

# Findings

## The Who, What and How of Social Innovation

Deliverable 8.1 of the project:  
“Impact of the Third Sector as Social Innovation” (ITSSOIN),  
European Commission – 7th Framework Programme

28 February 2017

Deliverable of the  
FP-7 project: ITSSOIN (613177)



### **Suggested citation**

Anheier, H. K.; Krlev, G.; Behrendt, C.; Mildenerger, G. (2017). Findings. The Who, What and How of Social Innovation. Deliverable 8.1 of the project: “Impact of the Third Sector as Social Innovation” (ITSSOIN), European Commission – 7th Framework Programme, Brussels: European Commission, DG Research.

### **Acknowledgements**

We would like to thank our partners of the EU-sponsored project “ITSSOIN – Impact of the Third Sector as Social Innovation” for their extensive support in preparing this report. The partner network consists of the *University of Heidelberg* for Germany, *VU University Amsterdam* and the *Netherlands Institute for Social Research* for the Netherlands, *London School of Economics and Political Science* for England, *Università Commerciale Luigi Bocconi* for Italy, *Copenhagen Business School* for Denmark, *ESSEC Business School* for France, *Masaryk University* for the Czech Republic, *Universidade da Coruña* and *Universidad de Oviedo* for Spain, and the *Stockholm School of Economics* for Sweden.

### **ITSSOIN**

ITSSOIN is a research project funded under the European Commission’s 7th Framework Programme and was initiated in response to a call for research “The impact of the third sector on socio-economic development in Europe”. The project represents a research collaboration between 11 European institutions, is led by the University of Heidelberg, and runs from 2014-2017.

Date:	28. February 2017
ITSSOIN deliverable:	No. 8.1
Authors:	Anheier, H. K.; Krlev, G.; Behrendt, C.; Mildenerger, G.
Lead partner:	University of Heidelberg
Contact person:	Georg Mildenerger Centre for Social Investment, Heidelberg University georg.mildenerger@csi.uni-heidelberg.de +49 – (0)6221 – 54119-59

## Contents

### Part I – Organisations

<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>What is and what makes social innovation? .....</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1.	Organisational behaviour .....	3
2.2.	Organisational resources.....	4
2.3.	Organisational structure.....	6
<b>3.</b>	<b>Methodology .....</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1.	Quantification of the research.....	8
3.2.	QCA analysis .....	9
<b>4.</b>	<b>Results .....</b>	<b>11</b>
4.1.	Arts & culture.....	14
4.2.	Social services.....	15
4.3.	Health care.....	15
4.4.	Environmental sustainability.....	16
4.5.	Consumer protection .....	16
4.6.	Work integration.....	17
4.7.	Community development .....	17
<b>5.</b>	<b>Discussion .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Conclusions.....</b>	<b>20</b>

### Part II - Framework Conditions

<b>7.</b>	<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Field variables and degree of social innovation .....</b>	<b>22</b>
8.1.	Sector prevalence and civic engagement .....	22
8.2.	Marketization and social division.....	23
8.3.	Field dynamism .....	24
<b>9.</b>	<b>Methodology .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>10.</b>	<b>Results .....</b>	<b>25</b>
10.1.	Arts & culture.....	29
10.2.	Social services.....	29
10.3.	Health care.....	29
10.4.	Environmental sustainability.....	30
10.5.	Consumer protection .....	30
10.6.	Work integration.....	30
10.7.	Community development .....	31
<b>11.</b>	<b>Discussion .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>12.</b>	<b>Conclusions.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>13.</b>	<b>References .....</b>	<b>34</b>

## Part I – Organisations

### 1. Introduction<sup>1</sup>

Social innovation, as a process of social renewal and progress is getting more and more attention in the context of global challenges such as climate change, poverty, social inequality and conflicts, often referred to as ‘wicked problems’—a term designating phenomena that are messy and hard to solve (Churchman, C. West, 1967; Rittel & Webber, 1973). The notion of social innovation can be traced back to Max Weber, who has written on the impact of ‘abnormalities’ in social behaviour leading to social change, affecting the general social order (compare to (Bureau of European Policy Advisers (BEPA), 2011)). It can also be related to the discussion of the bottom-up processes initiated by individual actors that Popper (1966) has referred to as ‘social engineering’ as early as the mid-1940s. First targeted research on the topic however has only emerged in the late 1980s (see for instance Zapf, 1989) and not before 2000 has it gained broad attention from institutional, organisational and management research, which are now contributing to a growing body of literature.

Despite existing studies on what enables actors to drive social innovation, the existing evidence is still often episodic, referring to singular and unconnected cases of actions promoting the ‘public good’ (Barley, 2007; Battilana & Dorado, 2010; Mair & Marti, 2009; Reay & Hinings, 2005; Reficco & Marquez, 2012). Besides, most of the research is located in a developing country context and actor traits emerge from explorative research rather than being tested by means of explanatory research. In this report we present a systematic investigation of actor traits that enable social innovation based on a set of hypotheses located on three levels: (1) organisational behaviour, (2) organisational resources, and (3) organisational structure.

Our hypotheses are derived from the literatures on technological innovation and on social innovation. In this report we only briefly outline the various studies on types of innovation adopted by ITSSOIN. The hypotheses focus on key peculiarities of social innovation, part of which it shares with technological innovation and part of which differentiate the two. The key traits used refer to the innovations’ motivational character, their image of the innovation and their primary impacts. They are tested empirically based on a sample of 129 organisations involved by various degrees in social innovation across nine European countries and seven fields of activity: culture & arts; social services; health care; environmental sustainability; consumer protection; work integration; and community development. As part of a large scale research project and by means of international expert consultations we have first selected major social innovations, one within each field of activity. These innovations have each been studied cross-nationally within a subset of the nine countries by means of a retrospective ‘process tracing’ (Collier, 2011; George & Bennett, 2005) to find out which (types) of organisations have contributed in which way to the present state of the innovations, and which traits have enabled them to do so. The results of the qualitative case-based work have been

---

<sup>1</sup> The section “Introduction” and “What is and what makes social innovation?” contain parts that have previously been used in ITSSOIN deliverables D 1.1 and D 1.4. They are reused in a restructured fashion here to aid the understanding of the reader of the background of our work. D 1.1 and D 1.4 can be consulted for more detailed information, but we repeat the parts most essential to our analysis within this document. This has been found more effective than paraphrasing what has been previously said in a succinct fashion, or omitting the introductory part altogether and replacing it by a mere reference to the previous deliverables.

synthesised across fields into a quantitative data set (Goertz & Mahoney, 2012), which has finally been analysed by ‘qualitative comparative analysis’ (QCA) (Ragin, 1989, 2000; Rihoux & Ragin, 2009) to arrive at solution terms, that is logic combinations of actor traits that have enabled actors to contribute to social innovation.

We find that social innovators’ characteristics differ strongly across fields and that aggregation of insights at present is literally impossible. The ‘best recipes’ for social innovation, to stick with QCA terminology, are thus context-dependent. However, certain conditions crystalize from our analysis across fields. The behavioural conditions of social needs orientation, pro-social values and external openness emerge as most important. Resource-related variables also matter: Most prominently local embeddedness, but also transaction costs and volunteering. Independence from external pressures as another resource-related factor in turn can be compensated by other traits. The structural variables of age and length of engagement in a field are found to be relatively less substantial.

## **2. What is and what makes social innovation?**

Most definitions of social innovation include a multitude of aspects. The European Commission, in drawing together insights from pioneering research in the field, such as that of the TEPSIE project (The Young Foundation, 2012), defines social innovation as:

*“The development and implementation of new ideas (products, services and models) to meet social needs and create new social relationships or collaborations. It represents new responses to pressing social demands, which affect the process of social interactions. It is aimed at improving human well-being. Social innovations are innovations that are social in both their ends and their means. They are innovations that are not only good for society but also enhance individuals’ capacity to act” (European Commission, 2013, p. 6).*

The innovation categories in the above definition (products, services, models) are incomplete. Other categories include: ideas, processes, structures, behaviours, and practices (Cuerva, Triguero-Cano, & Córcoles, 2014, p. 105). From the viewpoint of technological innovations some of these can be illustrated by innovation in industrial production: the car (product), assembly line production (processes), lean manufacturing (structure), and outsourcing (practice). In studying social innovation empirically we will find variations of these categories. But first we want to get a better grip on what social innovation as a concept is and how it relates to organisation theory.

Scholars have brought up the proposition of treating social innovation as a ‘quasi-concept,’ just as is the case for ‘social cohesion’ for example. A quasi-concept is characterised by its approximating character and inherent definitional looseness, which is beneficial for a phenomenon’s simultaneous use in a research and a policy context (Bernard, 1999; Jenson, 2010). We are generally supportive of the idea, since it tries to remove ambiguity while taking seriously the complexity of the subject, rejecting a too narrow focus. However, a quasi-concept of social innovation is not useful if it is not built on empirical and conceptual accounts of what constitutes and differentiates kinds of innovations so as to derive a more detailed understanding. Only by doing so can we move on to assess social innovation with explanatory research. In this article we study who and what is involved in social innovation, that is what types of actors (firms, state agencies, non-profits/third sector organisations) are engaged and what characteristics determine whether those involved play a minor or a major role in drafting, testing, promoting, developing and spreading it. For doing so we review what the technological and emergent social innovation literatures tell us about the characteristics that lever organisations’ social innovativeness. In the review we include organisations’ (1) behaviour, (2)

resources and (3) structure and derive a comprehensive set of hypotheses. With 'social innovativeness' we refer to:

*“The ability of organisations to contribute to or create solutions to previously inadequately addressed social needs – this solution shall serve both a functionalist (efficiency & effectiveness) and a transformationalist function (change) and primarily aim at improving the situation for the beneficiaries (target groups) and other actors involved. Increased social innovativeness is marked by a more frequent (overall or within the social innovation process) and more substantial (clearly recognisable or dominant) and more sustainable (lasting) involvement in the development of such solutions.”*

Somewhat similar to the definition of social innovation introduced by Phills, Deiglmeier and Miller (2008) and Le Ber and Branzei (2010), social innovation appears as a novel and more sustainable solution to a social problem for which the value created accrues primarily to society rather than private individuals. The ability to bring about such innovations depends, as previous studies have shown, on several organisational characteristics.

## **2.1. Organisational behaviour**

The idea of entrepreneurial innovation, which goes back to Schumpeter's discussion of entrepreneurship as the ultimate renewing force in the economy, analyses the influence of individual and collective actors on innovation (Autio, Kenney, Mustar, Siegel, & Wright, 2014, p. 1089; Picciotto, 2013). Entrepreneurship has since been interpreted in a non-commercial, 'civic' or 'social' version (see for instance Drucker, 1985). Social entrepreneurship more strongly than traditional entrepreneurship links to social innovation. Hoogendoorn et al. (2010, p. 3) for instance point out that there is a 'social innovation school of thought' in social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurs tend to have a higher focus on social needs than business entrepreneurs and while both entrepreneur groups maximise local network embeddedness and need creativity to implement innovation, social entrepreneurs focus on unmet social needs and are more locally bound than business entrepreneurs (Shaw & Carter, 2007). Thereby, preferring to support suppressed or marginalised target groups and taking risky moves into a field instead of optimising on profit and growth is interpreted as being oriented towards social needs. Similarly, raising awareness on the needs on socially deprived and marginalised groups is read as a sign of social needs orientation. Related to these questions of attitudes, when talking about organisational behaviour we also took into account social entrepreneurs' greater ability to connect to target groups and to sense their problems in order to develop potential solutions. This ability will necessarily arise from an organisation's stated and practiced orientation towards social needs (Osburg, 2013).

The social needs orientation of an organisation is strongly linked to the dominance of pro-social values within this organisation and to its pronounced motivation to change things for the better (Crossley, 1999; Schmitz, 2015). By pro-social value sets we refer to the motives on which an actor takes action, such as religious or ethical motives in contrast to customer satisfaction or product excellence. Thus, although interlinkages between the two organisational traits can be observed, they are not imperative: for instance, social needs may be addressed in order to consequently benefit from the improved situation of a needy target group. Among other things the will to foster positive social change helps to prevent a mission drift and reduces potential threats to the viability of social innovations (Crepaldi, Rosa, & Pesce, 2012). Overall, it is not only social enterprises that are characterised by needs orientation and strong social values, but pro-active social endeavours of many sorts, may they happen in newly founded entities, established organisations (e.g., social intrapreneurship in Kistruck & Beamish, 2010) or informal groups (e.g., social movements in Hendersen, 1993).

