor to the development of solutions as it reframes social problems into opportunities for empowerment. Scholars have suggested that development of such innovations is characterized by several iterations before solutions are implemented and spread within communities (Brown & Wyatt, 2010; Sun & Im, 2015). For instance, several studies emphasise the need for rapid prototyping of products and services before the innovative solutions are socially acceptable in target communities. The literature is awash with well studied examples that exemplify this aspect including microfinance, M-Pesa, E-Choupal, amongst others (Hart & London, 2005; Ratcliff & Doshi, 2016). It is argued that socially

acceptable solutions have greater impact in empowering communities, addressing social challenges in addition to becoming better embedded within societies.

Therefore, existing research views social innovation as a complex process that is affected by several enabling and limiting factors, diverse stakeholder groups and it impacts communities as well as participating innovators (Brown & Wyatt, 2010; Cajaiba-Santana, 2014; Mulgan, 2006). In this light, it becomes crucial to examine the social groups and factors which make SI a dynamic, negotiated and iterative process of social change. Not only are these factors responsible for the success and failures of SIs, they also explain why and how social innovations emerge in specific institutional contexts. In addition, various stakeholders have been associated with the problem identification, solution discovery, implementation and scaling stages of the phenomenon (Jastrzębska, 2017; Mulgan et al., 2007). Stakeholders can assist or inhibit the process of SIs in each of these stages. An examination of the stakeholders and factors of SI in literature also adds weight to the view of SI as a collaborative process within an eco-system constructed around social problems. However, insights on such factors and social groups are scattered amongst the fragmented literature in various research disciplines. There is scant research on attempts to classify factors that enable or inhibit SI. To address these concerns, the author analysed the stakeholders and factors of SI in literature.

8. Methodology.

A selective review of relevant literature was conducted to provide a holistic understanding of SI. This study included articles from peer-reviewed journals from a range of research disciplines such as management, strategy, social entrepreneurship and development studies. In addition, as some of the most influential articles on social innovation also lie in non-peer reviewed journals, exceptions were made in the case of these articles (Brown & Wyatt, 2010; Hart & London, 2005; Mulgan, 2006; Mulgan et al., 2007). Articles on SI that were not published in peer reviewed journals have been excluded from this study, for example graduate dissertations and working drafts. This review was modelled on previous literature reviews that use a similar methodology

(Walls & Paquin, 2015; Wassmer, Paquin, & Sharma, 2014). The databases Google Scholar and EBSCOHost were searched using a two-dimensional search term matrix, combining “social innovation”, “socially responsible innovation”, “corporate social innovation”, “grassroots social innovation”, “positive social change” with terms that include stakeholder groups and agents of social innovation such as “community”, “social enterprise”, “social entrepreneur” in article titles, abstracts and author supplied keywords. After this selection process, 83 articles were selected for further analysis in the qualitative software Nvivo 11 pro. As indicated earlier, the groundwork for social innovation literature was set fairly recently, thus most articles were published after 2000, signalling the growth phase in social innovation literature (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014; van der Have, Robert P & Rubalcaba, 2016).

The content analysis of the selected articles was undertaken in two steps. First, a preliminary coding system was set up to examine the factors (antecedents, enablers, limiters, consequences) and stakeholders of social innovation. The author’s understanding of factors was drawn from previous content-analysis based literature reviews and studies that discuss the enablers, limiters and consequences of social innovation (George et al., 2015; Ramachandran et al., 2012). In this context, antecedents were understood as factors required for social innovation to occur in the first place. Enablers were factors that facilitate social innovation and in contrast, limiters were factors that inhibited the development of social innovations. Consequences were understood as the positive or negative impacts of social innovations on beneficiaries, participants and communities. Nodes from 10 of the most cited articles on social innovation were analysed and a more comprehensive coding system was developed for the remaining articles. As the initial coding was partially exploratory, several new nodes were added to understand the additional insights and themes from the literature. At the end of coding the selected articles 2,416 sections of text were coded with 83 unique nodes. In the second step, nodes were merged or collapsed as ‘child-nodes’ into the over arching ‘mother-nodes’ of the factor and stakeholder categories established previously. Additional nodes that emerged through exploratory efforts were dropped as they were not deemed relevant to the scope of this study. The results of the two-step coding analysis are detailed in Table 2.

The analysis of the coded literature revealed various stakeholders and factors that contribute to social innovation as a dynamic, negotiated and iterative process of change. In addition, the literature revealed two distinct categories of organizational forms engage in the process of innovating solutions for social problems. These two forms were classified as Grassroots Social Innovation (GSI) – which includes social purpose organizations and social movements of change, and Corporate Social Innovation (CSI) – which includes commercial organizations and Multinational companies (MNCs). The analysis of literature reveals that the two approaches differ not just in terms of purpose but also in their internal processes and impacts on communities and innovating partners.

9. SI factors according to levels of analysis and stakeholder groups.

This section details results of the coded literature from four research communities – management, strategy, social entrepreneurship and development studies. 83 articles were coded to reveal the stakeholders and four factors of SI – antecedents, enablers, limiters and consequences. An attempted classification of factors is compounded by the fact that SI is a complex process that has impacts on various levels (Lindberg & Portinson Hylander, 2017). SI transcends sectors and levels of analysis to discover processes that have lasting social impact (Phills et al., 2008). However, few studies explicitly state the nature of these levels but indicate that scales and levels of analysis are needed to classify aspects of SIs. (Jastrzębska, 2017) For instance, solutions can be categorized as being incremental or disruptive innovations. Alternatively, they can also be classified as being situated at macroeconomic or microeconomic levels of analysis. Previous research on gender and SI have also emphasised the need to distinguish between various levels of analysis (Lindberg et al., 2016). To reduce the complexity, the various factors of SI were organized across individual, organizational and institutional levels of analysis (Table 3(a), 3(b)). Table 4 further breaks down the frequency with which stakeholder groups are mentioned according to number of articles and coded references. Social enterprises, Commercial enterprises and Communities were the most commonly mentioned groups in the context of SI factors. In addition, governments, non-profit organizations and platforms were also frequently mentioned stakeholder categories. Table 5(a), 5(b) further demarcate the most common SI factors that were associated with dominant stakeholder groups.

9.1 Antecedents of a SI.

The review of articles found that Antecedents had the third highest number of coded sections overall (301 references) across 64 articles included in the study. Some of the most common sub-factors in this category were the social motivation of the innovator, personal hardships, human capital of the social innovator at the individual level of analysis. At an institutional level, convergence of market sectors, new public private partnerships, grassroots movements for social change were amongst the most prevalent sub-factors. Tables 5(a) and 5(b) also highlight key factors for the dominant stakeholders in the study. For commercial and social enterprises, some key factors were the existence of an existing partnerships, opportunity identification stakeholder exercises, alignment of business with social goals and the organizational incentives.

At the individual level of analysis, much of the coded sections for antecedents described the role of a social motivation in initiating the idea of a novel solution to a social problem. Social entrepreneurs and innovators were also described as embedding themselves in local contexts and experiencing personal hardships that inspired them to reconceive challenges into business opportunities. Coding for antecedents also suggests a range of motives for engaging in SI at the organizational level of analysis. While much of the literature implicitly supports social enterprises undertaking SI, for-profit and hybrid organizations tend to have more clearly articulated motives for undertaking SI – for example, the pursuance of social innovation as new business models, leveraging existing relationships within communities for creating innovation, recognition of skills and knowledge and their utilization. The goals set by these types of organizations may differ. For-profit firms tend to take on smaller, more manageable goals, rather than tackle larger social challenges such as income inequality and gender inequity more directly. It was also found that when antecedents are well defined by the organization, the outcomes tend to be more aligned with the original intent of the innovating enterprise and are more likely to be measurable. At the institutional level, studies described how social innovations emerge from contexts where the lines between public and private boundaries are more diffused. Public-private partnerships can emerge from the convergence of such sector boundaries to address social challenges at a larger scale.

9.2 Enablers of a SI.

Enablers were discussed in almost equal measure as consequences. With 446 references across 72 articles included in this study. This is probably due to the broad definition of the factor used for this study. Some of the most popular sub-factors at the individual level included storytelling to transcend cultural boundaries, norm-value pairs between funders and innovators and leveraging previous work experience. At an organizational level the most common sub-factors were leveraging local ties, stakeholder co-creation, operational policies and incentives and participation in knowledge sharing networks. Particularly amongst social and commercial enterprises, several subcategories were also highly interrelated. For instance, leveraging local ties and stakeholder co-creation were cross-coded 31 times. At an institutional level, most widely discussed sub-factors included bricolage, common social and cultural norms, leveraging community ties and support from local administration.

It is not surprising why enablers receive considerable attention in SI literature. Researchers use different terms for enablers such as facilitating factors (Mulgan et al., 2007) or institutional elements for corporate social innovation (Herrera, 2015). These enablers are viewed as mechanisms that help bring SI to fruition, be it from ideation to prototyping or from prototyping to scaling in various institutional settings. Some enablers also indicate an intuitive stakeholder approach. These include storytelling to cross cultural and social barriers, exchange of ideas between funders and entrepreneurs, leveraging local ties, cross boundary dialogues and knowledge sharing platforms. Furthermore, enablers pointed to previous experience and personal history as entrepreneurs and the presence of a network of other actors and organizations with diverse competencies. The multitude and range of collaborations and mechanisms necessary for SI to happen point to the complexity inherent in the idea of making a positive social impact.

9.3 Limiters of a SI.

Limiters were least commonly discussed factors with 274 coded sections across 53 articles included in the study. Limiters are considered to be the antithesis of enablers which can be either a ‘lack of’ or ‘opposite of’ enabling factors. The most common limiters at the individual level included conflict in values between the funder and entrepreneur, marginalization of social

entrepreneurs by mainstream financial institutions and governments. At the organizational level, common sub-factors included the failure to consider needs of all stakeholders, novel solutions that were not prototyped to elicit feedback, lack of access to finance and skilled employees, and the excessive costs of educating communities. Common sub-factors at the institutional level included the lack of gender equality, rigid social hierarchies, corruption in government machinery and the culture of dependency fostered by government grants and non-governmental organizations.

Most examples of limiters were found in articles that contained descriptive case studies on social entrepreneurs and social enterprises. Such studies tended to describe the difficulties encountered by individual innovators and organizations due to institutional level problems. Curiously, due to the prevalence of such limiters, social enterprises seem to innovate business models that allows them to deliver a solution without getting trapped in government bureaucracy (Lindberg & Portinson Hylander, 2017; Sabato, Vanhercke, & Verschraegen, 2017). Commercial enterprises that lack local knowledge and legitimacy also overcome inhibiting factors through partnerships with implementation partners such as social enterprises or NGOs (Guo, Lee, & Swinney, 2015; Le Ber & Branzei, 2010a).

9.4 Consequences of a SI.

Consequences of a social innovation were most widely discussed with 412 references across 70 articles. It was interesting to note that nearly every definition or conceptualization of social innovation has an outcome-based component (Table 1). Amongst consequences, some of the most prevalent sub-factors at the individual level included altering perceptions and behaviours of beneficiaries towards social challenges, the birth of a new social motivation for commercial entrepreneurs and overcoming mental limitations and personal development of the entrepreneurs. At an organizational level, the common sub-factors included economic benefits for the innovating firm such as access to new markets, development of new base of the pyramid models, improvements in the value chain, and new capabilities for product innovation. At an institutional level, outcomes included the economic empowerment of marginalized communities and greater gender equality. It is difficult to tease apart the impact of outcomes across multiple levels of

analysis. Therefore, several consequences sub categories were cross coded, for instance – economic empowerment with new products or services and new base of the pyramid models.

Consequences are easier to analyse post-hoc, but there are several intangible benefits that can be difficult to measure and demarcate. For instance, CSI projects tended to have more tangible and measurable metrics relative to social purpose organizations. For example, firms engaging in CSI tend to measure the increase in revenue streams through new products, value chain efficiency improvements, specific products and services for base of the pyramid markets (Herrera, 2015). This highlights the conundrum of SIs more broadly – the difficulty in measuring the various positive social impacts due to the intangible and overlapping nature of benefits for a diverse range of stakeholders. In most articles outcomes were not tangible measures but were either inferred or briefly discussed.