*H 1: The higher the social needs orientation of an organisation, the higher is its social innovativeness.*

*H 2: The higher the importance of pro-social value sets in an organisation, the higher is its social innovativeness.*

While the latter two innovator traits likely hold for social innovation only, there are further ones that generally favour innovation. For instance, for being innovative an organisation has to be able to learn continuously (Crossan & Apaydin, 2010; Nicholls, 2013). This ability to learn is related to internal and external characteristics of an organisation (Blättel-Mink, 2006), whereby the external characteristics seem more relevant in view of social innovation.

Although there have been major innovations that were developed in relative isolation, external organisational openness in most cases is a critical variable for innovation (Hogan & Coote, 2014). An organisational culture that is both, flexible and externally oriented, is more likely to 'create'—potentially leading to breakthroughs—rather than to 'collaborate' (focus on long-term stability), to 'control' (focus on preservation) or to 'compete' (focus on short-term performance) (Baumol, 2004; Turró, Urbano, & Peris-Ortiz, 2014). This assumption is supported by the fact that access to a large set of knowledge inputs is beneficial for the emergence of innovation (Coleman's thinking on innovation in 1957/1966; Rogers, 2003; Vedres & Stark, 2010). A multiplicity of external connections and thus a wide as well as diverse stakeholder network allows a variety of signals to reach an organisation and to disseminate innovative pilots (The Young Foundation, 2012).

Thus connecting and brokering (the latter referring to actors, who had not been in contact previously; see Fleming, Mingo & Chen, 2007) emerges as the most salient factor affecting an organisation's innovative capacity. The influence of external structures on the ability to learn is reflected in the literature that focuses on organisations' long-term survival (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Ronald, 2012, p. 526). DiMaggio and Powell developed the concept of organisational fields. These fields can put organisations under isomorphic pressures which makes them adapt to the structures in which they are embedded (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). This can be interpreted as one strategy to maintain organisational viability—yet, as fields change, innovation serves as a source of transformation that creates organisational plurality over time. Over and again networks come up as the grounding structure of such innovation processes (Powell & Grodal, 2005), or at least the involvement of groups of actors that span borders. This perspective outlines that innovation processes often take place in the interaction of a multitude of stakeholders and at different levels of action.

The transformation of institutional fields is an example that outlines the interplay of actors therein: Greenwood et al. (2002) for instance illustrate how professional associations play an important role in theorizing, promoting and diffusing innovations and thereby effecting institutional change. Maguire et al. (2004) discuss how several community organisations have advocated and established new practices in HIV/AIDS treatment by linking these practices to stakeholders' standard routines and values (here: pharmaceutical firms). Similarly McInerney (2008) elaborates on field-configuring events in the area of 'non-profit technology assistance providers.'

*H 3: The higher the organisational openness of an organisation, the higher its social innovativeness.*

## **2.2. Organisational resources**



A pronounced capacity for resource mobilisation is related to organisation's connectedness in addition to the capacity for detecting challenges, the creative spurs for developing solutions, and the enabling function on legitimacy formation. In particular the diversity of resources is seen as an enabler of social innovation (The Young Foundation, 2012). Organisations that can tap a greater variety of tangible as well as intangible resources are likely to be better able to meet the complexity of social challenges. Nemeth and Staw (1989) suggest that diversity and horizontal decision making are key factors in firms' innovation activities. Furthermore, the literature suggests that the stability of resources, sometimes rooted in resource diversity, enables organisations to be socially progressive and innovative in their domestic environment (Petrova & Tarrow, 2007). All of these aspects not only point to the mere availability of resources, but to effects of their employment, for instance the reduction of transaction costs in acquiring and processing information and also of decision making as explored a while ago (Williamson, 1981). Williamson explicitly links to the meeting of social needs as a criterion of institutions' functionality analysis by the transaction costs approach (in relation to Simon, 1978).

*H 4: The lower the transaction costs an organisation incurs, the higher is its social innovativeness.*

Several of the above considerations are directly related to some form of voluntary engagement, in particular the issues of resource diversity, the influx of new ideas and the proximity to target groups point to civic engagement as a critical resulting moderator of social innovativeness. Voluntary engagement (be it in the form of classical volunteerism or the involvement of customers in product development, that is forms of open innovation Chesbrough, 2003) increases the likelihood that societal problems which need to be addressed will be identified. Voluntary activity levers an organisation's connectivity, and the involved volunteers act as links into society and will thereby assist in the transmission of innovation (Evers & Brandsen, 2016). Generally speaking, volunteers have larger networks than non-volunteers. Although this circumstance might be a little less pronounced in contexts of innovative organisations, it still may inform reasoning on the innovative capacity which emerges from voluntary engagement: of particular relevance to social innovation is having a strategic 'broker position' (Burt, 1997, 2004) between formalised organisations, their target groups and society at large.

*H 5: The higher the degree of voluntary engagement in an organisation, the higher its social innovativeness.*

In addition to organisation theory, innovation system theory can be helpful in defining enabling factors for social innovation. Innovation system theory embeds innovations in territorial clusters (Asheim, Lawon Smith, & Oughton, 2011; Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 2000; Lengyel & Leydesdorff, 2011; Leydesdorff, Dolfsma, & van der Panne, 2006; Leydesdorff & Fritsch, 2006; Mahroum & Al-Saleh, 2013, p. 321; Nicholls, 2013; Rodriguez-Pose & Comptour, 2012; Strand & Leydesdorff, 2013, p. 472). Systems of innovation are often defined by following Lundvall (1992, p. 2) as "elements and relationships which interact in the production, diffusion and use of new, and economically useful, knowledge." Asheim et al. (2011) stress the importance of placement therein and argue that knowledge is more easily shared in local contexts. The authors outline openness and connectivity of such systems as critical determinants of innovative capacity. Even in times of dynamic transfer and mobility of resources and capital, such properties are hard to develop and replicate. This is underscored by the relative failure of replicating Silicon Valley anywhere else in the world (Rosenberg, 2002; Saperstein & Rouach, 2002; Saxenian, 1994).



*H 6: The higher the local embeddedness of an organisation, the higher its social innovativeness.*

Finally, the aspect most closely connected to ‘standard’ innovation research focusing on technological and business innovation is the organisations’ ability to act independent from market, state or public pressures. Such relative freedom results in an increased ability to experiment and to test new ideas (Saxenian, 1994); this, in turn, is found to be a major source of innovation.

*H 7: The higher an organisation’s ability to act as independent from market, political or other pressures, the higher its social innovativeness.*

### 2.3. Organisational structure

Organisational research further indicates that the age of an organisation matters in developing and implementing innovation (Blättel-Mink, 2006; Cameron & Quinn, 1983), with newly established organisations supposedly possessing particular innovative capacity, if they manage to generate ties to existing knowledge clusters (see Fontes, 2005; Maurer & Ebers, 2006 on biotechnology start-ups). At the same time, and partly in contrast to the latter condition, organisations can profit from previous experience in the respective or related fields (compare for instance to the discussion of ‘born-global’ start-ups that depend on previous entrepreneurial experience Odorici & Presutti, 2013). In consequence, it seems beneficial if organisations have a rather long duration of engagement in a particular field, especially relative to the time of emergence of a particular innovation.

*H 8: The younger an organisation, the higher its social innovativeness.*

*H 9: The longer an organisation’s engagement in an organisational field (relative to the emergence of innovative developments in the field), the higher its social innovativeness.*

Table 1 indicates which hypotheses have been derived from previous research on technological innovation with little modification and which of them are influenced by the particular character of social innovation.

**Table 1 Definitions and hypotheses**

Hypotheses (Codes)	Related primarily to Social Innovation	Derived from Technological Innovation
H 1 social needs	X	
H 2 pro-social values	X	
H 3 external openness	X (exceptionally high)	
H 4 transactions costs		X
H 5 voluntary engagement	X	
H 6 local embeddedness	X (exceptionally high)	
H 7 independence from pressures		X
H 8 age		X
H 9 engagement in field		X

Hypotheses 1 and 2 point to a normative grounding of social innovation. Hypothesis 3 underlines the (higher degree) of organisational openness that is required by its more complex and less governable nature. Hypotheses 5 and 6 exemplify the social grounding, which is needed for social innovation. Hypotheses 4, 7, 8 and 9 in turn don’t mark a specific difference between social and technological innovation.

### 3. Methodology

The hypothesis testing is based on empirical research from cross-national and multi-field case study research (Eisenhardt, 1989) of recognised social innovation streams (SI streams) across Europe. ‘SI stream’ refers to new approaches, principles of action, governance forms or modes of organisation that have fundamentally affected a field of activity, and already for a certain period of time (at least for five years back from the date of the research) and across national borders, so that they are not geographically restricted. We use the term ‘SI stream’ instead of simply social innovation to point out that we look at broad developments rather than singular or restricted innovation events. The SI streams have been studied by cross-national teams across nine European countries (Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Sweden, Spain, The Netherlands, and UK). They are based in seven fields of activity: culture & arts; social services; health care; environmental sustainability; consumer protection; work integration; and community development. A shared social innovation stream has been compared across three to four countries in each of the seven fields. The field-country combinations have been chosen by (1) the rationale of representing the diversity of Northern, Southern, Eastern and Western Europe, (2) the relevance of the individual SI stream and the field as a whole within the respective countries, (3) and national institutional structures.

The studied SI streams have been selected in a two-step consultation of national and international experts from academia, policy and practice among a range of several alternatives that had been derived from previous research.

**Table 2 Social innovation streams**

Field	SI stream	Countries
Arts & Culture	Arts for spatial rejuvenation	Italy, France, Spain, The Netherlands
Social Services	New governance arrangements for serving the most vulnerable	Italy, Spain, Sweden, UK
Health	The recovery approach to mental health	Czech Rep., France, UK, Denmark
Environmental Sustainability	Promotion of bicycle use in urban contexts	Czech Rep., Denmark, Germany, Italy
Consumer protection	Online financial education	Czech Rep., Spain, Denmark
Work integration	Cross-sector partnerships	Czech Rep., Germany, France, Spain
Community develop.	Self-organised community development with refugees	Czech Rep., Italy, The NL, UK

Table 2 illustrates the empirical setup in terms of fields, SI streams and countries. Due to the breadth of the national geographic context further specifications have been made. The cases in arts & culture (spatial rejuvenation), environmental sustainability (promoting public spaces for stimulating bicycle use) and community development (local self-organised local integration of refugees) have been investigated in a specific city to make sure that a dense description of the context was possible. The others in contrast were located at the national level. The analyses in consumer protection (online financial education) and work integration (cross-sector partnerships) have focussed on specific initiatives, online platforms or partnerships respectively that best embodied the SI stream. The ones in social services (new governance arrangements for serving the most vulnerable) and health (the recovery approach in mental health treatment) identified a number of different activities and actors that were involved in driving the practice or establishing new organisational forms respectively.

Since this is and has been performed in other outputs (deliverables 4-7.1 and 8.2) we do not cover the selection process or detailed insights from the extensive case-based research performed. We can however illustrate how the research has been performed. The main method used was that of ‘process tracing’ (Collier, 2011; George & Bennett, 2005), which has originated in political science. There it is used to study how legislation has come into being. More specifically the method requires researchers to start from for instance a newly passed legislation and then look backwards to understand several issues, including: Who has been involved in proposing, revising and pushing the legislation through? Which were the milestones that the legislation has passed in the process? Which alternative routes could the legislation have taken at several crossroads and who or what was involved in driving the legislation down the path it has actually taken?

We have posed the very same questions as regards our social innovation streams, starting at their present state and then tracing them back in time in order to find out which (types) of organisations have contributed to their emergence and how they have done so. The actors involved in promoting the innovations were studied in the context of the ‘strategic action fields’ (Fligstein & McAdam, 2012) they inhabit, with a view to their power positions, functions and missions. The process tracing has drawn on a variety of qualitative sources of information: (1) interviews with experts within the organisations and such that had general ‘external’ knowledge of the innovations, for instance researchers (employing a common but thematically adapted and structured interview guide as well as some questionnaire items); (2) desktop research; (3) document analysis (for instance of policy documents); (4) available literature on the specific innovations in their geographic settings. The research instruments have been designed so as to test the formulated hypotheses.

### 3.1. Quantification of the research

Based on insights generated in the case-based research the team members were asked to complete a quantitative dataset for a ‘qualitative comparative analysis’ (QCA) (Ragin, 1989, 2000; Rihoux & Ragin, 2009). The quantitative table contained for each organisation identified and studied: (1) a judgement by the researchers in how far the respective organisation was and is marked by the traits contained in the hypotheses, and (2) its contribution to the outcome, namely to which level it had added to the social innovation stream. All entries of the table have been made in a ‘fuzzy set’ format (as opposed to a ‘crisp set,’ that is a dichotomous coding), rating each item on a scale between 0 (meaning ‘not at all’) and 1 (‘very high’), with intervals at 0.25 (low) and 0.75 (high). Table 3 is an excerpt of said QCA table.

**Table 3 QCA Data table excerpt**

Hypotheses & Outcome/ Organisation	H 1 Social needs orientation (Socne)	H 2 Pro-social value sets (Proso)	...	Outcome Contribution to SI stream (Outcome)
Organisation A	1	0.75	...	0.75
Organisation B	0	0.25	...	0.25
...	...	...	...	...

The coding has been performed along a guide, which specified coding criteria. The hypothesis on pro-social values shall serve as an example for all other variables: Value sets can be assessed by analysing mission statements. For instance action based on religious or ethical motives can be differentiated from motives of commercial professionalism such as customer satisfaction or

product excellence, or a sense of bureaucratic duty. Pro-social values comprise notions of solidarity and caring for others (including caring for the environment). Social needs orientation increases the likelihood of having pro-social values and vice versa, but there are no clear directional associations. Social needs may for instance be addressed with the hope of benefiting from the improved situation of a needy target group, for instance in 'base-of-the-pyramid business' (Prahalad & Hammond, 2002). Such activity would thus be social needs oriented, but not necessarily based on pro-social values. At the same time a pro-social value based organisation might want to care for needy target groups but miss addressing their immediate social need. This is the case where food banks provide immediate remedy to hunger but don't (additionally) promote individuals' ability to sustain themselves by moving out of homelessness. If the organisation acts mainly on the basis of pro-social values, they are central for the organisation (code 1). If the organisation is dominated by pro-social values, but other values are also important, e.g. market values, code 0.75. If pro-social values are dominated by other values but are still identifiable, code 0.25. Code 0, if no pro-social values are identified. The coding has been performed by those researchers directly involved in the case work. Two coders have performed it independent of each other. Where assessments deviated, where feasible they were discussed with team members and decided on collectively.

Overall our data set includes 129 organisations that have been identified in the process tracing as playing a larger or lesser role in the SI stream within the specific scope of the respective case research. In some few cases we have also studied settings where the innovation did not occur in a country or only rudimentary so. The studied organisations in consequence didn't contribute to the social innovation, but their study could provide insights on which factors might have to be absent to enable innovation or those that are irrelevant. The distribution of the outcome, namely the contribution to the SI stream was: no contribution (4%), low contribution (27%), high contribution (34%), very high contribution (35%). Among the involved organisations were 79 non-profits (62%), 25 for-profits (19%) and 25 public agencies (19%).

### **3.2. QCA analysis**

Since the number of our cases was too small and our analysis intended to test for the effects of combinations of conditions (or their absence), apart from the statistics mentioned below to inform the selection of hypotheses (factor analyses and logistic regressions to identify the conditions with highest possible explanatory potential), no full regression analysis has been carried out. By means of a QCA analysis instead we proceeded as follows. Based on the full QCA table, which contained 15 variables (hypotheses) and the outcome (contribution to SI stream)<sup>2</sup> we have performed explorative data analyses with the aim of reducing the number of variables to be tested in the QCA. The reason is that the number of potential combinations in QCA solution terms is  $2^n$ . With 15 conditions this would have led to more than 32,700 potential combinations. Therefore we have first done a theory based and intuitive grouping of variables and then performed explorative factor analyses. With both of this together we arrived at clusters of variables that loaded on common factors. We have dropped variables with lower factor loadings in favour of those with higher factor loadings. In addition to this and to cross-check, we have computed correlations between the 'competing' variables and logistically regressed the variables to the outcome. We did this to make sure we didn't dismiss any

---

<sup>2</sup> Please note, although the outcome was coded as a fuzzy set, we have reduced it to a crisp set in the analysis for simplification. Thus, we only reduced the data to 'no contribution' or 'very high contribution' to the SI stream.

variables of significant influence or such that seemed interesting since they didn't behave as suggested by theory, for instance had a negative association with the outcome although we would expect a positive one or did not correlate with other variables that were thematically similar. The nine hypotheses presented initially are only those that have remained. We have dismissed further hypotheses on: open internal organisational culture, recognition of social innovation as a concept within the organisation (both behaviour); resource diversity, social capital, ability to combine advocacy and service provision (all resources); organisational size (structure). In addition to the nine hypotheses we test the sector affiliation of the studied organisation as to its influence.

The goal of QCA is to identify conditions or combinations of conditions (here: our variables/hypotheses on organisational traits that promote social innovativeness) that are necessary or sufficient for the outcome (contribution to the SI stream) (Wagemann & Schneider, 2015). In view of the still considerable complexity of our 9 conditions, we have chosen to analyse the data by a 'two-step' approach, which distinguishes between remote and proximate conditions (Schneider & Wagemann, 2006). Remote factors are rather (1) stable over time and (2) not easily or not at all modifiable by the actors. Proximate factors are the opposite and thus (1) more flexible and due to change over time, and (2) can be shaped by the actors. Table 4 allocates our hypotheses to the two categories.

**Table 4 Remote and proximate conditions**

Hypothesis	Remote / Proximate
H 1 Social needs (socne)	Proximate
H 2 Pro-social values (proso)	Remote
H 3 External openness (extoo)	Proximate
H 4 Transaction costs (trans)	Proximate
H 5 Voluntary engagement (vol)	Proximate
H 6 Local embeddedness (loc)	Proximate
H 7 Independence from pressures (ind)	Remote
H 8 Age (age)	Remote
H 9 Engagement in Field (eng)	Remote

The two-step approach helps reduce 'logical remainders,' that is possible combinations of conditions which cannot be found empirically in the dataset, by testing fewer conditions at a time. The procedure is as follows. First, we disregard the difference between remote and proximate conditions and test whether we have any conditions that are necessary for the outcome. These we exclude from the further analysis, since they are always present when the outcome occurs. With the remaining set of variables we first analyse only those factors we consider remote. This analysis yields conditions that are contextual in their character and make the outcome possible by enabling proximate conditions to work. They seem significant (this does not mean they are necessary). The factors considered proximate are then tested together with the remote factors highlighted as important for the analysis. Each pre-identified remote factor is tested with all proximate factors. By this we arrive at solution terms of sufficient conditions, in which remote factors may or may not reoccur. If the respective remote factor does not reoccur in the final term, it seemed relevant but turned out to be not sufficient.

A robustness test was carried out to test the stability of results. First, the classification of factors as being remote and proximate was varied where reasonable and the analysis re-run to detect changes this would cause. Following the same rationale, analyses were completed several times while leaving out certain conditions. Both did not lead to significant differences in the results, so that we can say with confidence that the ones presented are reliable solution

terms that depend little on choices made, both as regards the classification and the selection of conditions. Furthermore, when testing for instance for the necessity of a condition, conservative, that is high thresholds were applied throughout to ensure robustness and comparability of claims.

It is to be remarked that in our testing we cannot claim to detect causation. Although our cases were marked by a varied degree of actor involvement in social innovation, we have only studied 'successful' social innovations and only indirectly gathered insights into conditions that lead to failure. Extending our sample in this regard could fortify our claims as regards causality, as would a random sampling of innovations, which at present is near impossible due to the emergent state of an inventory of recognised and systematically discussed social innovations. Our results thus mainly point at existing relations between the social innovation outcome (contribution to the innovation) and particular traits.

#### **4. Results**

We had initially suspected that a step-wise aggregation of insights on combinations of necessary and sufficient conditions would be possible across at least clusters of fields. One would for instance expect that SI streams in health care and in social services and the actor traits needed to promote them would be very similar. This supposition was not confirmed in our analysis. Results differed significantly from each other in cross-field comparison, which is why we decided to report them separately for each field. This does not mean that there are no common trends that we could outline, which we will do later in the discussion. Now we present findings in each field in the order initially introduced, which corresponds to the work structure of our project. All observations are discussed in relation to Table 5, which summarises the results for all of our seven fields.



**Table 5 Solution terms organisational traits per field (continued on next page)**

Sufficient conditions for SI stream in Arts & Culture				
NC: socne, age	<b>eng</b> *~vol*extoo*~trans*loc	<b>eng</b> *vol*extoo*trans*loc	vol*~extoo*~trans*loc	
<i>Consistency</i>	1	1	1	
<i>Raw coverage</i>	0.42	0.47	0.26	
<i>Unique coverage</i>	0.32	0.32	0.11	
<i>Solution consistency: 0.89 / Solution coverage: 1</i>				
Sufficient conditions for SI stream in Social Services				
NC: socne, proso	<b>~ind</b> *age*loc*trans*extoo	~vol*loc*~trans*extoo	<b>state</b> *eng*~vol*~loc*~trans*extoo	<b>state</b> *eng*vol*loc*trans*extoo
<i>Consistency</i>	0.92	0.81	0.88	0.88
<i>Raw coverage</i>	0.23	0.26	0.14	0.14
<i>Unique coverage</i>	0.09	0.12	0.14	0.14
<i>Solution consistency: 0.87 / Solution coverage: 0.42</i>			<i>0.93/0.23</i>	
Sufficient conditions for SI stream in Health Care				
NC: socne, proso, loc	extoo*~trans	vol*extoo	<b>ts</b> *eng*~vol*extoo*~trans	vol*extoo*trans
<i>Consistency</i>	0.90	0.88	1	1
<i>Raw coverage</i>	0.45	0.71	0.19	0.62
<i>Unique coverage</i>	0.12	0.38	0.05	0.48
<i>Solution consistency: 0.90 / Solution coverage: 0.88</i>			<i>1/0.71</i>	

Abbreviations: socne=social needs; proso=pro-social values; extoo=external openness; trans=transaction costs; vol=voluntary engagement; loc=local embeddedness; ind=independence from pressures; age=age of organization; eng=(length of) engagement in field  
 Explanations: NC=necessary conditions; **remote factors** (if occurring in solution) marked in bold; \*='and'; ~='absence of condition'.

Sufficient conditions for SI stream in Environmental Sustainability

NC: proso	<b>state*eng</b> ~vol*loc~trans*~socne	loc*extoo*socne	~vol*loc~trans*extoo	~vol*loc*trans*socne
<i>Consistency</i>	1	0.95	0.92	1
<i>Raw coverage</i>	0.20	0.70	0.39	0.23
<i>Unique coverage</i>	0.03	0.24	0.02	0.04
<i>Solution consistency: 0.90 / Solution coverage: 0.88</i>				

Sufficient conditions for SI stream in Consumer Protection

NC: ~state, proso	<b>ts*vol</b> *loc*extoo*socne	<b>ts*trans</b> *loc*extoo*socne		
<i>Consistency</i>	1	1		
<i>Raw coverage</i>	0.55	0.50		
<i>Unique coverage</i>	0.18	0.13		
<i>Solution consistency: 1 / Solution coverage: 0.68</i>				

Sufficient conditions for SI stream in Work Integration

NC: -	<b>ind*eng</b> *loc*extoo*socne	~vol*extoo*socne	~vol*trans*extoo	
<i>Consistency</i>	0.97	0.96	0.89	
<i>Raw coverage</i>	0.41	0.69	0.61	
<i>Unique coverage</i>	0.09	0.04	0.02	
<i>Solution consistency: 0.85 / Solution coverage: 0.87</i>				

Sufficient conditions for SI stream in Community Development

NC: ~market, socne, proso	loc*extoo	loc*vol	trans*extoo*vol	
<i>Consistency</i>	0.94	0.93	1	
<i>Raw coverage</i>	0.81	0.84	0.68	
<i>Unique coverage</i>	0.07	0.09	0.04	
<i>Solution consistency: 0.85 / Solution coverage: 0.93</i>				

Abbreviations: socne=social needs; proso=pro-social values; extoo=external openness; trans=transaction costs; vol=voluntary engagement; loc=local embeddedness;

ind=independence from pressures; age=age of organization; eng=(length of) engagement in field

Explanations: NC=necessary conditions; **remote factors** (if occurring in solution) marked in bold; \*='and'; ~='absence of condition'.