10. Social Innovation as a dynamic, negotiated and iterative process of change.

This section discusses specific coded factors and stakeholders in literature that make SI a dynamic, negotiated and iterative process of change. While the author had previously discussed why SI is characterized by these features, this section explains which specific coded factors and stakeholders make these features occur in the first place. It is also discussed how the interactions between stakeholders and factors contribute to the three overarching features of SI.

10.1 SI as a dynamic process.

SI is referred to as ‘dynamic’ because it involves changes in roles and responsibilities, different impacts on stakeholders and it also follows a progression from problem identification to solution implementation. The coding of literature revealed that a diverse range of stakeholders engage in complex interactions that result in shifting roles and responsibilities thereby making SI a dynamic process of change. Social enterprises, commercial organizations and NGOs are seen as active participants in knowledge sharing platforms and cross sector partnerships that enable social innovations. These collaborative arrangements are characterized by knowledge sharing, capability

building, and even exchange of values in the case of longer term partnerships. In addition, local communities, NGOs and social enterprises are seen to engage in a process of social bricolage, which is defined by resource pooling and creative utilization of scarce resources through deep engagement with local communities (Di Domenico et al., 2010). Furthermore, stakeholders who were seen as limiters to the initiation of social innovations were described as enablers in the same context, at a later, scaling stage of the innovation. For instance, national governments and mainstream banking institutions are seen to inhibit the development of microfinance ventures but the same stakeholders became actively involved in sustaining and scaling the microfinance ventures at a later stage (Nicholls et al., 2015; Pol & Ville, 2009).

10.2 SI as a negotiated process.

SI is a ‘negotiated’ process because various social groups engage in intensive discussions to better understand the social problem, discover scope for collaboration and overcome obstacles in the innovation process. The interaction of several factors and stakeholders indicate that SI becomes a negotiated process in defining the scope of social problems and in gaining legitimacy to implement innovative products and services. The coded articles reveal that stakeholders engage in an intensive and complex process of negotiating within collaborative arrangements. In cross sector partnerships and public private arrangements, stakeholders conflict over different logics, values and motives over reframing community problems as social or business opportunities. While these factors can be seen as limiters, this internal process of negotiation is also seen to result in mutually beneficial outcomes. Commercial enterprises, social enterprises and governments collectively increase their commitment of resources towards addressing social problems in order to reach agreements in the SI process. Over time, partners in cross sector partnerships also experience changes in their traditional roles and relationships which further helps in developing social innovations in different contexts. The coded data also revealed that an external negotiation process unfolds between groups that proactively drive social innovations and passive but powerful institutional actors. Social enterprises and NGOs are seen in the context of enablers who seek legitimacy from local governments for gathering community resources and gaining a licence to operate in the local contexts.

10.3 SI as an iterative process.

The coded data reveals much evidence of SI as an iterative process of social change. To become socially acceptable and better embedded in communities, social innovations such as products and services in particular, require several iterations. Over time, these innovative solutions also acquire attributes that help in scaling across geographic areas that share similar institutional contexts. Social enterprises and commercial organizations are seen to actively engage with their targeted communities to continually test products and services to ensure their financial viability and reach within communities. Social enterprises in particular are seen as developing products or services that not only address social problems but are also deeply embedded within communities. The consequences of social innovation reveal that products and services that are built with a social motive are characterised by low development costs, are locally sourced, are adaptable and multifunctional; all of which aid in their rapid prototyping and scalability across communities.

This section described that various factors and stakeholders contribute to making SI a dynamic, negotiated and iterative process of social change. The next section looks deeper into the differences and similarities between two distinct approaches that are associated with social innovation. The comparative analysis of the GSI and CSI approaches helps synthesise the disparate insights in literature associated with social purpose and commercial enterprises.

11. The two approaches in Social Innovation literature.

The literature on SI appears to be divided between innovations by social purpose organizations and commercial enterprises (van der Have, Robert P & Rubalcaba, 2016). The GSI approach refers to the process through which a system of social purpose driven actors innovates solutions through a combination of new and existing practices that empower marginalized communities and create positive social impact. GSI innovation systems have a more inclusive innovation approach and their developmental process tends to have positive implications for public policy and creation of new innovation regimes at a national level (Borzaga & Bodini, 2014; Lindberg, 2014; Mulgan et al., 2007; Pol & Ville, 2009). In contrast, CSI is far more instrumental approach that is aimed at

benefitting the innovating individual or enterprise. It refers to a process by which commercial enterprises integrate social innovation into their strategy and operations with the purpose of enhancing business sustainability and competitive advantage (Herrera, 2015; Herrera, 2016). The differences between the two approaches are highlighted in Tables 5 (a) and 5(b) which show the different core elements, processes and outcomes between the two approaches.

11.1 Grassroots Social Innovation (GSI).

The narrative on SI is largely dominated by organizations, entrepreneurs and networks that develop solutions for truculent social problems without a profit-making motive. Such a decentralized approach at social problem solving is commonly referred to grassroots social innovation (GSI) (Borzaga & Bodini, 2014; Mulgan et al., 2007; Pol & Ville, 2009). GSI movements fund, develop and implement novel solutions based on the ‘traditional’ heritage-based knowledge of a community. The purpose of actors involved in such movements is to create a positive social impact and empower marginalized communities. Any economic benefit that may accrue to actors is considered as a by-product of the innovation process (Franz et al., 2012; Mulgan, 2014; Yunus, 2007). With further advancement in IT technology, grassroots movements have also begun cooperating across borders with allied movements that are working to solve a similar problem albeit in different geographical contexts. Some prominent grassroots movements that have achieved this collaborative spread include the international network of street papers, streetnet (a network of street vendors based in south Africa), the Honeybee Network in India (which empowers marginalized communities by preserving and patenting local knowledge) (Sristi, 2017), groots (which links together grassroots womens organisations around the world) and Wiego (which campaigns for women in informal employment), and the forum network in Asia for drugs projects (Mulgan et al., 2007).

11.1.1 Purpose: diffused via organizations whose primary purpose is social.

As mentioned above, the GSI approach has three core elements that are exclusive to its own process of value creation and these elements are absent from the CSI approach. According to most widely cited studies on GSI, the innovation of products and services is motivated by the goal of meeting a social need and not by a profit-motive. Therefore, such novel solutions are considered

to be predominantly developed and diffused through organisations whose primary purposes are social (Borzaga & Bodini, 2014; Mulgan et al., 2007; Pol & Ville, 2009). Organizations that fall under this ambit include social enterprises, social businesses, social entrepreneurs, co-operatives, non-governmental organizations and in some cases commercial enterprises that reinvest the proceeds into scaling the SI further. This approach differentiates social innovation from conventional technological and business innovations that are motivated by profit maximisation and diffused through enterprises that are motivated by profit maximisation (Mulgan, 2014). Additionally, such organizations are well positioned to meet the needs of underserved populations more efficiently, effectively, and if not profitably, at least sustainably through the creation of new business models. Such models are created by the combination of market and nonmarket approaches, usually by blending firm revenue with philanthropic financial support. Such models also tend to have lower cost structures and more effective delivery mechanisms (Phills et al., 2008). Despite such advantages, such social enterprise models are rife with tensions and involve trade-offs. But they are more effective vehicles of creating lasting social impact than charitable organizations who may create a culture of dependency on their beneficiary communities.

A large number of SIs are developed by social entrepreneurs who possess the vision, capabilities and access to unconventional resources that traditional commercial ventures find difficult to acquire (Mumford, 2002). The literature on GSI is replete with examples of change agents who have transformed local and global contexts with their new concepts and unique approaches. For instance, at the global level, the concept of microfinance introduced by Bangladesh's Nobel Peace Prize winning social entrepreneur Prof. Mohammad Yunus has been classed as a quintessential social innovation (Yunus, 2007). Today, there is extensive recognition of the positive impact GSIs developed by social enterprises have on economic systems (Harding 2004; Neck, Brush, and Allen 2009).

11.1.2 Process: practices that prompt social change.

Another hallmark of GSI is its ability to combine existing and new practices which mobilize the collective intelligence and skills of communities to create locally applicable solutions (Borzaga & Bodini, 2014; Mulgan et al., 2007; Pol & Ville, 2009). Recent studies have found that regardless

of the form of change agents – entrepreneurs, activists, non-profits; the world’s most pressing problems can only be solved by shedding old patterns of behaviour and embracing new holistic practices of value creation (Phills et al., 2008). Organizations also need to leverage cross-sector dynamics and break away from their traditional market roles to develop new practices that enable knowledge creation and dissemination for SI (Bosworth et al., 2016; Lindberg & Portinson Hylander, 2017). Research suggests that the development of new practices can bring about a permanent alteration in social relations, formation of new relationships and interaction mechanisms that eventually lead to a permanent systemic change amongst the network of actors (Jastrzębska, 2017). The resulting changes in entrepreneur perception, firm behaviour and network interactions becomes necessary for the resolution of intractable social problems. In this manner, the indirect beneficiaries of SI are the innovators and implementers themselves who gain through the SI process by learning new practices of creating positive social change. It appears that the research on GSI suggests that effective solutions arise once a keen sense of community and a shared sensitivity to the local context exists amongst actors (Franz et al., 2012; Mulgan et al., 2007). This powerful effect of the combination of new and existing practices demonstrates the complexity and multi-faceted nature of social innovation.

11.1.3 Outcome: empowerment of communities.

Studies suggest that GSI is a better alternative to empower local communities than charitable organizations because the latter breed a culture of dependency, only provide incremental solutions and are too bureaucratic, and thus, inefficient in their implementation of solutions (Bhatt & Ahmad, 2017; Lindberg et al., 2016). Social enterprises are better equipped to enable the social, economic and political empowerment of marginalized communities due to their unique business model and value creation mechanisms that is centered on the targeted communities. For instance, Solar Ear is a social enterprise that manufactures cost effective hearing aids to low income households in developing countries (Solar Ear, 2017). This enterprise has developed a unique model that employs hearing impaired persons to develop, test and iterate the hearing aids themselves thereby not only saving on production costs but also developing a product that is ideal for the target consumers (Ashoka, 2008). Such a model leads to the economic and social empowerment of the hearing-impaired community and enables their inclusion into society.

Research on GSI has shown similar approaches towards empowering communities which include bricolage, bridging social divides (BSD) and the positive deviance approach in the developing world (Bosworth et al., 2016; Brown & Wyatt, 2010). Such approaches empower local action without going through the “straightjackets of government development plans” and allow SIs to be better delivered (Bitencourt, Marconnato, Cruz, & Raufflet, 2016). In this manner, hybrid organizations such as social enterprises are also able to embed solutions within local communities by leveraging local skills and accounting for background conditions.

11.2 Corporate Social Innovation (CSI).

Studies on CSI are sparse relative to GSI but there is a growth in the number of publications in the last 5 years (P. Mirvis et al., 2016). As mentioned previously, CSI refers to the process by which commercial enterprises integrate social innovation into their strategy and operations with the purpose of enhancing business sustainability and competitive advantage. Existing studies on CSI provide a preliminary conceptual framework to institutionalize and improve social innovation implementation within commercial enterprises. CSI is incorporated through a process of active sensing the business context, organizational elements such as operations and culture, and active stakeholder engagement (Herrera, 2015). Currently, this approach is being championed as an effective way to alleviate social problems while also anticipating and responding to market trends early and successfully. The literature on CSI is growing faster relative to CSR & firm innovation for two reasons. First, traditional CSR still exists in the form of philanthropic initiatives that are not tied to the business strategy of the firm. In contrast, CSI is akin to a corporate investment that provides instrumental benefits in the form of new market opportunities and mitigation of stakeholder risks, Second, even the more effective CSR programs involve firms partnering with NGOs to deliver a short term social service to community groups. On the other hand, CSI requires a company to leverage the full range of its assets to delve into socially impactful R&D (H. Mirvis et al., 2012).

11.2.1 Purpose: to identify and commercialize market opportunities.

Studies on CSI have shown that leading firms are turning to CSI in order to grow and meet stakeholder expectations. Such firms are turning to use this new instrument because it helps them tap into markets at the Base of the Pyramid (BoP). To this end, firms have begun partnering and supporting social enterprises and local innovators to seek and commercialize business solutions that meet social needs. Other benefit of such partnerships is that they enable firms to gain knowledge about local market conditions and access to markets in unfamiliar or otherwise inaccessible cultures. Catering to such BoP markets requires more than just an innovative solution, firms that are foreign to the local context also need to learn how to effectively deliver their solutions to the local markets. Such a ‘native capability’ can only be developed experientially and through co-creation with local partners and target communities (Hart & London, 2005). Furthermore, firms need local legitimacy and connections with the potential pool of users in a BoP market. Partnering organizations can enable engagement with such local communities thereby providing access to a market that is beyond the usual reach of the firm. A successful example of a firm leveraging CSI to discover new market opportunities is Intel. Intel had launched an education program aimed at improving the rate of technological literacy in developing countries such as India (IndiaCSR, 2015). By developing a stakeholder engagement platform that enabled collaboration between targeted beneficiaries, local implementation partners and its own employees, Intel gained insights into an untapped market for basic technology education software (Intel, 2014). Through such descriptive examples, the research on attempts to show that CSI offers economically viable solutions to environmental and social problems.

11.2.1 Process: SI integration through stakeholder engagement.

The process of active stakeholder engagement is critical for both GSI and CSI. A full-scale engagement with an ecosystem of stakeholders leads to myriad of benefits for the firm including acquisition of tacit knowledge, identification of value creation opportunities, co-creation of better products, gaining legitimacy to name a few. Existing literature on CSI also uniformly states that successful CSI requires stakeholder acceptance, cooperation and co-creation (Herrera, 2016; P. Mirvis et al., 2016). The literature on CSI lays out a process of effective stakeholder engagement which occurs in two stages. The first stage involves stakeholder mapping coupled with active

sensing of the business context by company employees. The second stage is focused on defining the perimeter of co-creation and the mechanisms that enable it. In stakeholder mapping, the company evaluates the interests and influences of groups that have a stake in the company's business activities. In the context of CSI such stakeholders can be classified as direct, indirect or mediating (Herrera, 2012). This process helps a company to categorize stakeholder groups in terms of collaborative potential and identify value creation opportunities (Herrera, 2011). Active sensing encompasses actively and continuously gathering information about the business context. This information can be both market and non-market related and provides a foundation for the co-creation stage of CSI. The co-creation stage involves CSI mechanisms such as ideation, prototyping and scaling. Active stakeholder engagement enhances the effectiveness of such mechanisms by building social capital and enhances competitive advantage (P. Mirvis et al., 2016). However, researchers also state that corporate values that support experimentation and collaboration along with structural democratization that encourage CSI are also needed. The co-creation stage of SI will yield optimal benefits and is more likely to increase competitive advantage when the structure, culture and operational mechanisms enable co-creation.

11.2.3 Outcome: improvements in the value chain.

A considerable amount of literature on CSI is based on the enhancement of a firm's value chain. This includes sourcing of products, operations aspect of supply chain and more recently, the engagement of employees in CSI (H. Mirvis et al., 2012). The focus of CSI scholars on value chain enhancement comes from existing literature on CSR and corporate sustainability. Researchers argue that by integrating CSI into a firm's value chain leads to optimized social and environmental footprint via better stakeholder engagement and environmental protection practices. Firms engaging in CSI tend to undertake a footprint analysis that involves the evaluation of their extended value chain which comprises of all processes, inputs-outputs, by-products, suppliers, suppliers, distributors, business partners, and disposal of product and packaging (P. Mirvis et al., 2016). The active monitoring of non-market metrics is also claimed to enhance CSI integration. Existing literature on CSI states that there are three clear value chain improvements by integrating CSI (Herrera, 2016). First, increasing employee engagement by their involvement in socially relevant R&D leads to increase in organizational learning and empowers them to resolve technical

challenges in their day to day operations. An example of this process is IBM's initiative to it's employees on a one month learning assignment in remote regions of Africa to develop business courses for local entrepreneurs (Herrera, 2015). This initiative led to increased insights into the slack processes at IBM back in their US offices. Second, collaborations with external parties to create sustainable supply chains leads to knowledge sharing between partners and insights into each other's business contexts. For instance, the Canadian grocer Loblaw, partnered with environmental organizations to develop better sustainable sourcing criteria. Meanwhile, the environmental groups learned more about the factors of costs and margins in Loblaw's grocery business. Third, CSI enables firms to move to a deeper form of engagement with BoP communities. Firms can move from merely developing stronger sourcing criteria to producing affordable products that can be used in BoP communities. For instance, the American multinational SC Johnson, moved from a sustainability sourcing scorecard to having an active positive social impact on their sourcing communities. The company worked with the farming communities to help establish cooperatives and community-controlled marketing and distribution systems (Herrera, 2015).

Extant literature on social innovation is rife with discussion on which organizational form is best suited to develop and scale social innovations. Some studies have stated the vital importance of a primary social purpose as a necessary precursor to developing social innovations (Mulgan, 2006; Mulgan et al., 2007; Mulgan, 2014). In contrast, an emerging sub-domain of literature champions the role of commercial organizations in institutionalizing social innovation processes that lead to positive social outcomes (Herrera, 2015; H. Mirvis et al., 2012; P. Mirvis et al., 2016). Therefore, it was important to highlight this ongoing debate in social innovation literature. Although our understanding of the debate is usually centered around the need for a primary social purpose, this study also shows that the fundamental differences between GSI and CSI is more than just purpose. The two approaches also differ in terms of their enabling processes and positive social outcomes.

This study found that both approaches lead to prosocial outcomes for communities and beneficiary groups. The CSI approach is also aimed at providing financial benefits to the innovating enterprise but it is accompanied by a social purpose that plays a complementary role to the commercial motive of the innovating firm. In this light, the author suggests that future research would find it

more productive to move away from the debate of which organizational form is better suited to engage in enabling social change. By pitting social purpose organizations against commercial organizations takes the focus away from the complexity and intrigue that characterizes social innovation as a process of change. Instead, studies can examine a variety of social innovators and organizational forms that contribute to positive social outcomes. This new focus also enables future studies to better understand the characteristics of the social innovation process and different mechanisms to incorporate the process into organizational forms.

12. Study of social innovators.

12.1 Introduction.

The terms social innovator and social innovation are not novel terms. Social innovators have endeavoured to empower marginalized communities and address complex social challenges since the dawn of the industrial revolution (Mulgan et al., 2007). This category of entrepreneurs is distinct from commercial entrepreneurs because their individual interests are secondary to the intent to create social value for communities (Nicholls, 2010a). They are also distinguishable from conventional entrepreneurs because they seek to embed themselves and their innovative solutions within societies. Social innovators bring together disparate elements of society and allows impactful ideas to be planted within minds of policymakers, entrepreneurs and community leaders.

Individual level studies in social innovation literature are generally based on descriptive case studies and anecdotal evidence (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014; Pol & Ville, 2009). Several studies have focused on the question of *why* social innovators seek to address social challenges. Studies have attempted to shed light on the personality traits of social entrepreneurs, their ethical motivation and their visionary leadership capabilities (Shamuganathan & Nga, 2010; Tracey & Phillips, 2007). In contrast, fewer studies have attempted to shed light on *how* social innovators engage in the process of problem identification, solution discovery and achieve impact. Additionally, most studies on social innovation are discussed conceptually or are situated at the organizational and institutional levels (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014; Pol & Ville, 2009; Vickers et al., 2017). There is a lack of research on individual level studies on the role of social innovators in making social innovation a dynamic, negotiated and iterative process of transformative social change. While scholars have

attempted to describe the process of social innovation, a descriptive examination of the literature may not be adequate. Cases can be an important source to validate existing views in literature and aid in developing more refined conceptualizations (Siggelkow, 2007). In this context, the study was designed to address two broad questions - First, how does the social purpose guide social innovators in the processes of problem identification and solution discovery. Second, how do the innovators institutionalize and protect the social purpose into their organizations and in engagements with partners.

12.2 Methods.

The data for this study was collected through semi-structured interviews. Interviews were conducted with (co-)founders, CEOs and senior company representatives of their respective organizations. Three criteria were established for selecting organizations to be included in this study. First, the organization should exhibit a primary social purpose through its vision, mission or value proposition items that are publicly available. Second, the organizations should have a discernable positive social impact on its target community. Finally, the potential interviewees should be available for a face to face interview with the author of this study. The list of potential organizations to be included in the study was partly compiled with the assistance of District 3 innovation centre at Concordia University.

Initially, 18 enterprises were contacted for being included in this study. However, several organizations were set-up by international students who had returned to their home countries upon the completion of their studies. Therefore, five interviews were eventually conducted by the author. All organizations were based in Montreal and were situated in diverse industries ranging from the Arts sector to the Agricultural sector (Table 7(a), 7(b)). Each interview lasted for approximately an hour and ten minutes.

The interview questionnaire was approved by the author's supervising committee before conducting the interviews. The research instrument was designed to address the two goals of this study – to understand the process of problem identification and solution discovery; and to shed light on how the social purpose is institutionalized into the enterprise and in its partner engagements. Although there was some variation in the line of questioning based on the

information provided by the interviewee, most key questions were asked at various stages of the interviews. Some of these included:

“Could you talk about which problem(s) you seek to address?”

“Could you explain about the product/service (Enterprise name) you offer to the market?”

“What does growth mean to you?”

“Which groups help you to grow?”

All interviews included in the study were recorded with the explicit permission of the interviewees. 418 minutes of interview data was recorded from all five participants in the study. The data was transcribed, coded and analysed using the qualitative software Nvivo 11 pro. The coding structure and analytical approach was discussed prior to analysing the data for common themes. For instance, nodes such as ‘social purpose’, ‘problem identification’, ‘collaboration with partners’, ‘innovative product or service’, were defined and established prior to data analysis. Any publicly available data verbally expressed by the interviewee and included in the analysis was also verified by the author. In the analysis stage, the ‘child nodes’ which were most similar in nature (e.g. ‘stating social purpose’ or ‘reframing social challenges’) were collapsed under ‘parent nodes’ (e.g. ‘role of social purpose’). Using these parent nodes, four common themes were identified across the data from all five interviews.

12.3 Themes.

All five organizations involved in this study were for-profit social enterprises (Dees, 1998) and belonged to different industry sectors (Table 7(a), 7(b)). Some interviewees also expressed that their enterprise does not belong to a specific defined sector but rather lies ‘in between’ sectors (Table 7 (b)). Three organizations in the study were early and mid stage start ups, while two organizations were in operation for some years. Three interviewees were co-founders while the remaining two interviewees were senior level employees in their organizations (Table 7 (a)). Three interviewees came from non-profit backgrounds (Chrysalabs, ALTE Co-op and Mealshare) while the remaining two held traditional corporate roles (Communauto, Culture Creates) prior to joining/co-founding their current organizations.

Four overarching themes were found common across all five interviewees. First, all participants in the study expressed that they were driven by a social purpose over a commercial motive. This primary social motivation influenced the interviewees to reframe social challenges facing communities into viable business opportunities. Second, the interviewees expressed embedding the social purpose into their organizations while simultaneously striving to protect it from internal and external actors. The participants expressed that through choice of co-founders, organizational policies, they could incorporate a social purpose into their enterprises. In conjunction, the innovators sought to protect their social purpose from proactively choosing who to collaborate with and whom not to. The social purpose of interviewees acted as a filtering and alignment mechanism as they developed new relationships for collaboration. Third, the innovators cultivated broader social sector identities over traditional organizational ones. The participants expressed that they are working for their sector or to address social problems rather than for their enterprises. The CEOs and co-founders in particular viewed their organizations as vehicles for addressing the broader social problems. In addition, these broader identities enabled the innovators to constantly educate and learn from their target communities and sectors. Fourth, the interviewees expressed collaborating and negotiating on social challenges and solutions with partners in their eco-systems. All participants alluded to developing new eco-systems through connecting with actors across sectoral boundaries. In conjunction, the innovators collaborated with communities and other stakeholders in the co-creation of innovative products and services.

12.3.1 Theme 1: Role of social purpose in reframing social challenges into business opportunities.

All interviewees in the study emphasised that their organization is driven by a primary social purpose which is supplemented by efforts to ensure a financially sustainable business model. The reimagining of social problems as opportunities for innovation are understood as an essential feature of social entrepreneurs and innovators (Phillips et al., 2015). By immersing themselves in the institutional context of social challenges, social innovators can leverage their skills and experience to embark on a journey of solution discovery (Yunus, 1998, 2006).