The table in the first column and first line reports the necessary conditions for each field, which for that reason have been excluded from the further analysis. It then reports the combination of conditions (several solution terms) that are sufficient for the innovation. As described above, sufficient conditions are tested for each pre-identified remote condition separately (compare Table 4 for the conditions considered remote and those considered proximate). If remote conditions reoccur in the final solution terms, they are marked in bold in that term. All conditions not marked in bold are proximate ones. When two remote conditions (or combinations of more than one condition) were identified, as in social services and health care, the solution consistency and solution coverage are indicated separately for each *set* of solution terms that relate to the respective (combination of) remote condition(s).<sup>3</sup> Please note that for social services, health care, environmental sustainability and work integration we are not displaying all possible final solution terms to reduce the complexity in the presentation of results. We have skipped those solution terms that provided the lowest raw coverage, that is the lowest explanatory potential. The solution consistency and solution coverage listed, however, always refer to the full set of possible solution terms.

Some terminological clarifications: ‘Consistency’ measures the level by which identified necessary or sufficient conditions (or combinations thereof; here: organisational traits) are related to the outcome (contribution to SI stream). It resembles ‘significance’ in statistical models. The (combination of) conditions identified in QCA are usually ‘quasi-necessary’ or ‘quasi-sufficient’ in that the relation between them and the outcome is strong in the majority of cases, but some cases still deviate from this pattern. Consistency values range from ‘0’ to ‘1,’ with ‘0’ indicating no consistency and ‘1’ indicating perfect consistency (Ragin, 2006). Consistency in Table 5 is indicated for each solution term, then labelled ‘consistency’ and for the entire set of solution terms, then labelled ‘solution consistency.’ Once it has been established that a condition or combination of conditions is consistent, ‘coverage’ (also ranging between 0-1) provides a measure of empirical relevance. The analogous measure in statistical models would be  $R^2$ , the share of variance in the outcome explained by the tested variable. Coverage just as consistency can relate to the entire set of solutions or each individual solution term. In the latter case the ‘raw coverage,’ gives the extent to which each solution term can explain the outcome (contribution to SI stream). While raw coverage includes cases, for which the outcome could also be explained by an alternative solution term, ‘unique coverage’ gives the proportion of empirical observations (links between actor traits and outcome) which can be explained *exclusively* by that term (Legewie, 2013). Necessary conditions are also tested for consistency and coverage, which we however don’t report. For a condition to be sufficient it has to have a consistency of  $>.9$  and a coverage of  $>.5$ . Finally, ‘\*’ denotes a logical ‘and,’ and ‘~’ marks the absence of a condition.

#### 4.1. Arts & culture

In *arts & culture* social needs orientation and age (here: younger organisations) are a necessary conditions. Somewhat paradoxically the remote condition of long engagement has been identified as a sufficient condition in terms 2 and 3, and those have a significantly greater raw coverage (0.42 and 0.47) than term 1 (0.26). However, it is to be stressed that the variable of engagement has been assessed in relation to the emergence of the innovation. Since *arts based*

---

<sup>3</sup> The column in which the solution consistency/coverage are given marks the second remote factor (combination) and the corresponding solution terms of sufficient conditions.

*place rejuvenation in urban contexts* at least in some of the countries analysed is a relatively recent phenomenon, it is possible that organisations that were newly founded were engaged from the beginning in creating the social innovation stream. In turn this means that long established incumbents, such as museums, might not have played a major role therein. Volunteering, external organisational openness and low transaction costs also play a role in the solution terms. Note the interaction with long engagement. Long engagement, where it is present, seems to be able to compensate for the absence of volunteering and high transaction costs (here: the absence of low transaction costs; see first term), while the presence of volunteering and low transaction costs increase the explanatory potential of the solution (second term). Term 3 indicates when long engagement does not occur and transaction costs are high, volunteering can compensate for both to a degree. The outcome is still possible, but less often observed (lower raw coverage of term 3). High external organisational openness is favourable (see terms 2 and 3). While the outcome is possible with low external openness (its absence in term 3), the combination of conditions then has a lower explanatory potential than when it is present. High local embeddedness is part of all three solution terms. There might be an interaction with external openness and volunteering, but most likely the condition is promoted due to the fact that the SI stream has been studied within one specific urban context in each country.

#### **4.2. Social services**

The SI stream in *social services* necessitates social needs orientation and pro-social values. One of the remote conditions are organisations of a young age, which are however not independent from external pressures (term 1). This looks like some public, private or non-profit spin-off from an incumbent engaged in or created in the establishment of *new governance arrangements for serving the most vulnerable*. These organisations need to be locally embedded, marked by high external openness and low transaction costs. All of this points in fact to a spin-off. However, another type of organisation plays a major role here too (term 2). One that is locally embedded, and highly open, but with high transaction costs and no volunteering. For these entities a young age and independence from pressures does not play a role (the remote condition is not sufficient within this combination). This could be a public agency. We say *could*, since in the solution term sector affiliation is no sufficient condition. However, this supposition is supported when we look at the second remote factor combination, namely that of a state agency with long engagement in the field (terms 3 and 4). For the latter volunteering, local embeddedness and transaction costs play some role, but it makes almost no difference whether they are high or low, since both combinations explain the outcome to the same extent (raw coverage 0.14). Taken together the spin-off makes for 0.23 of raw coverage while the (supposedly public sector) incumbent provides a raw coverage of  $0.14+0.14(+0.26)$ . In any case external openness is indispensable, since it occurs in all terms. We have tested whether it could be considered a necessary condition, but the consistency value was too low for that.

#### **4.3. Health care**

In *health care* external openness is present in all solution terms, but unlike social needs orientation, pro-social values and local embeddedness it is not a necessary condition. The necessity of local embeddedness is striking, since the SI stream in the field, namely the *recovery approach in mental health treatment* represents a universal principle focusing on the self-healing ability of patients, which we would expect not to be locally bound. Local connections however seem to play a role in making it common practice. External openness, though not necessary is part of all sufficient terms. It seems to be able to compensate for high transaction costs (term 1; raw coverage=0.45), while if additionally paired with volunteering its explanatory potential increases (term 2; raw coverage=0.71). These two terms have emerged against the

engagement of state organisations with high independence from external pressures. This combination of remote conditions has however not proved to be sufficient in the testing and does therefore not appear in the solution terms. The remote pair of third sector activity of long engagement has in contrast been sufficient in combination with external openness and without being dependent on volunteering (term 3). The raw coverage of the latter term (0.19) is however lower than that of volunteering, external openness and low transaction costs in combination (term 4; raw coverage=0.62), which in turn is lower than that of term 2 that is the same as term 4, but does not depend on low transaction costs. Thus, the analysis suggests volunteering in combination with external openness—note their might be strong interconnections between the two—were most important for the innovation.

#### **4.4. Environmental sustainability**

In *environmental sustainability* only pro-social values turned out to be necessary. It is likely that because local traffic planning is state-directed, state involvement paired with long engagement has emerged as a remote factor for *promoting bike use*. It has however only been sufficient in combination with local embeddedness and in the absence of all three, volunteering, social needs orientation and low transaction costs (term 1). Alternative roads to the innovation were established through actors with high social needs orientation, high local embeddedness and high external openness (in fact highest raw coverage=0.7; term 2). This likely corresponds to a third sector organisation. This also holds for term 4, which yields the same combination of factors, only with the absence of volunteering. The third sector organisations engaged in the innovation were in fact found not to rely on volunteers substantially in the qualitative in-depth investigation. Term 3 in turn points to the fact that also other organisations, potentially firms or quasi-public entities have played a role. For this type of organisation social needs orientation did not play a role (does not occur). It did not employ volunteers and had high transaction costs, while it was externally open and locally embedded. This could be the case for a firm entering the field to provide a bike-sharing system for instance, or for a newly founded brokering quasi-public organisation with coordinative functions, of which we found evidence in the case analyses.

#### **4.5. Consumer protection**

*Consumer protection* shares the necessary condition of pro-social values with environmental sustainability, but in contrast to the latter was marked by the absence of state engagement, while third sector engagement was a remote condition part of the sufficient solution terms. These organisations additionally had to be social needs oriented, externally open and locally embedded (both terms). Due to their reoccurrence the latter conditions were each re-tested for necessity, but it was not confirmed. The outcome seems to depend on the combination of these conditions in which they become sufficient. Note the relevance of local embeddedness for a service provided online, *consumer education for the use of alternative financial products*. It could be that the provision of the service has to be backed by a coalition of locally embedded actors to gain legitimacy or reach a certain size and scope. This thought is supported by the outcomes of the case studies which suggest that online projects of financial education often rely on civil society organisers with a certain level of recognition, who are known in communities and have a profound network of stakeholders. Through these contacts it is expected that users will (1) find out about a specific consumer protection project or service, (2) trust the information provided online. Besides, online information could be complemented by personal tutoring and advice. Volunteering (term 1) or low transaction costs (term 2) are important too. The provision of expertise by experienced corporate volunteers from the financial industry has actually emerged from the case work. Low transaction costs, in gathering and distributing knowledge

for instance (here: consumer advice) might just be the other version of such volunteer engagement.

#### **4.6. Work integration**

Our investigation of the *work integration* SI stream, namely *cross-sector partnerships for bringing disadvantaged groups into the labour market*, did not yield any necessary conditions. The remote condition of high independence from external pressures paired with long engagement was found to be sufficient if further combined with local embeddedness, high external organisational openness and social needs orientation (term 1). This would point to third sector organisations that had gathered expertise in working with refugees or other disadvantaged groups. Those organisations which are strongly locally embedded and open to social needs are more likely to create strong and innovative partnerships: their access to and experience with said target groups made them critical enablers for linking the latter and the firms engaged in the studied cross-sector partnerships to provide employment. At the same time, the combination of remote conditions points at the difficulty of territorially anchored initiatives to scale up.

The aspect of independence from external pressures is likely not a generic trait of these organisations, but a condition located at the field level in this case. Also, the situation across countries regarding independence or dependence from external pressures is very diverse. For some countries external pressures are pronounced at the field level. In Germany for example, this might stem from the urgency of integrating refugees into the labour market that resulted from the current surge of asylum seekers in Europe or the prominence of combating unemployment more generally, both of which have increased the availability of financial resources in the field. Unlike other forms of help for the disadvantaged, the non-profit organisations trying to promote work integration did not significantly depend on volunteer engagement, which is why it is unsurprising that the absence of volunteering has emerged in the other two terms (2 and 3). The absence of volunteering combined with high external openness and either social needs orientation or low transaction costs provided an even higher raw coverage than the first term (0.69 for term 2 and 0.61 for term 3). Both could also point to firms, which as reported by interviewees had experienced a redirection toward addressing social needs through public pressures, for instance triggered by the ‘refugee crisis,’ or to state agencies that were forced to act more dynamically by similar public pressures.

#### **4.7. Community development**

Along with social needs orientation and pro-social values, the absence of market actors have emerged as necessary conditions in *community development*, more specifically *self-organised community building and integration of refugees*. The condition of non-market actors is a logical consequence of the fact that no market actors were found to be engaged in the field at all. However, this might be due to the selection of the cities studied in the field. The sufficiency of local embeddedness in terms 1 and 2, or the enabling role of external organisational openness or volunteering in the two solution terms is also of little surprise. Studying interactions between the latter two conditions is more interesting. Questions and suggestions arise, such as: Can external openness, for instance membership in informal or formal networks or umbrella organisations, be substituted by volunteering, or is the one dependent on the other? Both reoccur in term 3 in addition to low transaction costs. The raw coverage of the third term is however lower than that of the other two (0.68 as compared to 0.81 and 0.84), which in fact suggests substitution instead of a mutual leverage, since both in combination cannot make up for local embeddedness. The capacity of doing so seems to depend on low transaction costs. But low transaction costs might also be a result of the two. Term 3 sketches a public or non-profit



entity that is active across individual local initiatives, whereas terms 1 and 2 rather point to actors whose scope of activities is locally restricted.

## 5. Discussion

Although our results differ remarkably across fields, there are also common trends which emerge in relation to our hypotheses. These become apparent when we display the relevance of hypotheses based on their occurrence our QCA analysis and the interpretation above. Some conditions have not emerged in the solution terms of sufficient conditions or as necessary conditions at all. This suggests that they are irrelevant in view of the respective SI stream. Other conditions were spotted only in some of the terms within in the solution set, but not in others. Or they appeared in several terms but both as being present (that is with the tendency formulated in the hypotheses, for instance ‘low transaction costs,’ or ‘many volunteers’) and as being absent (that is in the reverse of that tendency). Both cases point to the relevance of these conditions, but their influence is unclear or varied by other conditions. Finally, we identified conditions that were clearly necessary or sufficient for the outcome, or whose absence was. Table 6 categorises the hypotheses according to this.