Some interviewees expressed the need to build all encompassing innovative solutions that cover the scope and nature of specific social problems. For instance, Chrysalabs is a start up that aims to provide cost effective and accurate nutrient sensing technology for small and medium sized

farmers in Quebec. The co-founder of Chrysalabs expressed the need to reconceive the social and environmental challenge into solutions as follows:

“...we are not only making a remote sensing tool for farmers, but we also want to help increase soil health and regeneration of nutrients in those farms... I really believe in technology and providing tools to people who need them, I have done that my entire life”

Regarding the efforts to ensure financial viability of their remote sensor, the co-founder also expressed the need to balance financial viability of the product for their target market with the social purpose as follows:

“we have this idea of offering a tool for farmers which is cheap, at the same time the challenge we face is to bring something precise enough and useful enough for this cheap price. It is the first challenge - technology challenge that we have. We have to create the best tool for a small amount of money and if with the same tool, we increase the precision, it could increase the price. So, in terms of our social mission, and given our target market, this is our challenge.”

12.3.2 Theme 2: Embedding and protecting social purpose via organizational practices and selection of stakeholders.

Social purpose organizations can internalize their social mission through policies, incentive systems and hiring practices (Dees, 1998; Dees et al., 2004). The institutionalization of the social purpose makes social enterprises effective vehicles for addressing intractable local and global social challenges.

All interviewees expressed the need to integrate their social objectives into their respective organizations (Table 8). For instance, ALTE Coop is an engineering cooperative that provides consulting in the areas of social housing, energy management and design engineering. One of the co-founders interviewed articulated the process of integrating the social purpose as:

“we also decided that maybe the people we have in the jobs bank work for 6 months consistently, then they can become full time employees of ALTE in the future. So they should have enough pro bono work in their pocket before wanting to join the 8 of us inside”

The co-founder also expressed that their policy of recruiting engineers into their floating jobs bank is based two aspects – the skill sets of the prospective employees and the employees need to create a positive social impact. In this context, he co-founder mentioned the following:

“many engineers we are working with have decades of experience in the sector. But they are happy to take a massive pay cut to work with us because in their previous job they could not see the impact they were having on the company and client. It was very repetitive for them over there. Everyday was the same for them. With us, they have ownership as well as they are seeing the clear impact they are having. So it is values based for them”

All the interviewees unanimously expressed concerns about protecting their social purpose. The interviewees mentioned the need to protect their social mission internally with other co-founders, employees, and also externally from stakeholder groups.

For instance, the co-founder of Chrysalabs indicated that it is crucial to partner with groups that supplement their social purpose and simultaneously avoid groups that may cause mission drift over time:

“That is the problem with business, what is your revenue, who are your clients and how do you get money from them. I say to groups who ask me this - I am trying to help them first and then I am trying to get a business that is valuable and make money to keep going. And this is the kind of business I like. This is where the social impact comes into play. You can make a normal business and make a lot of money of it. But if you think the other way, there is people that I can help and then, we can find partners to have money for that.”

Similarly, founders expressed the need to protect the social mission internally through common values and incentive systems. In this context, the co-founder of ALTE Coop expressed the following:

“The social way of thinking is similar because most of us come from the NGO background. Some of us, even myself came from working in social projects in student committees in college.”

And:

“For us, values are the most important factor. We are all engineers with different expertise but we see things the same way. We made a policy that has some different impacts. So one is that profit sharing is allowed for members only if the member puts a certain number of pro bono hours in a year’s time.”

12.3.3 Theme 3: Developing broad social sector identities and consistently educating the sector.

Social enterprises can be classified as hybrid enterprises due to different motives that are spread across public and private boundaries of value creation (Doherty et al., 2014). In this light, social purpose organizational forms tend to have a broader social identity than commercial enterprises. Founding social innovators and entrepreneurs work across sectoral boundaries in cross sector partnerships and other multi-stakeholder initiatives (Smith & Woodworth, 2012). The data indicates that the broader roles of the interviewees involves two aspects. First, the interviewees perceive themselves as working for the sector or in between the sector rather than an enterprise. Second, the interviewees take it upon themselves to educate their target market on the innovative solution offered and why is it necessary.

Developing broad social sector identities:

All interviewees defined their roles as extending beyond the conventional confines of their organizations and into a broader community or sector level context (Table 9). For instance, Culture Creates is technology firm that seeks to empower the Canadian arts sector by addressing their problem of unstructured web data. The co-founder interviewed had been working as a career arts administrator in the sector for over 30 years. With this background, the co-founder expressed the following:

“If I got private money, they will say no you are making money for us and not the arts sector. We are investing in you. I fundamentally would find it very difficult to get up in the

morning and make money for an investor. It is much easier to make money for the sector. I fundamentally believe in the value arts offers to society. And we don't have a better way of understanding the ways of the world particularly now, which excuse my language, but we are *****! So the arts is a way of understanding the balance. And also understanding others – you are sharing the experience with other human beings – your phone is off, no other electronics are on and you are presented an idea of yourself or the world.”

Similarly, Communauto is a car-sharing service that aims to reduce private car ownership by offering economically viable alternatives. The company representative interviewed expressed the company's broader identity is a result of its social and environmental missions. The company seeks to reduce the amount of time people spend in traffic while simultaneously reducing the negative impact on the environment through its electric car fleet and two user friendly services. In this background the company representative expressed:

“We see Communauto as a car sharing service that offers two kinds of services. One is that it is more opportunistic, which we call the free-floating service and the other is for planned out trips for station-based reservation rides. And this is because our main aim is to replace the private ownership of cars and to diminish the pressure on urban infrastructure.”

Consistently educating and learning from the sector:

All interviewees mentioned the importance and challenge of educating their sector on the nature and scope of the social problem to be addressed. In addition, organizations found it challenging to reduce the complexity of the social problem and simplify their messaging on how their product or service addresses the social problem. In all instances the target markets or communities were, to different extents, unaware of their social challenges. The organizations involved in the study attempted to educate their markets and communities through social media, inter-personal interactions, hosting events and through educational programs.

For instance, the co-founder of Culture Creates expressed the need to conduct pitches for their partners and clients:

“We make pitches and try it out and pivot accordingly. We are doing it for arts organizations and not investors so that they understand the problem. And they don't understand the problem. I ask them in the pitches is your website ready and I tell them its

not. You cannot be found on the web and I give examples of Siri, which everyone is familiar with. If you ask Siri a question and it cannot get an answer then you are not there. Then I introduce them to structured data.”

Similarly, the representative from Communauto expressed a strategy to explain the benefits of overcoming the social problem through the solution offered by the company:

“Historically we have been open in talking about it. We are not aggressive in scouting and recruiting. But now we are trying to explain our offering more proactively - The way we market is that what we offer is a more simpler way for an employer to keep track of driving expenses. If you use your own car then report the amount of km you travel and get compensation and a lot of this is trust based. But to use our cars for business. Then you have the comprehensive bill at the end of the month is a great way to control for expenses and compensation. It is easier with this bill and a plus for them.”

Interviewees also expressed the difficulty in reducing the complexity in their communication about what their product or service offers. The co-founder of Culture creates mentioned the challenge of simplifying their messaging in order to explain the social problem

“As an entrepreneur you have the curse of knowledge. My understanding of a semantic web is a 10, while for others it’s not there. So I need to reduce it to a level 5 and I think I did it! But the audience is at a 2. So these last few years has been about getting that 5 down to a 2.”

Another interviewee expressed:

“The problem is not seeing the opportunity, it is communicating it effectively. Very very difficult to do. It took me years to connect and engage using simple words. I am not dumb, but this hard and it looks so simple. This is the hardest thing. People still ask why does it matter?”

12.3.4 Theme 4: Multi sectoral partnerships - negotiating and collaborating on social challenges and solutions.

Scholars have discussed that social purpose organizations engage and negotiate through cross sector partnerships and multi stakeholder initiatives to address complex social challenges (Mulgan et al., 2007). In addition, the value creation mechanisms of social enterprises are underpinned by a collaborative process of problem identification and solution discovery. The interview data revealed that all participating organizations collaborate with different stakeholders to understand social issues and develop innovative solutions. The co-creative mechanism of these enterprises has two key aspects. First, the organizations connect previously unconnected actors thereby creating an eco-system of stakeholders who apply their concerted efforts towards a social problem. Second, the interviewees also expressed that the process of co-creating with partners entails sharing knowledge, increased trust and leveraging collective expertise to address social challenges.

Creating eco-systems around social challenges:

Due to the multidimensional nature of social challenges and its impacts on a broad set of social groups, the interviewees highlighted the need to develop supportive eco-systems. Creating such a community around a social problem involves making connections amongst actors that did not previously exist. For instance, Mealshare, is a social enterprise that aims to end youth hunger in one generation through a buy one give one meal program. The community leader of the company expressed the need to address this issue through partnerships with local restaurants and charities. The community leader convinced previously unconnected actors to form partnerships around the issues of youth hunger and gentrification. In this context, the interviewee expressed the following:

“I also bring the issue of gentrification with our mandate when the restaurant also brings it up, because they want to do more for the community. Sometimes the restaurants do talk about how they want to join and are attracted to working with charities. And they get that they have a responsibility and how to bridge that gap. So this is a good opportunity to bring it up, it is a very sensitive problem. Gentrification is becoming an increasingly important topic, particularly in Montreal where people are very community oriented. And it ties in nicely with the charity the restaurants can work with, so it's a more direct connect. And ideally, I try to seek restaurants that are around a charity, and luckily the charity we have

in Montreal, they are in locations that have a lot of restaurants, so it is very easy to point that out and make them involved”

Similarly, the representative from Communauto emphasised the need to build long term collaborative arrangements to address the challenges of stress on urban infrastructure and rising carbon emissions. The interviewee articulated that building partnerships with public authorities is possible through credibility and trust: *{also mention unis and carbon emissions?}*

“At the end of the day a lot of it is really political. I think the population has to be ready and asking for our service. And politicians have to be open to the idea. We are being lucky, we have a lot of partnerships with transit companies that helps with the credibility, that has been over the years. It has been going on for 20 years. It was not in the first year they said yes to us. The hardest thing was to demonstrate that it is a viable business model that is not going to go bankrupt.”

As Communauto was engaged in their partnerships much longer than the other four organizations, the interviewee also articulated that a ‘snowball effect’ takes place where like minded actors and organizations proactively join the effort to tackling the social problem.

“There was a snowball effect in the sense that someone with the same activity as you is engaging in collaboration and then you want to do it too. So for example there is this retirement home that offered similar to car sharing. A car that anyone can drive. So you see that there is this interest now even from such areas.”

Co-creating solutions with partners:

In addition to building communities around social problems, the interviewees also expressed how such systems share knowledge, resources and develop capabilities for innovative solutions (Table 10). An interactive process of co-learning occurs in a system of innovation that builds solutions for social challenges (Phillips et al., 2015). With this background, interviewees mentioned leveraging spaces offered by social innovation incubators in the city to share workspaces with like

minded social enterprises. The co-founder of ALTE Co-op expressed the following in the context of Esplanade, a leading innovation incubator in Montreal:

“Esplanade helps only because we have social mission at the core. It is great here because like minded entrepreneurs are here to learn from, there are joint lunches, discussions and brainstorming sessions. What is good is that everyone here knows that everyone else has the same value to have positive impact but are not sure on where we can collaborate. This requires more interaction and discussion about each other's businesses. Then we can find scope for working on something together”

Similarly, the co-founder of Chrysalabs expressed gaining business skills by working with several innovation incubators and universities such as District 3 at Concordia University, Esplanade and at Polytechnique Montreal. The co-founder stated the following:

“District 3 really helped us put a system in place to answer some business questions. We also joined the entrepreneurship center at Polytechnique, they have contests for student entrepreneurs, that we won in the last session. They offer money but also business advice to the winners and workshops which are useful for marketing and business plan. We are also part of the Esplanade, the impact aid program. That is interesting because they have the vision similar to District 3 but for a later stage for the business.”

Other interviewees also expressed sharing knowledge and developing skills with partners such as public universities, government and local businesses. One interviewee mentioned:

“we also have an environmental vision, but we do not have the expertise to answer the questions because we are not scientists or experts in business. I am creating an ecosystem that consists of experts in different topics, a community that has skills for the problem and not focused around the company.”

Similarly, another organization recently received public funding to address digital challenges faced by Canadian arts organization. The co-founder had previously expressed the necessity of working with the Canadian government to address the challenge on a national scale:

“The Canadian government is talking about bringing about digital transformation and investing a lot of money into the program. But the basic building blocks of this

transformation are missing – structured metadata. Our way is the way to go forward and the government is willing to spend a large amount of money into the sector”

12.4 Discussion.

The research on social innovation has consistently emphasised that a complex interaction of factors and stakeholders make social innovation a dynamic, negotiated and iterative process of social change. Social innovation has been discussed as a dynamic path that evolves from problem identification to solution discovery and implementation, through the confluence of various factors. Such factors have been previously identified as antecedents, enablers, limiters and consequences. However, only a descriptive justification for the features of the process-based view of social innovation may be insufficient and cases can be used to overcome such limitations. Cases are valuable for an inductive research strategy as they let theory emerge from data and help justify a more refined conceptualization of phenomena (Siggelkow, 2007). Using the interview data, this study attempted to identify and categorize factors that facilitated or inhibited the social innovation process of participating organizations. It was found that the data conformed with a variety of factors that are also discussed in literature. However, the interviewees also expressed factors that are unique to this study (Table 11).

The interviewees highlighted several reasons that explained why they began a new social venture or engaged in a process of innovation. These reasons were categorized under antecedents, defined as - factors that cause social innovation to occur in the first place. Some common antecedents across all organizations included having a primary social motive, leveraging previous skills and experience of the innovator and the social network of the interviewee. Two enterprises also expressed the role of government support as a factor in initiating their social venture. Social entrepreneurship and management scholars have often discussed the importance of the social purpose in reframing social problems as opportunities for innovation (Mulgan et al., 2007; Mulgan, 2014). The reimagining of social challenges into economically viable solutions can lead to a sustainable improvement in the well-being of the target beneficiaries. Most interviewees discussed the role of social purpose in three distinct ways. First, the social purpose was instrumental in enabling the reimagining of challenges as business opportunities. Second, the social motive was institutionalized into organizations through structure, policies and hiring practices. Third, the

social purpose also guided entrepreneurs to proactively engage with partners who shared a similar prosocial outlook. This also included avoiding potential partners who were only profit-centric.

The participants in the study also discussed reasons that aided the continued development of their innovation and social enterprise. These reasons were classified as enablers – factors that facilitate the solution discovery and implementation process. Enablers were discussed in context of the interviewee being part of a larger eco-system of actors centered around a social purpose. Commonly discussed enablers included being part of such an ecosystem of experts, sharing knowledge and resources, development of capabilities, assistance from social innovation hubs and sharing co-working spaces with social enterprises. Scholars have emphasised the critical role of collaborative groups or systems of actors in the development of products and services for addressing social problems (Phillips et al., 2015). Such multi stakeholder constellations consistently share knowledge and resources as they increase their commitment to the social cause over time. Social enterprises can develop new capabilities and become more embedded in their communities as a result of intensive collective activities within such eco-systems (Defourny & Nyssens, 2010; Phillips et al., 2015). Interestingly, the interview data also found that sharing co-working spaces with other social enterprises enabled most of the participating organizations to discover opportunities for further collaboration. For instance, one of the enterprises, ALTE Coop, relocated its main office to a co-working space managed by Esplanade, a prominent social innovation incubator in Montreal.

In contrast, the interviewees also discussed factors that curbed the development of their innovations which are understood as limiters of social innovation. The participants expressed their frustration with inhibiting factors such internal clash of values with fellow co-founders, differing values with stakeholders and lack of funding opportunities. Several studies on social innovation have discussed the impeding role of such factors. For instance, the internal and external clash of values can inhibit sharing knowledge amongst stakeholder groups, rise in mistrust amongst participants of a social network (Ratcliff & Doshi, 2016; Webb, Kistruck, Ireland, & Ketchen Jr, 2010). These limiting factors can in turn constrain the development of products and services or even result in the failures of social innovations. In addition to the factors mentioned in literature, the interviewees also expressed two limiting factors that are not common to the literature. The lack of awareness or acknowledgement of the social problem on part of the intended beneficiaries was

a frustrating problem for all participants. Furthermore, the social innovators expressed their difficulties in simplifying the complexity and communicating the benefits of their product or service to the intended target market.

The interviewees also expressed the impact of the innovation process on themselves, their organizations and on stakeholders. These impacts are categorized as consequences – the effects of the social innovation process on the enterprises and their stakeholders. As three of the participating organizations were early stage startups, their positive social impact on their target communities was minimal. However, the interviewees and the startups themselves experienced a change in their roles and relationships with time. The interviewees emphasised they re-defined their role more broadly as working for the sector or social challenge rather than expressing themselves in an organizational context. The other two relatively mature enterprises described the positive social impacts as empowerment of the target sector and of beneficiaries. The change of roles and improvement in the well being of communities has been widely discussed in social innovation literature (Franz et al., 2012; Le Ber & Branzei, 2010a; Lindberg & Portinson Hylander, 2017).

This study found that most of the factors that contribute to the process of social innovation are largely congruent with those discussed in existing literature. However, the interview data also suggested four additional enablers and limiters which are seldom discussed by scholars in the field. Amongst enablers these include the role social innovation incubators and sharing of co-working spaces. In the context of limiters factors such as the lack of awareness of social problem and difficulty in communicating benefits of the innovation were also found. The four emerging factors are rarely discussed in literature because most studies on social innovation discuss mature social enterprises and partnerships (Calton et al., 2013; Manning & Roessler, 2014; VanSandt & Sud, 2012), or are expressed conceptually (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014; Lawrence et al., 2014; Pol & Ville, 2009) or, studies are situated at an institutional level of analysis (Tracey et al., 2011). As three participating organizations in the study were start-ups, the innovation incubators and co-working spaces were essential to their development.

Scholars have also discussed social innovation as a dynamic, negotiated and iterative process of transformative social change (Lawrence et al., 2014; Phillips et al., 2015). The process of solution discovery can become dynamic for participants in a system of innovation as they experience changes in roles and relationships. The interviewees cultivated a broader social identity which

developed further through increased interactions within an eco-system of prosocial actors. The participants also continuously shared knowledge and formed new expertise in solving social challenges. This enabling process materialized as the interviewees formed new connections with several organizational forms across different sectors. The interview data also suggested that actors negotiated over the scope for collaboration, alignment of different motives in co-creating partnerships and on identification of social problems. For instance, the co-working spaces enabled social enterprises to discover scope for collaborations. In such spaces, prospective partners engaged in dialogue to seek opportunities for creating mutually beneficial social projects and ensure positive social impacts on communities. In addition, the process of identifying the social problem was also negotiated amongst participants. The participating co-founders expressed their difficulty in establishing the nature and ambit of the social problem with their target communities. Through discussions and pitches, the co-founders pivoted their enterprises towards specific social and business problems of their beneficiaries. Finally, the process of innovating was iterative and experimental for most interviewees. They expressed that their products, services and business models experienced several iterations through pilot testing of innovations with focus groups and target communities. Innovation hubs in particular were helpful in providing the three start ups in this study with resources and advice that enabled rapid iterations in their business model and market strategies.

12.5 Further research.

Few studies have attempted to understand the process of social innovation from the perspective of social innovators (Lettice and Parekh, 2010). Future scholars can explore the themes identified in this study over a larger sample. For instance, studies can examine how social innovators reconceive social challenges into business opportunities. Social entrepreneurship scholars have discussed the role of social motive as an essential ingredient in initiating social innovations (Kickul et al., 2012). However, there is a lack of scholarship on how social innovators engage in the process of defining the nature and scope of the social problem with partners. An in-depth qualitative interview study of social innovators and their partners would shed light on the dynamic and negotiated aspects of the process-based view of social innovation.

Similarly, the incorporation of a social purpose into business practices and policies can be another fruitful avenue of research. Previous studies have examined the institutionalization of social innovation into company strategy and operations for competitive advantage (Herrera, 2015; P. Mirvis et al., 2016). However, these studies have been in the context of obtaining economic benefits for the innovating firm and are partly guided by a commercial motive as opposed to a prosocial motive. Scholars can conduct a longitudinal study to examine how social purpose organizations such as co-operatives and community organizations embed a social purpose through negotiations and discussions with relevant groups.

In addition, previous studies have discussed the inhibiting factors for the development and scaling of social innovations. However, this study reveals that social innovators find it challenging to educate their target market on the social problem and on the benefits of innovative solutions. Future studies can examine the effects of learning from and educating the target markets on the innovator and the beneficiaries. For instance, scholars can examine whether the interactive learning and educating process makes social challenges more salient for beneficiaries and the innovation more relevant through learning-based iterations.

12.6 Limitations of the study.

This generalizability of findings from this study is limited due to small sample size of five interviews. In addition, the social enterprises included in the study are based in very different sectors from each another and vary considerably in their size and age. Three organizations in the study were also early stage start-ups in contrast to the other established organizations. However, this study was designed to be an initial exploratory study aimed at generating insights into how social innovators embed a social mission into their organization and stakeholder engagements. In addition, the intention of the study was to compare our academic understanding of social innovation with the views of modern day practitioners.

12.7 Conclusion.

This study was aimed at providing empirical support for the process-based view of social innovation. Most studies that describe the phenomenon as a complex process of systemic change tend to be conceptual or put forth an analytical framework based on existing literature (Have, Phillips, Lawrence). Through in-depth interviews with social innovators, the author found support for the view of social innovation as a dynamic, negotiated and disruptive process of social change.

The study found that social innovators are primarily guided by a social purpose which they embed and protect through organizational policies and choice of stakeholder relationships. In addition, the innovators assumed a broader social identity which enables them to educate and learn from their target markets. They also help build eco-systems around social problems to ensure concerted efforts from a range of social groups.

The study also found that the factors of social innovation as expressed by interviewees were largely consistent with those in existing literature. Four exceptions emerged in the context of enablers and limiters of social innovation. For enablers, these included the role of social innovation incubators and co-working spaces. In terms of limiters, the two factors were the lack of awareness of social problem amongst target beneficiaries and the difficulty in communicating benefits of the solution.

13. References.

- Aguilera, R. V., Rupp, D. E., Williams, C. A., & Ganapathi, J. (2007). Putting the S back in corporate social responsibility: A multilevel theory of social change in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(3), 836-863.
- Ashoka. (2008). HOWARD WEINSTEIN: Solar ear. Retrieved from <https://www.ashoka.org/en/fellow/howard-weinstein>
- Baker, T., & Nelson, R. E. (2005). Creating something from nothing: Resource construction through entrepreneurial bricolage. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(3), 329-366.
- Barca, F., McCann, P., & Rodríguez-Pose, A. (2012). The case for regional development intervention: Place-based versus place-neutral approaches. *Journal of Regional Science*, 52(1), 134-152.
- Barendsen, L., & Gardner, H. (2004). Is the social entrepreneur a new type of leader? *Leader to Leader*, 2004(34), 43-50.
- Battilana, J., & Dorado, S. (2010). Building sustainable hybrid organizations: The case of commercial microfinance organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(6), 1419-1440.
- Berger, E., & Nakata, C. (2013). Implementing technologies for financial service innovations in base of the pyramid markets. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 30(6), 1199-1211.

- Bhatt, P., & Ahmad, A. J. (2017). Financial social innovation to engage the economically marginalized: Insights from an indian case study. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 29*(5-6), 391-413.
- Bitencourt, C., Marconnato, Cruz, L. B., & Raufflet, E. (2016). Introduction to special edition social innovation: Researching, defining and theorizing social innovation. *RAM.Revista De Administração Mackenzie, 17*(6), 14-19.
- Borzaga, C., & Bodini, R. (2014). What to make of social innovation? towards a framework for policy development. *Social Policy and Society, 13*(3), 411-421.
- Bosworth, G., Rizzo, F., Marquardt, D., Strijker, D., Haartsen, T., & Aagaard Thuesen, A. (2016). Identifying social innovations in european local rural development initiatives. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research, 29*(4), 442-461.
- Brickson, S. L. (2007). Organizational identity orientation: The genesis of the role of the firm and distinct forms of social value. *Academy of Management Review, 32*(3), 864-888.
- Brooks, A. C. (2009). *Social entrepreneurship: A modern approach to social value creation* Pearson Prentice Hall Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Brown, T., & Wyatt, J. (2010). Design thinking for social innovation IDEO. *Development Outreach, 12*(1), 29-31.
- Brugmann, J., & Prahalad, C. K. (2007). Cocreating business's new social compact. *Harvard Business Review, 85*(2), 80.