**Table 6 Overview of conditions’ occurrence (organisational traits)**

Conditions	SI stream in Arts & Culture	SI stream in Social Services	SI stream in Health	SI stream in Environmental Sustainability	SI stream in Consumer Protection	SI stream in Work Integration	SI stream in Community Development
H 1 [socne]	●●	●●	●●	○	●	●	●●
H 2 [proso]		●●	●●	●●	●●		●●
H 3 [extoo]	○	●	●	●	●	●	●
H 4 [trans]	○	○	○	○	●	○	●
H 5 [vol]	○	○	○	~●	●	~●	●
H 6 [loc]	●	○	●●	●	●	○	●
H 7 [ind]		○				○	
H 8 [age]	●●	○					
H 9 [eng]	●	○	○	○		○	

●● = necessary condition; ● = sufficient condition; ○ = varied condition; ~ = absence of condition

Abbreviations: socne=social needs; proso=pro-social values; extoo=external openness; trans=transaction costs; vol=voluntary engagement; loc=local embeddedness; ind=independence from pressures; age=age of organization; eng=(length of) engagement in field

Please note that technically QCA doesn’t allow us to speak of individual sufficient conditions. Only terms, that is combinations of conditions, can be sufficient (unless a single factor were to emerge as a solution). However, designating which conditions were sufficient in combination with others as done in Table 6, helps us identify those conditions or variables that would need closer inspection in future research and what that research would need to explore. We provide a concise set of interpretations from our analyses.

Two qualifying remarks upfront: First, all interpretations below refer not to the entire field of activity as such, but to the specific social innovation stream we identified within these fields. Second, in all our estimations we have to take into account a potential bias towards third sector organisations coming from the choice of the SI stream. For example, a focus on ‘self-organisation’ in the field of community development clearly prompted the presence of third sector organisations. Yet, these were the social innovations identified by experts and after all even the very definition of social innovation contains some elements, one would intuitively link to the third sector, such as pro-social values.

However, although the number of third sector organisations identified in the SI streams points to a major significance of the sector for social innovation, sector affiliation alone does not explain the outcome. Actor contributions to the innovation seem to depend more strongly on individual traits, whereby variables of organisational behaviour and resources are relatively more important than those of structure. In line with the definition of social innovation, social needs orientation seems indispensable. It appears in all innovations, mostly as a necessary condition. This could be regarded as a selection bias. However, the case in environmental sustainability calls for caution in making such a judgement. Here, the influence of social needs orientation is in fact unclear. Pro-social value sets are similarly important. Yet, while always necessary they are never sufficient and don't occur at all in work integration or arts & culture. Thus, while being socially minded is often helpful, it is not a prerequisite. External organisational openness is a major factor, and in all except for one case sufficient. Only in arts & culture it is varied by other variables, in our case most likely local embeddedness. All three, social needs, pro-social values and external openness, highlight the critical importance of organisational behaviour.

We find another very significant factor which however falls into the category of organisational resources, namely that of local embeddedness. It turned out to be sufficient or necessary in five of our seven cases, and even in fields where the innovation was embodied by a practice (health) or a service provided mainly online (consumer protection). The fact that it furthermore did not play a prominent role in social service or work integration could be grounded in that we analysed national initiatives without a specific local connection. Other resource related conditions were confirmed in their relevance, yet less clearly than local embeddedness. Transaction costs for example are highly relevant in view of social innovation, but their direction is ambiguous. In consumer protection, low transaction costs seem a particular asset that can hardly be compensated for by other conditions. Although low transaction costs seem to be similarly important in community development, here they could hardly be called an asset: looking in more detail into the situation in the field it turns out that with virtually no budget, low transaction costs are hardly a condition. Instead, they can be seen as an outcome. As self-organisation implies that costs can be minimised, it is not that 'low transaction costs made this innovation happen' but rather the other way around. The 'innovation allowed for low transaction costs'. In other fields the influence is more varied. High transaction costs can be buffered-off, for example by long engagement (arts & culture) or organisational size and supposedly actor power (social services). Volunteering is another condition that needs closer inspection. The fact that its absence was sufficient in environmental sustainability and work integration is most likely because the organisations studied did not employ volunteers. It does not mean that volunteering was actively hindering the innovation. On the contrary, volunteers were critically important community development. They were relevant in arts & culture, health and social services too, as well as in some activities in the field of consumer protection, but less uniformly. Finally, it seems we have to declare one of our resource-related hypotheses as rather irrelevant, namely that of independence from external pressures. One of the reasons for its emergence (and in a varied way) in only two cases might be that the variable tried to capture too large a variety of influences, or that it was too hard for our experts to assess the pressures organisations faced, in particular in comparison with other organisations. However, it might also suggest that pressures are just not that important, at least not as restrictors of innovation. In turn we have seen in the work integration example that public pressures can increase resources dedicated to a particular issue, with favourable consequences for innovation.

With regard to our structural conditions of age and duration of engagement, we have seen that they were relatively unimportant. Long engagement seemed to matter more than a young age so that social innovation, at least when considered at the stage where it has reached a certain

scope and recognition, seems in fact to rely more on experience and potentially existing contacts that result from it than on the establishment or entrance of new contesters. It is worth noting though that age was a necessary condition and long engagement a sufficient condition in arts & culture. Thus, the two are not necessarily contradictory. Also worth noting is that the influence of engagement was varied by other variables across the other fields it occurred in.

## **6. Conclusions**

Our study has provided the first cross-country, explanatory testing of organisational traits that drive social innovation. It has underlined some winning combinations of conditions, but also underlined that the investigation of social innovation must remain field-based, since uniform patterns across fields are yet to emerge or be identified. At the same time it has revealed those factors that had the most significant influence. In relation to some of them the analysis empirically confirmed their relevance, which to date had rested mainly on theoretical reasoning. Among them the necessity/sufficiency of a social needs orientation, and the necessity, but partly also the compensability of pro-social values. Our investigation has furthermore excavated the greater significance of organisational behaviour and organisational resources relative to variables of organisational structure. Related to the latter, but as another distinct finding, proximate factors, that is those that the organisation can modify pro-actively, were marked as more important than remote factors on which the organisation has little influence. This suggests that organisations, by initiating organisational change or by exploiting existing predispositions can choose to engage and shape social innovation. Finally, while highlighting the markedly stronger engagement of non-profits in social innovation—by mere numbers of actors identified as well as in the QCA results in some fields—our analysis has confirmed the suggested cross-sector nature of social innovation. This marks social innovation as an important and timely research focus across disciplines, theoretical approaches and traditions.

## Part II – Framework conditions

### 7. Introduction

Organisations are not the only factors that might influence social innovation. Wider framework conditions need to be taken into account, as also voiced in relation to the measurement of social innovativeness on the national level (Krlev, Bund, & Mildenberger, 2014). Within the ITSSOIN project we have taken several such context conditions into account: (1) national welfare regimes (deliverable 2.1); (2) media perceptions; and (3) citizen perceptions (the latter two in deliverable 2.3). Results on the perception dimensions have added to our understanding on how the third sector is seen, but provided little insights into social innovation and its connection to the third sector or other actors. The main reason for this is a severe lack of survey data or media reporting on the subject. As regards framework conditions we therefore relate and test only the national background within the respective fields investigated.

From previous research on both, the capacity of national welfare contexts and national (technological) innovation capacity, we have some indication of field variables that play a role in moderating such capacity. We draw on three distinct conceptual approaches: (1) Welfare regimes (Esping-Andersen, 1990); (2) Social origins theory (Salamon & Anheier, 1998); and (3) Varieties of capitalism (Hall & Soskice, 2001b). We use the different points of reference of each approach—(1) properties of national welfare regimes; (2) the scale of the third sector and the degree of civic engagement; and (3) coordination mechanisms of national economies—to derive hypotheses on relevant factors affecting social innovation capacity and activity within field-country combinations.

We test the hypotheses based on data that has been gathered in ITSSOIN's empirical investigation along with the information on actor traits used in Part I. All field conditions are by definition remote and hardly malleable through actor activity. Theoretically we might have thus integrated them as remote factors in the organisational analysis. However, this would have counteracted our rationale of keeping tested conditions at a level that does not produce an exorbitant number of potential combinations. Also, there probably will be interaction effects between organisational and field conditions. Yet, as theorised here and throughout the ITSSOIN project, the influence of field variables will distinct from that of organisational traits.

The supposition, which would have to be tested against a greater variety of SI streams and national institutional contexts, is that field conditions more strongly moderate the overall level of social innovation, while organisational traits determine activity and actor contributions to the social innovation. Since both these levels are connected, we use a new, combined outcome in testing the field/country conditions' relation to the social innovation: the combination of actor involvement in the SI stream (as used in the organisational level analysis) and a variable gauging the strength of the respective SI stream, also in cross-national comparison within a field. This yields an outcome that does not only account for actor activity but also for the (relative) strength of its product, namely the social innovation stream.

As per the organisational level analysis we find that aggregation of insights is not sensible across investigated fields. We therefore analyse and report the results for each field in turn. Also in parallel to the organisational level investigation though, we find that certain conditions seem more significant for social innovation than others. Third sector and state prevalence for example are more important than that of market actors. Civic engagement is an enabling factor of social innovation about as often as it is not. The domination of a field by professionals seems to play a vital role in moderating its function. Cross-sector collaboration, mostly between two

rather than all three sectors, emerges as a relevant factor even in fields where one would not expect it (health care or environmental sustainability). Low stratification in a field is beneficial more often than high stratification; the same goes for high decommodification over low decommodification. Thus, field conditions that tend towards inclusiveness and solidarity rather than selectiveness and marketization foster social innovation. Field dynamism seems stimulating, but not necessarily so in interventions that target vulnerable groups.

## **8. Field variables and degree of social innovation<sup>4</sup>**

As per the investigation of organisational traits we develop several hypotheses on how framework conditions, more specifically field characteristics influence the degree of social innovation (activity) in that field. We form hypotheses on three different levels: (1) sector prevalence and civic engagement; (2) marketization and social division; (3) field dynamism.

### **8.1. Sector prevalence and civic engagement**

The Social Origins Theory draws on previous conceptions of the importance of welfare state conceptions in assessing national capacity to provide stable and equitable welfare to their citizens, but suggests also that the social forces brought in by the existence of the third sector within these contexts is central (Anheier, 2014). Volunteering or civic engagement have typically been linked to the investigation of the third sector. The interest in moving from mere head-counts of engaged volunteers to the motivation of volunteers, the effects of volunteering on those that volunteer and of volunteering on society, including its effects on innovation, are relatively (Dekker & Halman, 2003; Mohan, 2011; Mohan, Twigg, Jones, Steve, & Barnard, 2006) to very new (WP3 of ITSSOIN). Just as the existence of third sector organisations though, volunteering through its linking capacity between such and other organisations on the one side and society on the other, is suggested as a factor that will influence the innovative capacity in a field within a national context.

This leads us to hypotheses related to the prevalence of sectors and the degree of engagement within fields of activity, with social innovation increasing where the third sector is more prevalent and civic engagement is high.

*H 1: The higher the relative prevalence of the third sector in a field, the stronger the social innovation.*

This in turn necessitates a reverse hypothesis on the other sectors.

*H 2: The higher the relative prevalence of state actors in a field, the weaker the social innovation.*

*H 3: The higher the relative prevalence of market actors in a field, the weaker the social innovation.*

---

<sup>4</sup> Just as in Part I, some of the following stems from previous deliverables (D 1.4 and D 2.1 in particular). However, in contrast to Part I all the text used here is original, since the hypotheses at the field level, drawn from several points of reference within the ITSSOIN project, had to be tailored more closely the QCA investigation than was necessary with regard to the hypotheses on organisational traits. The latter had been more elaborate and apt to a QCA testing to begin with and could be reused in almost unaltered fashion here.

We further posit:

*H 4: The higher the civic engagement in a field, the stronger the social innovation.*

At the same time we have to acknowledge a characteristic trait of social innovation that has been remarked in a variety of contexts, namely its cross-sectoral nature (Dahl et al., 2014; Nicholls & Murdock, 2012; The Young Foundation, 2012). Several studies on which we draw state the general importance of external openness (Hogan & Coote, 2014) and collaboration for innovation, e.g. in terms of knowledge inputs (Coleman's thinking on innovation in 1957/1966; Rogers, 2003; Vedres & Stark, 2010). Cross-sector collaboration implies such openness. Thereby, such a premise is not in contrast to the above hypotheses, since cross-sector involvement can also occur in fields that are predominantly populated by the one or the other sector. Also, it is highly unlikely that some field of activity will be dominated exclusively by any one sector and that no other is present.