- Budinich, V., Manno Reott, K., & Schmidt, S. (2007). Hybrid value chains: Social innovations and the development of the small farmer irrigation market in Mexico.
- Cajaiba-Santana, G. (2014). Social innovation: Moving the field forward. A conceptual framework. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 82, 42-51.
- Calton, J. M., Werhane, P. H., Hartman, L. P., & Bevan, D. (2013). Building partnerships to create social and economic value at the base of the global development pyramid. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 117(4), 721-733.
- Carrigan, M., Moraes, C., & Leek, S. (2011). Fostering responsible communities: A community social marketing approach to sustainable living. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 100(3), 515-534.
- Chakrabarty, S., & Bass, A. E. (2014). Institutionalizing ethics in institutional voids: Building positive ethical strength to serve women microfinance borrowers in negative contexts. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 119(4), 529-542.
- Chalmers, D. (2013). Social innovation: An exploration of the barriers faced by innovating organizations in the social economy. *Local Economy*, 28(1), 17-34.
- Chatterjee, S. (2016). Articulating globalization: Exploring the bottom of the pyramid (BOP) terrain. *Organization Studies*, 37(5), 635-653.
- Chitnis, K., Kim, D., Rao, V., & Singhal, A. (2007). Internet, sanchalak, and e-choupal: Connecting rural Indian farmers to urban markets. Paper presented at the *San Francisco*,

CA: Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association,

Chliova, M., & Ringov, D. (2017). Scaling impact: Template development and replication at the base of the pyramid. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 31(1), 44-62.

Cons, J., & Paprocki, K. (2010). Contested credit landscapes: Microcredit, self-help and self-determination in rural bangladesh. *Third World Quarterly*, 31(4), 637-654.

Cornelissen, J. P., & Clarke, J. S. (2010). Imagining and rationalizing opportunities: Inductive reasoning and the creation and justification of new ventures. *The Academy of Management Review*, , 539-557.

Crane, A., Palazzo, G., Spence, L. J., & Matten, D. (2014). Contesting the value of “creating shared value”. *California Management Review*, 56(2), 130-153.

Cudd, A. E. (2015). Is capitalism good for women? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 127(4), 761-770.

De Liso, N., & Metcalfe, S. (1996). On technological systems and technological paradigms: Some recent developments in the understanding of technological change. *Behavioral Norms, Technological Progress, and Economic Dynamics: Studies in Schumpeterian Economics*, , 71-95.

Dees, J. G. (1998). Enterprising nonprofits. *Harvard Business Review*, 76, 54-69.

Dees, J. G., Anderson, B. B., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2004). Scaling social impact. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 1(4), 24-32.

- Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2008). Social enterprise in europe: Recent trends and developments. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 4(3), 202-228.
- Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2010). Conceptions of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship in europe and the united states: Convergences and divergences. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1(1), 32-53.
- Di Domenico, M., Haugh, H., & Tracey, P. (2010). Social bricolage: Theorizing social value creation in social enterprises. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(4), 681-703.
- Doherty, B., Haugh, H., & Lyon, F. (2014). Social enterprises as hybrid organizations: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 16(4), 417-436.
- Drucker, P. F. (1987). Social innovation—management's new dimension. *Long Range Planning*, 20(6), 29-34.
- Dubb, S. (2016). Community wealth building forms: What they are and how to use them at the local level. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 30(2), 141-152.
- Durden, D. A., Davis, B. A., & Boulton, A. A. (1988). Interaction of biogenic amines with components of cigarette smoke: Formation of cyanomethylamine derivatives. *Biochemical Pharmacology*, 37(19), 3729-3734.
- Ebrahim, A., Battilana, J., & Mair, J. (2014). The governance of social enterprises: Mission drift and accountability challenges in hybrid organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 34, 81-100.

- Elmes, M. B., Jiusto, S., Whiteman, G., Hersh, R., & Guthey, G. T. (2012). Teaching social entrepreneurship and innovation from the perspective of place and place making. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 11*(4), 533-554.
- Franz, H., Hochgerner, J., & Howaldt, J. (2012). *Challenge social innovation: Potentials for business, social entrepreneurship, welfare and civil society* Springer Science & Business Media.
- George, G., Rao-Nicholson, R., Corbishley, C., & Bansal, R. (2015). Institutional entrepreneurship, governance, and poverty: Insights from emergency medical response services in India. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 32*(1), 39-65.
- Germak, A. J., & Robinson, J. A. (2014). Exploring the motivation of nascent social entrepreneurs. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship, 5*(1), 5-21.
- Gerometta, J., Haussermann, H., & Longo, G. (2005). Social innovation and civil society in urban governance: Strategies for an inclusive city. *Urban Studies, 42*(11), 2007-2021.
- Goldstein, J., Hazy, J. K., & Silberstang, J. (2010). A complexity science model of social innovation in social enterprise. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship, 1*(1), 101-125.
- Griffiths, M. D., Gundry, L. K., & Kickul, J. R. (2013). The socio-political, economic, and cultural determinants of social entrepreneurship activity: An empirical examination. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 20*(2), 341-357.
- Gruenewald, D. A. (2014). Place-based education: Grounding culturally responsive teaching in geographical diversity. *Place-based education in the global age* (pp. 161-178) Routledge.

- Guo, R., Lee, H. L., & Swinney, R. (2015). Responsible sourcing in supply chains. *Management Science*, 62(9), 2722-2744.
- Haigh, N., Walker, J., Bacq, S., & Kickul, J. (2015). Hybrid organizations: Origins, strategies, impacts, and implications. *California Management Review*, 57(3), 5-12.
- Hall, J., Matos, S., Sheehan, L., & Silvestre, B. (2012). Entrepreneurship and innovation at the base of the pyramid: A recipe for inclusive growth or social exclusion? *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(4), 785-812.
- Hammond, A. L., & Prahalad, C. K. (2004). Selling to the poor. *Foreign Policy*, , 30-37.
- Hart, S. L., & Christensen, C. M. (2002). The great leap: Driving innovation from the base of the pyramid. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 44(1), 51.
- Hart, S. L., & London, T. (2005). Developing native capability. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 3(2), 28-33.
- Hayes, E. N., & Hayes, T. (1970). *Claude lévi-strauss: The anthropologist as hero* The MIT Press.
- Herrera, M. E. B. (2015). Creating competitive advantage by institutionalizing corporate social innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(7), 1468-1474.
- Herrera, M. E. B. (2016). Social innovation for bridging societal divides: Process or leader? A qualitative comparative analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(11), 5241-5247.
- IndiaCSR. (2015). Intel-india. Retrieved from <http://indiacsr.in/tag/intel-india/>

- Ireland, J. (2008). Lessons for successful BOP marketing from caracas' slums. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 25(7), 430-438.
- Jastrzębska, E. (2017). Engaging stakeholders as a condition of creating social innovations
angażowanie interesariuszy warunkiem tworzenia innowacji społecznych.
- Jones Christensen, L., Siemsen, E., & Balasubramanian, S. (2015). Consumer behavior change at the base of the pyramid: Bridging the gap between for-profit and social responsibility strategies. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36(2), 307-317.
- Kanter, R. M. (1999). From spare change to real change. the social sector as beta site for business innovation. *Harvard Business Review*, 77(3), 122-32, 210.
- Karnani, A. (2007). The mirage of marketing to the bottom of the pyramid: How the private sector can help alleviate poverty. *California Management Review*, 49(4), 90-111.
- Khanna, T., & Palepu, K. (2000). Is group affiliation profitable in emerging markets? an analysis of diversified indian business groups. *The Journal of Finance*, 55(2), 867-891.
- Kickul, J., Terjesen, S., Bacq, S., & Griffiths, M. (2012). Social business education: An interview with nobel laureate muhammad yunus. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3), 453-462.
- King, A. (2007). Cooperation between corporations and environmental groups: A transaction cost perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(3), 889-900.

- Kistruck, G. M., Beamish, P. W., Qureshi, I., & Sutter, C. J. (2013). Social intermediation in base-of-the-pyramid markets. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50(1), 31-66.
- Kramer, M. (2011). Creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review*, Jan-Feb,
- Lawrence, T. B., Dover, G., & Gallagher, B. (2014). Managing social innovation. *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation Management*, , 316-334.
- Le Ber, M. J., & Branzei, O. (2010a). (Re) forming strategic cross-sector partnerships: Relational processes of social innovation. *Business & Society*, 49(1), 140-172.
- Le Ber, M. J., & Branzei, O. (2010b). Value frame fusion in cross sector interactions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94(1), 163-195.
- Lindberg, M. (2014). From exclusion to inclusion in public innovation support? innovative practices in bottom-up networks. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Administration*, 18(4), 91-107.
- Lindberg, M., Forsberg, L., & Karlberg, H. (2016). Gender dimensions in women's networking for social innovation. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 29(4), 410-423.
- Lindberg, M., & Portinson Hylander, J. (2017). Boundary dimensions of social innovation: Negotiating conflicts and compatibilities when developing a national agenda. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 30(2), 168-181.

- Luo, X., & Du, S. (2015). Exploring the relationship between corporate social responsibility and firm innovation. *Marketing Letters*, 26(4), 703-714.
- Maak, T., Pless, N. M., & Voegtlin, C. (2016). Business statesman or shareholder advocate? CEO responsible leadership styles and the micro-foundations of political CSR. *Journal of Management Studies*, 53(3), 463-493.
- Mahoney, J. T., McGahan, A. M., & Pitelis, C. N. (2009). Perspective—The interdependence of private and public interests. *Organization Science*, 20(6), 1034-1052.
- Mair, J., & Marti, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 36-44.
- Mair, J., Martí, I., & Ventresca, M. J. (2012). Building inclusive markets in rural bangladesh: How intermediaries work institutional voids. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(4), 819-850.
- Manning, S., & Roessler, D. (2014). The formation of cross-sector development partnerships: How bridging agents shape project agendas and longer-term alliances. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 123(3), 527-547.
- Mirvis, H., Googins, B., & Kiser, C. (2012). Corporate social innovation. *Lewis Institute, Social Innovation Lab, Babson University.*
- Mirvis, P., Herrera, M. E. B., Googins, B., & Albareda, L. (2016). Corporate social innovation: How firms learn to innovate for the greater good. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(11), 5014-5021.

- Moulaert, F., Martinelli, F., González, S., & Swyngedouw, E. (2007). *Introduction: Social Innovation and Governance in European Cities: Urban Development between Path Dependency and Radical Innovation*,
- Moulaert, F., Martinelli, F., Swyngedouw, E., & Gonzalez, S. (2005). Towards alternative model (s) of local innovation. *Urban Studies*, 42(11), 1969-1990.
- Mulgan, G. (2006). The process of social innovation. *Innovations*, 1(2), 145-162.
- Mulgan, G. (2014). Design in public and social innovation: What works and what could work better. *Article Publié Sur Www.Nesta.Org.Uk*,
- Mulgan, G., Tucker, S., Ali, R., & Sanders, B. (2007). Social innovation: What it is, why it matters and how it can be accelerated.
- Nicholls, A., & Murdock, A. (2012). The nature of social innovation. *Social innovation* (pp. 1-30) Springer.
- Nicholls, A., & Murdock, A. (2011). *Social innovation: Blurring boundaries to reconfigure markets* Springer.
- Nicholls, A., Simon, J., & Gabriel, M. (2015). Introduction: Dimensions of social innovation. *New frontiers in social innovation research* (pp. 1-26) Springer.
- Ogburn, W. F. (1969). *On culture and social change*
- Pache, A., & Santos, F. (2013). Inside the hybrid organization: Selective coupling as a response to competing institutional logics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(4), 972-1001.