*H 5: The higher the collaboration of actors across sectors in a field, the stronger the social innovation.*

## **8.2. Marketization and social division**

There are also other classifications that seem indicative as regards influence on social innovation within a field or national setting. One such classification is that of variations in national welfare state conceptions. The most prominent one comes from Esping-Andersen (1990), who has used the two dimensions of 'decommodification' to denote market pressures or marketization and 'stratification' to denote social pressures or social division within the welfare state.

Since our investigation is not placed at the national level across fields of activity, but rather at that of fields, investigated cross-nationally, but the importance of those dimensions remains untouched, we have transferred Esping-Andersen's reasoning to the field level. To gauge the level of decommodification, he uses: allocation mechanisms for state benefits by the level of deservingness, or the safeguarding of citizens against risks (Bonoli, 1997; Esping-Andersen, 1990, p. 47) versus more market-based, competitive allocation and lower levels of protection for needy groups. Stratification in turn relates to aspects such as class division, and status differentiation (Esping-Andersen, 1990, p. 55) and whether these play a role in whether citizens can gain access versus solidarity and equal access to valuable resources.

When thinking about which specific constellation in these two dimensions will be most favourable for social innovation, we arrive at the following: If we take seriously that social needs orientation, and to a lesser degree pro-social values enable social innovation (see findings at the organisational level), we would expect that field conditions marked by a high degree of social solidarity and equal participation, and thus low stratification, will be beneficial for social innovation. As regards the other dimension, a combination of cooperation and competition is found to mark the enterprising and socially innovative character of engaged actors (Krev, 2012). Transferred to the field level this means that decommodification would need to be moderate, since a high degree tips the scale towards cooperation and a low degree towards competition. This leads us to the following proposition:

*H 6: The lower the stratification in a field, the stronger the social innovation.*

*H 7: The social innovation is stronger, when the degree of decommodification is moderate rather than high or low.*



### 8.3. Field dynamism

Now that we have explored conceptions that refer to organisational populations and the prevalence of actor groups as well as the reflection of traits of national welfare regimes at the field level, we turn to a classification that deals with how innovation relates to the coordinative mechanisms in a country's economy and the (resulting) actor dynamics and trajectories within fields of activity.

The varieties of capitalism approach looks specifically at how coordinative mechanisms and field characteristics influence the degree and character of innovation happening in the field (Hall & Soskice, 2001a). The approach focusses on the degree by which market actors can operate at relative freedom from state intervention. Those states where this freedom high is have been labelled liberal market economies (LME). Their counter-part are coordinated market economies (CME). LMEs are said to foster radical innovations (i.e. of the business/technological kind), while incremental innovations will be more pronounced in CMEs.

Transferred to the subject of social innovation, its more bottom-up, participative character would suggest that social innovation is stronger, or more sustainable in CME settings. On the other hand, and in relation to our first hypotheses on sector prevalence and civic engagement, a strong state might hamper the evolvement of the latter, suggesting that LME settings would offer more favourable conditions. The combination of the two leads us to the intermediate state between the two: "LME-like" settings might be able to allow for freedom and engagement at the same time and thereby be most favourable. All the latter however are a matter of cross-national variations, whereas here we are interested in field characteristics that might differ across fields within countries. However, the varieties of capitalism approach has some implications that can more easily be transferred to the field level too, in particular in its revised 'dynamic' version.

The approach in the outfit proposed by Hall and Soskice has been criticised for its static nature. It compared the state countries were in at a specific point in time. Schneider and Paunescu (2012) in turn have proposed a 'dynamic version' and not only looked at the state of countries, but specifically at their trajectories. They find while some countries have remained in the same category for a long time, others have transformed rather radically from CME to LME or LME-like. These cases are identified as particularly interesting, since the dynamism involved is supposed to promote innovation. Field dynamism with regard to disruptive trajectories versus settled and stable states has been at the heart of the initial field descriptions across all ITSSOIN countries (deliverables 4-7.1). These criteria have been used to decide on promising field-country combinations, or counter-factual cases, for the in-depth investigation in deliverables 4-7.3. We therefore formulate a last hypothesis:

*H8: The higher the dynamism in a field, the stronger the social innovation.*

## 9. Methodology

The coding of field conditions has followed the same logic as laid out in relation to organisational traits. Also all specifics of the QCA methodology apply in the same way, except for the fact that we have not chosen a two-step approach here. The reason is quite obvious: Field conditions are by definition remote, that is not easily modifiable by the actors involved in the field. We therefore perform a one-step analysis. The way the results are reported and discussed, however equals the one of organisational characteristics.

Another difference is that we use an outcome measure that combines organisational contribution to the SI stream and the 'strength' of the latter. In contrast to 'contribution to the SI stream' outcome used previously in the investigation of organisational traits--coded as 0, 0.25, 0.75 or 1--the new outcome variable is coded in intervals of 0.2 ranging from 0 to 1, and therefore slightly more fine-grained. All field conditions to be tested were first allocated to the initial organisational sample of 129 actors based on the specific field-country combination the respective organisations were placed in and then tested against the combined outcome.

The reason for using the combined outcome in the testing of framework conditions is as follows: In the testing of organisational traits we want to identify (combinations of) those factors that enabled actors to be involved in/contribute to an established and recognised SI stream--at that point disregarding the relative (cross-national or cross-field strength) of the SI stream. As regards field conditions though, we want to see how they moderate both, the stimulation of organisational activity relating to/involvement in the SI stream and the capacity of actors within a given framework to create an SI stream of a certain strength.

Actors may be strongly involved in an innovation, but relatively speaking the innovation itself might be considered weak. Or actors might contribute little to an innovation, but one that is very strong. In order to be able to cover all such cases and combinations thereof we need the combined outcome. It is marked by increased variance as compared to the individual 'contribution to the SI stream' and is more demanding to meet, which means it is harder to find cases where actors have contributed a lot to a strong SI stream. This corresponds to the more fundamental nature of framework conditions relative to that of organisational traits. Contexts are more rigid, less malleable, more path-dependent and generally of a higher restrictive or stimulating character. Organisations can of course be innovative no matter what the context conditions, but unfavourable contexts make innovation less likely just as favourable ones promote it, and on a level that affects many or all organisations active in the context alike.

We have explained in detail how the contribution of organisations to an SI stream has been assessed. So we don't have to repeat it here. The strength of the SI stream, however needs some more explanation. The latter has been rated by the country-field experts within our research team in relation to a common set of guiding questions relating to (1) the significance of the SI stream within the field and (2) cross-national variations in the SI stream: Has the SI stream affected a wide scope of individuals/actors/principles within the field as a whole? Has the change brought by the innovation relative to the previous state of things been substantial? When has the SI stream emerged in one country relative to the others? How advanced is the SI stream at present in that country relative to the others? Is the SI stream in the country original or a mere copy of the model in another country where the SI stream has previously existed? All field conditions have been tested as to their influence on this combined outcome.

## **10. Results**

As per the testing of organisational traits it turned out that field conditions could not be aggregated based on similarities in the solution terms of several fields. These differed substantially as will be seen in the following. Each field of activity is discussed in turn. The results are reported in Table 6 below. The necessity of treating each field separately does not mean that we cannot condense finding as to those factors that seem more significant modifiers of social innovation than others. This aggregation of insights will be performed in the discussion.

The structure of the table is equivalent to that of Table 5. The necessary conditions are reported first, then the solution terms of sufficient conditions. The number of solution terms has been lower here than in case of the organisational traits, so that none had to be eliminated for simplification and all possible solutions are reported. All terminological clarifications apply in the same way as laid out before.

One major remark has to be made before we look at the results. In contrast to the organisational level testing, we see that the identification of necessary conditions is easier and more telling than the solution terms of sufficient conditions we arrive at. The reason is that per country we look at several actors within the same context conditions. When a solution term results, it represents the specific setup in one country, except for the field of community development where the constellations in three different countries have been identified as enabling the outcome. The analysis is still indicative of which conditions likely foster the outcome, but there is less room for interpretation through the existence and comparison of alternative pathways. Also we have cases where a high level of the combined outcome (high actor involvement and very strong innovation) is so rare (social services), or where equal conditions either do or do not lead to the outcome (work integration), so that we cannot find a solution term. When there is only one solution term of sufficient conditions this has implications for the statistical figures indicated in the table: (1) 'unique coverage' equals 'raw coverage', and each equals 'solution coverage'; (2) 'consistency' equals 'solution consistency.'

The fact that some countries emerge relative to others gives some indication of which of them seem to be the primary settings for social innovation (compare to our reasoning in deliverable 2.1), but we don't pursue this line of inquiry here, since it is not in the centre of interest. Rather we want to find out at a more general level which context conditions appear as favourable or unfavourable for social innovation.

**Table 6 Solution terms field conditions per field (continued on next page)**

Sufficient conditions for SI stream in Arts & Culture	
NC: prevts, ~prevm, csp	strat*decomm*~dyna*prevst*~prevce (only Spain remaining)
<i>Consistency</i>	0,8
<i>Raw coverage</i>	0,68
<i>Unique coverage</i>	0,68
<i>Solution consistency: 0,80 / Solution coverage: 0,68</i>	
Sufficient conditions for SI stream in Social Services	
NC: prevst, prevm, ~dyna, csp	no sufficient conditions identified, few cases where strength of innovation and actor contribution high
<i>Consistency</i>	
<i>Raw coverage</i>	
<i>Unique coverage</i>	
<i>Solution consistency: / Solution coverage:</i>	
Sufficient conditions for SI stream in Health Care	
NC: prevts, csp	~strat*decomm*dyna*~prevm*prevst*prevce (only UK remaining)
<i>Consistency</i>	0,81
<i>Raw coverage</i>	0,78
<i>Unique coverage</i>	0,78
<i>Solution consistency: 0,81 / Solution coverage: 0,78</i>	

Abbreviations: prevts=prevalence of third sector; prevce=prevalence of civic engagement; prevst=prevalence of state; prevm=prevalence of market; dyna=dynamism in field; decomm=decommodification in the field; strat=stratification; csp=cross sector partnerships  
 Explanations: NC=necessary conditions; \*='and'; ~='absence of condition'.

Sufficient conditions for SI stream in Environmental Sustainability

NC: prevst, ~strat	csp*decomm*dyna*~prevm*prevce*prevts (only DK remaining)
<i>Consistency</i>	0,86
<i>Raw coverage</i>	0,65
<i>Unique coverage</i>	0,65
<i>Solution consistency: 0,86 / Solution coverage: 0,65</i>	

Sufficient conditions for SI stream in Consumer Protection

NC: ~strat	~csp*decomm*dyna*~prevm*~prevst*~prevce*prevts (Only ES remaining)
<i>Consistency</i>	0,87
<i>Raw coverage</i>	0,72
<i>Unique coverage</i>	0,72
<i>Solution consistency: 0,87 / Solution coverage: 0,72</i>	

Sufficient conditions for SI stream in Work Integration

NC: prevst, ~strat, csp	no sufficient conditions identified, almost equal evidence that similar conditions may lead and may not lead to
<i>Consistency</i>	
<i>Raw coverage</i>	
<i>Unique coverage</i>	
<i>Solution consistency: / Solution coverage:</i>	

Sufficient conditions for SI stream in Community Development

NC: prevts, prevce	~csp*strat*~decomm*~dyna*~prevm*~prevst (UK case)	~csp*strat*decomm*dyna*~prevm*~prevst (CZ case)	csp*~strat*decomm*dyna*~prevm*prevst (NL case)
<i>Consistency</i>	0,96	0,85	0,84
<i>Raw coverage</i>	0,61	0,42	0,49
<i>Unique coverage</i>	0,23	0,01	0,2
<i>Solution consistency: 0,97 / Solution coverage: 0,85</i>			

Abbreviations: prevts=prevalence of third sector; prevce=prevalence of civic engagement; prevst=prevalence of state; prevm=prevalence of market; dyna=dynamism in field; decomm=decommodification in the field; strat=stratification; csp=cross sector partnerships  
 Explanations: NC=necessary conditions; \*='and'; ~='absence of condition'.

### 10.1. Arts & culture

In *arts & culture* the prevalence of the third sector, the absence of market actors and cross-sector partnerships plays a role. The latter mainly refer to a joint engagement of third sector and state actors. The latter show up in the solution term of sufficient conditions in relation to the most indicative case identified, which is that of Spain. We further see that a high level of stratification and a low level of decommodification seem favourable. Based on the qualitative insights gained on the SI stream of *spatial rejuvenation by means of arts*, we can say that the high level of stratification in this case does not mean it is favourable to discriminate against target groups. It rather means that the ground for innovative approaches—in particular for those that take explicit account of fostering social cohesion as is the case in the investigated SI stream—is particularly fruitful in contexts where that problem is pressing. The response to social exclusion, however, does not seem to lie in commercialisation, for instance acquiring more resources through professional fund raising, more earned income or other business principles, but in solidarity-driven action that tries to reach out to those target groups by more community-oriented, uncommercial means. The latter rest mainly on engaging excluded groups through professional work, since volunteering or civic engagement is not a relevant factor (or rather its absence is). Finally, we see that the specific innovation was able to thrive in a context marked by the absence of dynamism rather than its presence. This may be linked to the vulnerable or excluded nature of target groups, which was also the case in the social services SI stream, where the absence of dynamism was even a necessary condition. Serving these particular groups might benefit from stable rather than changing context conditions. This is different in the SI streams in some other fields.

### 10.2. Social services

The SI stream in *social services* entitled *new governance arrangements for serving the most vulnerable*, as just mentioned shares the characteristic of relative stability with the one in arts and culture. Another shared trait is the necessity of cross-sector partnerships. However, partnerships in this field were established mainly between state and market actors. Third sector organisations were relatively more unimportant for the innovation. Furthermore, we could not identify any further combinations of conditions that were sufficient for the outcome. As mentioned before the reason is that we found only few cases where the SI stream was strong and the actor contributions were high. This could not least be due to the fact that the investigated SI stream included a variety of particular initiatives that fall under the label of ‘new governance arrangements.’ In Spain and in England, yet with some variation on target groups, the shared theme was new models of providing care through telecommunication technology. In Sweden in contrast the team analysed the use of new ways of organising the engagement of volunteers (volunteer centres) in the provision of social services. The fourth case, in Italy, in turn dealt with new funding mechanisms (social investment) for the formation of new service providing entities. We assume that though manageable in the qualitative in-depth discussion, this spread of facets in the SI stream increased the difficulty in examining context conditions by QCA. What is more, one of the remarks made by the research team across the different embodiments of the SI stream, was that they all struggled to meet the sustaining stage (compare to Carruthers & Espeland, 1991, pp. 11ff.), meaning that the innovation is identifiable and recognised but still in flux and only on its way to standardisation.

### 10.3. Health care

In *health care* we again find cross-sector partnerships as a necessary condition paired with the prevalence of third sector actors in the field. As in arts and culture the partnerships are formed with the state, since the latter combined with the absence of market actors are part of the solution term of sufficient conditions. In contrast to arts and culture, though, in the field of



health and more specifically in the *recovery approach to mental health* civic engagement plays a pronounced role. As the term suggests the provision of the approach, more than its expert-driven establishment in psychological or medical practice, has been user- or peer led guided by the principle of promoting 'lived experience' and giving it equal if not more weight than professional expertise. The combination of sufficient conditions in the UK turns out to explain the outcome best. Here stratification is low (absence of stratification) and decommodification is high. Both traits likely stem from the fact that the provision of health care in the UK is regulated and mostly provided by the public National Health Service, which ensures equal access to health services and might serve as a buffer against commercialisation otherwise witnessed in the social sector in the UK. The scene is also marked by a rather dynamic development. The latter points at the leadership role the UK has taken in adopting the principle of the recovery approach shortly after it has been pioneered in the USA and imitated in Australia.

#### **10.4. Environmental sustainability**

In *environmental sustainability* low stratification and the prevalence of state actors come out as necessary conditions. Low stratification is likely due to the universal access granted through the establishment and maintenance of traffic infrastructure, but also the inclusive promotion efforts sought when *fostering the use of public spaces for biking*. The influence of state actors is then due to their regulative capacity in the field. More interesting here are the sufficient conditions. In particular that the state alone does not seem to be capable of promoting the social innovation, but that cross-sector collaboration has to come in. Denmark and specifically Copenhagen delivers the solution term in the analysis, which is unsurprising given its prominence as the 'bike capital' of Europe if not the world. In this context third sector prevalence and civic engagement are both significant, as is the minor role of market actors. As in health dynamism seems to serve a stimulating function, as does decommodification—the latter pointing at the relatively minor role of commercial bike-sharing offers against the stimulation of private bike use.

#### **10.5. Consumer protection**

*Consumer protection* is one of the few fields where cross-sector collaboration seems irrelevant, at least in view of *online education for the use of alternative finance services*. Rather this service is clearly driven by the third sector. State or market actors only played minor roles within the field, even though they had some relevance in terms of financing the innovation. The low level of stratification marks the targeting of people from all social classes, but more specifically the inclusion of those otherwise excluded economically and therefore particularly dependent on alternative financial services. The high level of decommodification denotes the counteraction of profiteering through financial services, not only as an aim of the education effort but also as a principle in the provision of the consumer protection service. Both are of major relevance in Spain (the resulting solution term) which was among the countries struck hardest by the financial crisis of 2008 and its consequences. The absence of civic engagement indicates that the online education is provided professionally rather than by volunteers; the high degree of dynamism that the scene has developed in rather clear contrast to the recovering of the mainstream economy, which has largely been laconic and far from complete – in itself supposedly one of the reasons that make consumer protection so badly needed in the first place.

#### **10.6. Work integration**

Our investigation of the work integration has focussed explicitly on cross-sector partnerships that foster the integration of disadvantaged people through transitional initiatives,

organisations or programs which target disadvantaged persons. Disadvantaged persons are long-term unemployed people (people whose time of being unemployed exceeds one year) with low qualification. Cross-sector partnerships in different countries focused on specific groups of people, on marginalised groups in general, including refugees, young people without or with poor education and job market prospects, or otherwise excluded groups such as prisoners. Therefore it is trivial in this case that cross-sector collaboration has been marked as a necessary condition. However, when reflecting this result with findings from the other fields where this condition emerged more independently, it does gain importance. Other conditions are more striking. Although we would expect firms to play a dominant role in the field, since they are the key to labour market integration, the prevalence of state actors is a necessary condition. This is congruent with insights from the in-depth case work. Many firms have previously been reluctant to contribute to the training and employment of the aforementioned target groups. Thus, it took the initiative of the state, partly large scale programmes, but more importantly specific, geographically restricted initiatives to lever firms' commitment. It must be noted however that the ways in which the public sector influenced the field were very different in the various countries – e.g., shaping favourable legal conditions (France), initiating the partnership (Germany) or supporting it locally (Spain). The necessity of stratification points to the importance of work integration efforts to be inclusive in terms of target groups. In many countries the range and scope of such initiatives has increased through the pressures created by the large number of people seeking refuge in Europe in the last years. Unfortunately our cases do not allow us to further identify sufficient conditions. In contrast to social services, this is not due to the fact that we have few cases marked by a strong innovation and strong involvement. Instead the circumstance stems from similar context conditions across the investigated countries that in some cases lead to the outcome, whereas they don't in others. This gives us no clear indication as regards decommodification, market and third sector prevalence, civic engagement or field dynamism.

## **10.7. Community development**

*Community development* is the only field in which three solution terms result. The conditions in the UK, the Czech Republic and the Netherlands all lead to the outcome. All share the prevalence of third sector and civic engagement in the field, but the other conditions mostly vary. The only stable sufficient factor is the absence of market actors, who are literally not engaged in the field at all, except for slightly so in the Italian case, which has however served as a counter-factual in the investigation. Due to Italy's role as a transit country *self-organised integration of refugees* is new to non-existent. If we consider the other countries more closely, we find hints of interaction effects. First of all we see that two fundamentally different models exist. The third sector acts mainly on its own in the UK and in the Czech Republic, whereas in the Netherlands the third sector works together with the state. Where the latter happens the field is less stratified. We suppose the engagement of the state helps the third sector spread its efforts more broadly and evenly, so that almost no groups remain excluded. This is not so particularly in the Czech Republic where a rather negative policy perception prevails against refugees, which the third sector needs to counter-act. The stratification in the UK in turn does not necessarily result from a negative image of refugees, but rather from the fact that funding by the state for integration initiatives is scarce and competitive. This seems to drive commodification (absence of decommodification) but counterintuitively also to reduce dynamism. Where the third sector acts on its own (Czech Republic) or jointly with the state (the Netherlands) decommodification is higher, but also field dynamism. Competitive tendering and the pressures exerted by it thus rather stymie than promote innovation in this case, independent of whether the stratification prevails in the field through negative policy and public perceptions (the Czech Republic) or not (the Netherlands, and due to recent developments probably less so the UK).

## 11. Discussion

As per the organisational Table 7 highlights which of the conditions we tested occurs in which ‘outfit’ (not identified, necessary, part of a sufficient combination as either present or absent, varied) across the seven fields of activity. Based on this we can suggest which conditions seem to matter most and in which outfit.

**Table 7 Overview of conditions’ occurrence (field conditions)**

Conditions	SI stream in Arts & Culture	SI stream in Social Services	SI stream in Health	SI stream in Environmental Sustainability	SI stream in Consumer Protection	SI stream in Work Integration	SI stream in Community Development
prevt	●●		●●	●	●		●●
prevst	●	●●	●	●●	~●	●●	○
prevm	~●●	●●	~●	~●	~●		~●
prevce	~●		●	●	~●		●●
csp	●●	●●	●●	●	~●	●●	○
strat	●		~●	~●●	~●●	~●●	○
decomm	●		●	●	●		○
dyna	~●	~●●	●	●	●		○

●● = necessary condition; ● = sufficient condition; ○ = varied condition; ~ = absence of condition

Abbreviations: prevts=prevalence of third sector; prevce=prevalence of civic engagement; prevst=prevalence of state; prevm=prevalence of market; dyna=dynamism in field; decomm=decommodification in field; strat=stratification in field; csp=cross sector collaboration/partnerships

First, we see that third sector and state prevalence relatively speaking matter more than the prevalence of market actors. As to the third sector, it is interesting to note that although the prevalence of third sector actors has an enabling function, it is not always a necessary condition. This result suggests that there has been no explicit third sector bias in our selection of SI streams as aimed at by the ‘open sampling process’ directed by the innovations rather than pre-definitions of involved actors. While the role of the state is marked in every field in one or another way and mostly as an enabler, in consumer protection it does not play a role (or its absence is beneficial), in community development its role is varied. In contrast to this, the third sector wherever identified had an enabling function. Civic engagement can have, but does not always have an enabling function. It emerged as irrelevant or relevant in its absence in (1) fields that are marked by professional labour and commercial involvement (social services and work integration), and (2) where a similar domination or professional involvement is found, but where the latter is mainly public (arts and culture) or non-profit (consumer protection).

Cross-sector collaboration shows up, mostly as a necessary condition, even in fields where one would not necessarily expect it to be important (health or environmental sustainability). In some fields, single actors can achieve more if they act on their own (consumer protection and in some institutional settings in community development).

Stratification matters and mostly in its absence, though occasionally it can have a stimulating function, for instance where it provokes the emergence of more equitable and inclusive approaches (arts and culture, in particular in Spain). Decommodification also plays a role, and mostly when it is high. In the only case where it was spotted as relevant by being absent, meaning that commodification was high (community development in the UK), a closer look at the in-depth investigation revealed that it stymied rather than promoted social innovation. It is to be remarked that QCA does not allow us to test for the effect of moderate degrees of (de-)commodification which our hypothesis suggests at beneficial, but it at least suggests that high decommodification is better than low decommodification. This evokes major questions as regards the supposed effectiveness of quasi-market and earned-income principles in the social

economy (also problematised here McKay, Moro, Teasdale, & Clifford, 2015), should a simultaneous crowding-out of innovation be confirmed in future research. It would also mark a sharp divide between 'the enterprising' and the 'social innovation' focus in the social enterprise discourse, a distinction made some time ago but seldom rigorously tested (Dees, 2001).

Finally, we see that field dynamism can be beneficial for social innovation, but that stability might be more important in fields or innovations that address vulnerable groups (our cases in social services, partly in community development, and arts and culture; in the latter in Spain particularly). In particular as regards dynamism it is sometimes hard to tell whether it is a cause or an effect of SI streams.

## **12. Conclusions**

Our study of field conditions for social innovation has confirmed most of our initial hypotheses. It has supported one of the suggested findings of our investigation at the organisational level, namely that cross-sector collaboration in social innovation is vital and that it needs closer inspection. Against this it has however also shown that third sector and state prevalence (almost equally weighted) are more indicative of social innovation than the prevalence of market actors. Evidence on the role of civic engagement remains very context dependent. The combination of low stratification and high decommodification has been identified as more favourable for social innovation than other combinations, which calls into question the exact effectiveness of a move towards marketization in the social economy. Yet, we cannot say anything definite about moderate states of decommodification due to the analytic logic of QCA. The role of dynamism remains rather ambiguous. Against this, we can furthermore say that the Social origins theory and the Welfare regimes approach are somewhat more promising in understanding social innovation than the Varieties of Capitalism, at least when it comes to specific field conditions rather than national social innovation capacity.