- Perrot, F. (2017). Multinational corporations' strategies at the base of the pyramid: An action research inquiry. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 146(1), 59-76.
- Phillips, W., Lee, H., Ghobadian, A., O'Regan, N., & James, P. (2015). Social innovation and social entrepreneurship: A systematic review. *Group & Organization Management*, 40(3), 428-461.
- Phills, J. A., Deiglmeier, K., & Miller, D. T. (2008). Rediscovering social innovation. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 6(4), 34-43.
- Piscitelli, A. (2013). Between iracema beach and the european union: International sex tourism and women's migration. *CLAM (Hg.): Sexuality, Culture and Politics—A South American Reader*, , 426-452.
- Plyler, M. G., Haas, S., & Nagarajan, G. (2010). Community-level economic effects of M-PESA in kenya. *Financial Services Assessment*, , 1-8.
- Pol, E., & Ville, S. (2009). Social innovation: Buzz word or enduring term? *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 38(6), 878-885.
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). The big idea: Creating shared value.
- Powell, W. W., & Sandholtz, K. W. (2012). Amphibious entrepreneurs and the emergence of organizational forms. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 6(2), 94-115.
- Prahalad, C. K., & Ramaswamy, V. (2002). The co-creation connection. *Strategy and Business*, , 50-61.

- Prahalad, C. K. (2012). Bottom of the pyramid as a source of breakthrough innovations. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 29(1), 6-12.
- Pruth, C. (2007). Sun, sea, sex and swedes. A study of campaigns to prevent sex tourism in natal/brazil and stockholm/sweden.
- Ramachandran, J., Pant, A., & Pani, S. K. (2012). Building the BoP producer ecosystem: The evolving engagement of fabindia with indian handloom artisans. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 29(1), 33-51.
- Ratcliff, R., & Doshi, K. (2016). Using the bass model to analyze the diffusion of innovations at the base of the pyramid. *Business & Society*, 55(2), 271-298.
- Reficco, E., & Márquez, P. (2012). Inclusive networks for building BOP markets. *Business & Society*, 51(3), 512-556.
- Rennings, K. (2000). Redefining innovation—eco-innovation research and the contribution from ecological economics. *Ecological Economics*, 32(2), 319-332.
- Sabato, S., Vanhercke, B., & Verschraegen, G. (2017). Connecting entrepreneurship with policy experimentation? the EU framework for social innovation. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 30(2), 147-167.
- Schumpeter, J. (1908). On the concept of social value. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, volume 23, 213-232.
- Schumpeter, J. (1942). Creative destruction. *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, 825

Segarra-Oña, M., Peiró-Signes, A., Albors-Garrigós, J., & Miguel-Molina, B. D. (2017). Testing the social innovation construct: An empirical approach to align socially oriented objectives, stakeholder engagement, and environmental sustainability. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 24(1), 15-27.

Segel, A. I., Chu, M., & Herrero, G. A. (2006). Patrimonio hoy: A financial perspective.

Sen, A. (1997). *Choice, welfare, and measurement* Harvard University Press.

Shamuganathan, G., & Nga, J. (2010). The influence of personality traits and demographic factors on social entrepreneurship start up intentions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95(2), 259-282.

Siggelkow, N. (2007). Persuasion with case studies. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1), 20-24.

Simanis, E., & Hart, S. L. (2009). Innovation from the inside out. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 50(4), 77.

Smith, I. H., & Woodworth, W. P. (2012). Developing social entrepreneurs and social innovators: A social identity and self-efficacy approach. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3), 390-407.

Solar Ear. (2017). Solar ear: About us. Retrieved from <http://solarear.com.br/about-us/>

Sristi. (2017). ABOUT US: The honeybee network. Retrieved from <http://www.sristi.org/hbnew/aboutus.php>

- Stephan, U., Patterson, M., Kelly, C., & Mair, J. (2016). Organizations driving positive social change: A review and an integrative framework of change processes. *Journal of Management*, 42(5), 1250-1281.
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). Information and the change in the paradigm in economics. *American Economic Review*, 92(3), 460-501.
- Sun, S. L., & Im, J. (2015). Cutting microfinance interest rates: An opportunity co-creation perspective. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 39(1), 101-128.
- Swain, R. B., & Wallentin, F. Y. (2009). Does microfinance empower women? evidence from self-help groups in india. *International Review of Applied Economics*, 23(5), 541-556.
- Taylor, J. B. (1970). Introducing social innovation. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 6(1), 69-77.
- Thompson, J., Alvy, G., & Lees, A. (2000). Social entrepreneurship—a new look at the people and the potential. *Management Decision*, 38(5), 328-338.
- Tracey, P., & Phillips, N. (2007). The distinctive challenge of educating social entrepreneurs: A postscript and rejoinder to the special issue on entrepreneurship education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 6(2), 264-271.
- Tracey, P., Phillips, N., & Jarvis, O. (2011). Bridging institutional entrepreneurship and the creation of new organizational forms: A multilevel model. *Organization Science*, 22(1), 60-80.

- Tracey, P., & Stott, N. (2017a). Social innovation: A window on alternative ways of organizing and innovating. *Innovation, 19*(1), 51-60.
- Tracey, P., & Stott, N. (2017b). Social innovation: A window on alternative ways of organizing and innovating. *Innovation, 19*(1), 51-60.
- van der Have, Robert P, & Rubalcaba, L. (2016). Social innovation research: An emerging area of innovation studies? *Research Policy, 45*(9), 1923-1935.
- VanSandt, C. V., & Sud, M. (2012). Poverty alleviation through partnerships: A road less travelled for business, governments, and entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Ethics, 110*(3), 321-332.
- Vickers, I., Lyon, F., Sepulveda, L., & McMullin, C. (2017). Public service innovation and multiple institutional logics: The case of hybrid social enterprise providers of health and wellbeing. *Research Policy, 46*(10), 1755-1768.
- Viswanathan, M., & Sridharan, S. (2012). Product development for the BoP: Insights on concept and prototype development from university-based student projects in india. *Journal of Product Innovation Management, 29*(1), 52-69.
- Von Jacobi, N., Edmiston, D., & Ziegler, R. (2017). Tackling marginalisation through social innovation? examining the EU social innovation policy agenda from a capabilities perspective. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities, 18*(2), 148-162.
- Walls, J. L., & Paquin, R. L. (2015). Organizational perspectives of industrial symbiosis: A review and synthesis. *Organization & Environment, 28*(1), 32-53.

- Wassmer, U., Paquin, R., & Sharma, S. (2014). The engagement of firms in environmental collaborations: Existing contributions and future directions. *Business & Society*, 53(6), 754-786.
- Webb, J. W., Kistruck, G. M., Ireland, R. D., & Ketchen Jr, D. J. (2010). The entrepreneurship process in base of the pyramid markets: The case of multinational enterprise/nongovernment organization alliances. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(3), 555-581.
- Westley, F., & Antadze, N. (2010). Making a difference: Strategies for scaling social innovation for greater impact. *Innovation Journal*, 15(2)
- Windrum, P., & Koch, P. M. (2008). *Innovation in public sector services: Entrepreneurship, creativity and management* Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Wooder, S., & Baker, S. (2012). Extracting key lessons in service innovation. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 29(1), 13-20.
- Yunus, M. (2007). *Creating a world without poverty: Social business and the future of capitalism* Public Affairs.
- Yunus, M., Moingeon, B., & Lehmann-Ortega, L. (2010). Building social business models: Lessons from the grameen experience. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2-3), 308-325.
- Ziegler, R. (2017). Social innovation as a collaborative concept. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 30(4), 388-405.

14. Appendices.

14.1 Appendix A: List of tables.

Table 1: Various definitions of social innovation.

Author(s)	Definition
Mulgan et al, (2007)	Social innovation refers to new ideas that work in meeting social goals. “innovative activities and services that are motivated by the goal of meeting a social need and that are predominantly developed and diffused through organisations whose primary purposes are social”
Hamalainen and Heisscala, (2007)	Social innovations are changes in the cultural, normative or regulative structures of the society which enhance its collective power resources and improve its economic and social performance.
Pol and Ville, (2009)	Social Innovations improve the quantity or the quality of life and can occur in the intersection of business innovation and societal well being.
Centre for Social Innovation, (2008)	Social innovation refers to new ideas that resolve existing social, cultural, economic and environmental challenges for the benefit of people and planet. A true social innovation is system-changing—it permanently alters the perceptions, behaviours and structures that previously gave rise to these challenges.
Santana, (2013)	Social innovations are new social practices created from collective, intentional, and goal-oriented actions aimed at prompting social change through the reconfiguration of how social goals are accomplished
Phillis et. al (2008)	A social innovation is a novel solution to a social problem that is more effective, efficient, sustainable, or just than current solutions. The value created accrues primarily to society rather than to private individuals.
Herrera (2015)	Corporate social innovations refer to social innovations that create social value, provide business sustainability and competitive advantage to the innovating firm.
Mirvis et al (2016)	Corporate social innovation engages a company in societally relevant R&D and applies the full range of corporate assets to the challenges at hand.

Table 2: The common factors and sub factors of Social Innovation.

Antecedents: (64 articles; 301 references)	Limiters: (53 articles; 274 references)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Social motivation 2. Personal hardships of innovator 3. Human capital of entrepreneur 4. Traditional heritage and family skills 5. Dissatisfaction with the status quo 6. Leveraging existing business partnerships 7. Pursuing alignment of CSR with business goals 8. Converging norms and values of for profits and non-profits 9. Grassroots movements for social change 10. Inequality: rural-urban divide 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conflict in values of funder-entrepreneur 2. Marginalization of social entrepreneurs by mainstream finance institutions 3. Lack of skilled labour for projects 4. Lack of competitive salary and steady income for social enterprises 5. Lack of feedback mechanisms in prototyped solutions 6. Costs of educating and training workers - lack of institutional support 7. Lack of gender equality 8. Rigid social hierarchy and vested interests 9. State corruption 10. Culture of dependency

Enablers: (72 articles; 446 references)	Consequences: (70 articles; 412 references)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Active community participation in solution development. 2. Knowledge sharing amongst partners 3. Capability development through networks 4. Adapting innovation to local market. 5. Storytelling to cross social barriers. 6. Strong social performance measurements enhance access to funds. 7. Leveraging local ties through stakeholder engagement 8. Organizational policies that stimulate innovation 9. Government support 10. Bricolage - mobilising community resources 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Empowerment of marginalized communities 2. Greater gender equality 3. Shifting roles and relationships 4. Transformation of perceptions and behaviours within communities 5. Complementarity between social and commercial purpose 6. Improvements in company value chain. 7. Gaining access to new markets 8. Social License and legitimacy. 9. New Base of the pyramid models. 10. Democratization of knowledge production, application and dissemination.

Table 3 (a): Antecedents and Enablers of Social Innovation at Individual, Organizational, and Institutional Levels.

	Antecedents (64 articles; 301 references)	Enablers (72 articles; 446 references)
Individual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social motivation • Personal hardships • Human Capital of innovator • Traditional heritage and family skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Storytelling to cross cultural or social barriers • Common norm-value pairs between funder and entrepreneur • Leveraging previous work experience
Organizational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity identification with stakeholders • Existing partnerships • Alignment of business strategy with social goals • Organizational incentives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leveraging local ties • Stakeholder co-creation • Operational structures, policies and incentives that facilitate innovation • Knowledge sharing through networks
Institutional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convergence of market sectors. • New public-private partnerships • Unique historical or cultural contexts • Grassroots social movements • Addressing inequality, rural-urban divide 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bricolage – mobilising community resources • Common social and cultural norms • Leveraging community ties to scale innovations • Institutional support from governments and local administration.

Table 3 (b): Limiters and Consequences of Social Innovation at Individual, Organizational, and Institutional Levels.

	Limiters (53 articles; 274 references)	Consequences (70 articles; 412 references)
Individual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflict in values, expectations between funder-entrepreneur • Marginalization of social entrepreneurs by mainstream financial institutions • Marginalization by state and local governments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Altering perceptions and behaviours towards social challenges. • New social motivation for commercial entrepreneurs • Overcoming mental limitations and personal development.
Organizational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failing to consider needs of all stakeholders • Solutions not prototyped to elicit feedback • Lack of access to finance • Lack of skilled employees • Excessive costs of educating communities and training employees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of new products and services • New capabilities and knowledge through collaborative partnerships • Development of new Base of the Pyramid models and new markets

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements in company value chain
Institutional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of gender equality • Rigid social hierarchy and vested interests • Corruption in government institutions and state machinery • Culture of dependency fostered by grants and NGOs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating new relationships and connections amongst stakeholders • Change in social status of social groups • Democratization of knowledge production, application and dissemination. • Empowerment of marginalized communities.

Table 4: The most common stakeholders of a social innovation.

Stakeholders	Antecedents		Enablers		Limiters		Consequences	
	Articles	References	Articles	References	Articles	References	Articles	References
Government	26	42	22	37	28	53	20	31
Communities	44	80	46	169	38	102	53	193
Non-profits	25	48	32	60	23	42	26	47
Commercial Enterprises	39	59	48	153	26	92	38	118
Social Purpose Enterprises	32	53	46	138	40	86	42	112
Platforms	11	14	18	49	6	21	9	32

Table 5 (a): Factors of social innovation across stakeholders: antecedents and enablers.

	Antecedents	Enablers
Government	National Innovation regimes. Decentralized government systems. Willingness to accept criticism of status quo.	Government grants to NGOs and social businesses. Socially inclusive local governments.
Communities	Motive to create social value. Unique historical and cultural contexts. Activist/Social movements of change. Inequality: rural-urban divide. Shifting roles and perceptions.	Leveraging local ties. Storytelling to cross social barriers. Bricolage – mobilising community resources.
Non-profits	Human capital of entrepreneur. Convergence – public-private.	Leverage local ties through engagement. Knowledge sharing platforms.
Commercial Enterprises	Effective stakeholder strategy. Existing partnerships. Alignment of business with social goals.	Organizational values. Stakeholder driven co-creation. Operational policies and structures. Impact investing community. Access to finance and firm assets.

Social Enterprises	Human capital of entrepreneur. Social entrepreneurial opportunity.	Previous experience of entrepreneur. User driven innovation approach. Stakeholder driven co-creation. Active participation in knowledge sharing platforms.
---------------------------	---	---

Table 5 (b): Factors of social innovation across stakeholders: limiters and consequences.

	Limiters	Consequences
Government	Corruption. Political vested interests in status quo.	New local governing bodies for innovation. Increased transparency.
Communities	Lack of literacy. Rigid social hierarchies.	Empowerment: social, economic, political. Increased Literacy. Increased Sanitation and Health benefits. Gender equality.
Non-profits	Culture of dependency. Unwilling to undertake disruptive innovations. Mission drift due to ‘capture’ by grant makers.	Creation of new relationships. Democratization of knowledge.
Commercial Enterprises	Failure to consider stakeholders claims. Solutions not prototyped to elicit feedback.	Corporate Social Innovation – improvements in value chain. New Base of the Pyramid business models. Insights into market trends and opportunities.
Social Enterprises	Conflict in values of funder-entrepreneur. Marginalization by mainstream financiers.	Increased embeddedness into local context. Acquisition of Local knowledge. New solution delivery mechanisms.

Table 6 (a): Grassroots Social Innovation (GSI)

	Grassroots Social Innovation
Approach:	Grassroots Social innovations refer to innovative activities and services that are motivated by the goal of meeting a social need and that are predominantly developed and diffused through organisations whose primary purposes are social.
Core elements:	1. Primary purpose of innovating organizations is social. 2. New combination of old and new practices that prompt social change. 3. Empowerment of marginalized communities.
Approach specific Processes:	Community driven co-creative process; ‘collaborative continuum’ as a decision-making process; using platforms to gain access to finance and talent for social enterprises.

Approach specific Impacts:	Economic benefits are accrued to beneficiary communities, transformation of societal roles and traditional hierarchies, economic and skill based empowerment of marginalized communities.
Organizational forms:	Only socially oriented organizations: social enterprises, social entrepreneurs, NGOs and government bodies, platforms.

Table 6 (b): Corporate Social Innovation (CSI)

Corporate Social Innovation	
Approach:	Corporate social innovations refer to social innovations that create social value for communities while ensuring business sustainability and competitive advantage for the innovating firm.
Core elements:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Primary purpose of: gain competitive advantage and discover new markets. 2. Seek improvements in the value chain. 3. Active stakeholder engagement to gain social licence and legitimacy.
Approach specific Processes:	Proactive Stakeholder Management; Active sensing of business and social contexts; Internal value chain enhancement; using institutional elements such as structure, processes and culture to integrate CSI into strategy and operations.
Approach specific Impacts:	Commercialization of products and services, insights into market opportunities and potential customer segments at the base of the pyramid, value chain improvements.
Organizational forms:	Primarily commercial enterprises: Multinational organizations and SMEs.

Table 7 (a): General organizational details of the study on social innovators.

Organization	Age	Size	Classification	Interviewee
Culture Creates	3 years	2	Start up (prototyping stage)	Co-founder
ChrysaLabs	< 1 year	4	Start up (seed stage)	Co-founder
ALTE Coop	< 2 years	8	Start up (seed stage)	Co-founder
Communauto	24 years	53	Medium company	Customer Service
Mealshare	5 years	18	Small	Community Leader

Table 7 (b): The social challenges and innovation solutions of social innovators.

Organization	Sector(s)	Social Challenge(s)	Innovative Solution
Culture Creates	Arts and IT	Lack of demand and visibility of the Canadian arts sector	Structuring data of arts organizations
ChrysaLabs	Agriculture and IT	Lack of information on soil nutrients and quality	Soil sensing device and information capture
ALTE Coop	Engineering and Real Estate	Lack of affordable housing for low income groups	Engineering cooperative, pro-bono consulting
Communauto	Car sharing	Stress on urban infrastructure and rising carbon emissions	Subscription for electric and non-electric cars.
Mealshare	Food & Restaurants and Marketing	Youth Hunger and Gentrification	Buy one, share one meal program

Table 8: Primary Social Purpose – Institutionalization and Protection.

Organization	Social Mission	Institutionalization and Protection
Culture Creates	Empowering the Arts Sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share social mission with co-founder • Avoid financiers who do not share social mission
ChrysaLabs	Promote organic farming practices and improve soil quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share social mission with co-founder • Business model developed through social innovation incubators. • Align only with organic farmers
ALTE Coop	Empower communities through social housing and make organizations sustainable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Established a co-operative • Profit sharing based on number of pro-bono hours • Employee status based on pro-bono hours
Communauto	Reduce stress on urban infrastructure and reduce private ownership of cars	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investment into ‘expensive’ electric car fleet • Avoid operating in high demand, congested zones • Align and operate with transit partners, acquired firms based on social mission

Mealshare	Eradicate Youth Hunger and address gentrification in communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business model based on connecting socially conscious restaurants with partner charities. • 90% proceeds reinvested into scaling social mission
-----------	--	--

Table 9: Broader social identity of innovators - beyond traditional organisational boundaries.

Organization	Organizational form	Expressed social identity
Culture Creates	For profit social enterprise	'...working for the (arts) sector'
ChrysaLabs	For profit social enterprise	'we are building this company for the farmers'
ALTE Coop	For profit social enterprise	'...we made our coop for Montreal's community'
Communauto	For profit social enterprise	'..ride sharing service for the public transit sector'
Mealshare	<i>Registered</i> non-profit social enterprise	'..formed to be embedded in local communities'

Table 10: Collaborative process of innovators - problem identification and solution discovery.

Organization	Stated Collaborative form	Collaborative partners	Co-creation process
Culture Creates	'creative partnership'	Arts organizations, federal government	Knowledge sharing on the problem of unstructured data.
ChrysaLabs	'eco-system'	Social Innovation incubators, Farmers, Universities	Intensive interactions with experts to build business skills and technical capabilities.
ALTE Coop	'community group'	Social Innovation Incubator, social enterprises	HQ in co-working space to seek socially driven partners.

Communauto	'local partnerships'	Transit authorities, local governments	Collective strategy to address traffic congestion and access to transport.
Mealshare	'community partnerships'	Local restaurants, charities.	Selection of menu items eligible for 'Buy one give one' program

Table 11: Social Innovator study: Antecedents, Enablers, Limiters and Consequences of SI.

Antecedents	Enablers	Limiters	Consequences
Primary social motive	Innovation hubs	Internal clash of values	Change in roles and relationships
Previous skills and experience	Co-working spaces	External clash of values	Empowerment of target sector
Innovator's social network	Sharing knowledge and resources	Lack of funding	Empowerment of beneficiaries
Government support: public funds.	Capability development	Lack of awareness on social problem	
	Eco-system of groups sharing a common social purpose.	Difficulty in communicating value of innovative solution.	

14.2 Appendix B: Information and Consent form.



INFORMATION AND CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

Study Title: Social Innovation and Competitive Advantage.

Researcher: Shivaang Sharma.

Researcher's Contact Information: sharmashivaang@gmail.com (Mobile: 514 576 2182)

Faculty Supervisors: Raymond Paquin, Rajshree Prakash.

Faculty Supervisor's Contact Information:

Ex.2911 raymond.paquin@concordia.ca ; Ex. 2912 rajshree.prakash@concordia.ca

You are being invited to participate in a research study about Corporate Social Innovation and Competitive Advantage. This form addresses concerns about the purpose, procedures, benefits and potential risks from engaging in this study. Please read this form carefully before deciding whether you are comfortable with participating in this study. If there is anything that is not clear, or if you require more information, *please do not hesitate to contact the researcher.*

A. PURPOSE

This study examines organizations that develop innovative products or services to solve social problems. The purpose of this research is to understand how firms integrate their social mission into business activities, and their positive social impacts while ensuring financial sustainability. This study also aims to understand whether the firm gains any competitive advantage and delve into potential tensions in meeting social and financial goals.

B. PROCEDURES

If you participate, you will be asked to partake in an interview that may take up to an hour of your time. In this interview you will be asked questions about your firm's business model,

products/services, stakeholder engagement, financial and social benefits that have accrued due to the firm's activities.

As a research participant, your responsibilities would simply to be honest in responding to the researcher's questions.

C. RISKS AND BENEFITS

This research is not intended to benefit you personally. It is unlikely that you will face any risks by participating in this research. You might or might not personally benefit from participating in this research. Potential benefits include:

- Opportunity to evaluate your company's business model and social impact.
- Opportunity to relive and share your company's successes.
- Opportunity to uncover potential solutions to challenges faced by your organization.
- Contribute to an enhanced understanding of socially impactful ways of doing business in Canada.

D. CONFIDENTIALITY

By participating, you agree to let the researcher have access to information about how your business is organized to have a positive social impact through its activities and products and/or services. This information can be obtained from written documentation provided by your company as well your personal accounts shared via an interview.

We will not allow anyone to access the information, except people directly involved in this research. We will only use the information for the purposes of the research described in this form.

We will protect the information by storing all original data files obtained from your company as well as all data files used/produced in the analysis into password secured electronic files. Printed copies of the data used in or produced by the site visits and interview are kept in a locked cabinet and are to be destroyed after use. Digital files of interviews and transcripts will be erased once the study has been completed. When results of the study are disseminated in papers or presentations, company identifying information is removed, unless otherwise authorised by the company.

We intend to publish the results of this research. Please indicate below whether you accept to be identified in the publications:

[] I accept that my name and the information I provide appear in publications of the results of the research.

[] Please do not publish my name as part of the results of the research. Make use of a pseudonym, where applicable.

In certain situations, we might be legally required to disclose the information that you provide. This includes situations where []. If this kind of situation arises, we will disclose the information as required by law, despite what is written in this form.

E. CONDITIONS OF PARTICIPATION

You participate in this research voluntarily and you can stop at any time. There are no negative consequences for not participating or stopping in the middle of the study or asking us not to use your information.

You can also ask that the information you provided not be used, and your choice will be respected. If you decide that you don't want us to use your information, you can inform the researcher within one week of participation.

You will be informed of anything later development that could affect your decision to stay in this research.

We will not be able to offer you compensation if you are injured in this research. However, you are not waiving any legal right to compensation by signing this form.

F. PARTICIPANT'S DECLARATION

I have read and understood this form. I have had the chance to ask questions and any questions have been answered. I agree to participate in this research under the conditions described.

NAME (please print) _____

SIGNATURE:

DATE: _____

If you have questions about the scientific or scholarly aspects of this research, please contact the researcher. Their contact information is on page 1. You may also contact the faculty supervisors.

If you have concerns about ethical issues in this research, please contact the Manager, Research Ethics, Concordia University, 514.848.2424 ex. 7481 or oor.ethics@concordia.ca.