### 13. References

- Anheier, H. K. (2014). *Nonprofit Organisations: Theory, Management, Policy*. New York: Routledge.
- Asheim, B. T., Lawon Smith, H., & Oughton, C. (2011). Regional Innovation Systems: Theory, Empirics and Policy. *Regional Studies*, 45(2), 875–891.
- Autio, E., Kenney, M., Mustar, P., Siegel, D., & Wright, M. (2014). Entrepreneurial Innovation: The Importance of Context. *Research Policy*, 43(7), 1097–1108. doi:10.1016/j.respol.2014.01.015
- Barley, S. R. (2007). Corporations, Democracy, and the Public Good. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 16(3), 201–215. doi:10.1177/1056492607305891
- Battilana, J., & Dorado, S. (2010). Building Sustainable Hybrid Organizations: The Case of Commercial Microfinance Organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(6), 1419–1440. doi:10.5465/AMJ.2010.57318391
- Baumol, W. J. (2004). Entrepreneurial Cultures and Countercultures. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 3(3), 316–326.
- Bernard, P. (1999). Social Cohesion: A Dialectical Critique of a Quasi-Concept. *Lien social et Politiques*, 41, 47–59. Retrieved from <http://www.omiss.ca/english/reference/pdf/pbernard.pdf>
- Blättel-Mink, B. (2006). *Kompendium der Innovationsforschung*. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Bonoli, G. (1997). Classifying Welfare States: A Two-Dimension Approach. *Journal of Social Policy*, 26(03), 351–372. doi:10.1017/S0047279497005059
- Bureau of European Policy Advisers (BEPA). (2011). *Empowering people, driving change.: Social Innovation in the European Union*. Luxemburg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Burt, R. S. (1997). The Contingent Value of Social Capital. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42(2), 339–365. doi:10.2307/2393923
- Burt, R. S. (2004). Structural Holes and Good Ideas. *American Journal of Sociology*, 110(2), 349–399. doi:10.1086/421787
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (1983). Organizational life cycles and shifting criteria for effectiveness: Some preliminary evidence. *Management Science*, 29(1), 33–51.
- Carruthers, B. G., & Espeland, W. N. (1991). Accounting for Rationality: Double-Entry Bookkeeping and the Rhetoric of Economic Rationality. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97(1), 31–69.
- Chesbrough, H. W. (2003). *Open innovation: The new imperative for creating and profiting from technology*. Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business School Press.
- Churchman, C. West. (1967). Guest Editorial: Wicked Problems. *Management Science*, 14(4), B141. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2628678>
- Coleman, J. S., Katz, E., Menzel, H. (1957). The Diffusion of an Innovation Among Physicians. *Sociometry*, 20(4), 253–270. doi:10.2307/2785979

- Coleman, J. S., Katz, E., Menzel, H. (1966). *Medical Innovation: A Diffusion Study*, Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill Co.
- Collier, D. (2011). Understanding Process Tracing. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 44(04), 823–830. doi:10.1017/S1049096511001429
- Crepaldi, C., Rosa, E. de, & Pesce, F. (2012). Literature Review on Innovation in Social Services in Europe: Sectors of Health, Education and Welfare Services. Report from Innoserv.
- Crossan, M. M., & Apaydin, M. (2010). A Multi-Dimensional Framework of Organizational Innovation: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Journal of Management Studies*, 47 (6), 1154–1191.
- Crossley, N. (1999). Working Utopias and Social Movements: An Investigation Using Case Study Materials from Radical Mental Health Movements in Britain. *Sociology*, 33(4), 809–830. doi:10.1177/S0038038599000516
- Cuerva, M. C., Triguero-Cano, Á., & Córcoles, D. (2014). Drivers of green and non-green innovation:: empirical evidence in Low-Tech SMEs. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 68(0), 104–113. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.10.049
- Dahl, H. M., Eurich, J., Fahnøe, K., Hawker, C., Krlev, G., Langer, A., . . . Pieper, M. (2014). Promoting Innovation in Social Services: An Agenda for Future Research and Development. Summary Findings and Key Recommendations.
- Dees, J. G. (2001). The meaning of Social Entrepreneurship. Occasional Paper. Durham, NC.
- Dekker, P., & Halman, L. (Eds.). (2003). *Nonprofit and civil society studies. The values of volunteering: Cross-cultural perspectives*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147–160.
- Drucker, P. F. (1985). *Innovation and entrepreneurship: Practice and principles. Classic Drucker Collection*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building Theories from Case Study Research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 532–550.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The three worlds of welfare capitalism* ([Pbk. ed.]). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Etzkowitz, H., & Leydesdorff, L. (2000). The dynamics of innovation: from National Systems and “Mode 2” to a Triple Helix of university–industry–government relations. *Research Policy*, 29(2), 109–123. doi:10.1016/S0048-7333(99)00055-4
- European Commission. (2013). *Guide to Social Innovation*. Brussels. Retrieved from [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/presenta/social\\_innovation/social\\_innovation\\_2013.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/presenta/social_innovation/social_innovation_2013.pdf)
- Evers, A., & Brandsen, T. (2016). Social Innovations as Messages: Democratic Experimentation in Local Welfare Systems. In T. Brandsen, S. Cattacin, A. Evers, & A. Zimmer (Eds.), *Nonprofit and Civil Society Studies, An International Multidisciplinary Series. Social Innovations in the Urban Context* (pp. 161–180). Springer.



- Fleming, L., Mingo, S. and Chen, D. (2007), “Collaborative Brokerage, Generative Creativity, and Creative Success”, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 52 No. 3, pp. 443–475.
- Fligstein, N., & McAdam, D. (2012). *A Theory of Fields*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fontes, M. (2005). Distant networking: The knowledge acquisition strategies of 'out-cluster' biotechnology firms. *European Planning Studies*, 13(6), 899–920.  
doi:10.1080/09654310500188498
- George, A. L., & Bennett, A. (2005). *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Science*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Goertz, G., & Mahoney, J. (2012). *A tale of two cultures: Qualitative and quantitative research in the social sciences*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Greenwood, R., Suddaby, R., & Hinings, B. (2002). Theorising Change: The Role of Professional Associations in the Transformation of Institutional Fields. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1), 58–80.
- Hall, P. A., & Soskice, D. W. (2001a). Introduction. In P. A. Hall & D. W. Soskice (Eds.), *Varieties of Capitalism. The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage* (pp. 1–68). Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hall, P. A., & Soskice, D. W. (Eds.). (2001b). *Varieties of Capitalism.: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.  
Retrieved from <http://www.worldcat.org/oclc/46969900>
- Hendersen, H. (1993). Social Innovation and Citizen Movements. *Futures*, (April), 322–338.
- Hogan, S. J., & Coote, L. V. (2014). Organizational culture, innovation, and performance: A test of Schein's model. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(8), 1609–1621.  
doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.09.007
- Hoogendoorn, B., Pennings, E., & Thurik, R. (2010). What Do We Know About Social Entrepreneurship: An Analysis of Empirical Research (ERIM REPORT SERIES RESEARCH IN MANAGEMENT No. ERS-2009-044-ORG). Rotterdam.
- Jenson, J. (2010). *Defining and measuring social cohesion. Social policies in small states series: Vol. 1*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Kistruck, G.M. and Beamish, P.W. (2010), “The Interplay of Form, Structure, and Embeddedness in Social Intrapreneurship”, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 34 No. 4, pp. 735–761.
- Krlev, G. (2012). Strategies in Social Entrepreneurship: Depicting entrepreneurial elements and business principles in SEOs from Germany and Bangladesh. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Perspectives*, 1(1), 61–96.
- Krlev, G., Bund, E., & Mildemberger, G. (2014). Measuring what matters—Indicators of social innovativeness on the national level. *Information Systems Management*, 31(3), 200–224.  
doi:10.1080/10580530.2014.923265
- Le Ber, M. J., & Branzei, O. (2010). (Re)Forming Strategic Cross-Sector Partnerships: Relational Processes of Social Innovation. *Business & Society*, 49(1), 140–172.

- Legewie, N. (2013). An Introduction to Applied Data Analysis with Qualitative Comparative Analysis. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*; Vol 14, No 3 (2013). Retrieved from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1961>
- Lengyel, B., & Leydesdorff, L. (2011). Regional innovation systems in Hungary: the failing synergy at the national level. *Regional Studies*, (45), 677–693.
- Leydesdorff, L., Dolfsma, W., & van der Panne, G. (2006). Measuring the knowledge base of an economy in terms of triple-helix relations among 'technology, organization and territory'. *Research Policy*, (35), 181–199.
- Leydesdorff, L., & Fritsch, M. (2006). Measuring the knowledge base of regional innovation systems in Germany in terms of a Triple Helix dynamics. (35), 1538–1553.
- Lundvall, B.-Å. (1992). *National systems of innovation: Towards a theory of innovation and interactive learning*. London, New York: Pinter Publishers; Distributed exclusively in the USA and Canada by St. Martin's Press.
- Maguire, S., Hardy, C., & Lawrence, T. B. (2004). Institutional Entrepreneurship in Emerging Field: HIV/AIDS Treatment Advocacy in Canada. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(5), 657–679.
- Mahroum, S., & Al-Saleh, Y. (2013). Towards a functional framework for measuring national innovation efficacy. *Technovation*, 33(10–11), 320–332.  
doi:10.1016/j.technovation.2013.03.013
- Mair, J., & Marti, I. (2009). Entrepreneurship in and around institutional voids: A case study from Bangladesh. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24, 419–435.
- Maurer, I., & Ebers, M. (2006). Dynamics of Social Capital and Their Performance Implications: Lessons from Biotechnology Start-ups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51(2), 262–292.  
doi:10.2189/asqu.51.2.262
- McInerney, P.-B. (2008). Showdown at Kykuit: Field-Configuring Events as Loci for Conventionalizing Accounts. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45, 1089–1116.
- McKay, S., Moro, D., Teasdale, S., & Clifford, D. (2015). The Marketisation of Charities in England and Wales. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 26(1), 336–354. doi:10.1007/s11266-013-9417-y
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340–363.
- Mohan, J. (2011). *Mapping the Big Society: perspectives from the Third Sector Research Centre*. Working paper No. 62. Birmingham.
- Mohan, J., Twigg, L., Jones, K., Steve, & Barnard. (2006). Volunteering, geography and welfare: a multilevel investigation of geographical variations in voluntary action. In C. Milligan & D. Conradson (Eds.), *Landscapes of voluntarism. New spaces of Health, Welfare and Governance*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Nemeth, C. J., & Staw, B. M. (1989). The Tradeoffs of Social Control and Innovation in Groups and Organizations. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology Volume 22* (Vol. 22, pp. 175–210). Elsevier.

- Nicholls, A. (2013). The Social Entrepreneurship-Social Policy Nexus in Developing Countries. In R. Surender & R. Walker (Eds.), *Social Policy in a Developing World* (pp. 183–216). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Nicholls, A., & Murdock, A. (2012). The nature of Social Innovation. In A. Nicholls & A. Murdock (Eds.), *Social Innovation. Blurring Boundaries to Reconfigure Markets* (pp. 1–32). Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Odorici, V., & Presutti, M. (2013). The entrepreneurial experience and strategic orientation of high-tech born global start-ups: An analysis of novice and habitual entrepreneurs. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, 11(3), 268–291. doi:10.1007/s10843-013-0112-2
- Osburg, T. H. (Ed.). (2013). *Social Innovation: Solutions for a Sustainable Future*. Berlin, Heidelberg [u.a.]: Springer.
- Phills, J. A., Deiglmeier, K., Miller, D.T. (2008). Rediscovering Social Innovation. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Fall, 34-43
- Picciotto, L. (2013). Social Entrepreneurship and Confiscated Mafia Properties in Italy (No. LG13-73). Retrieved from EMES Network website: [http://www.emes.net/uploads/media/Picciotto\\_ECSP-LG13-73.pdf](http://www.emes.net/uploads/media/Picciotto_ECSP-LG13-73.pdf)
- Petrova, T. & Tarrow, S. (2007). Transactional and Participatory Activism in the Emerging European Polity: The Puzzle of East Central Europe. *Comparative Political Studies* 40(1): 74-94.
- Popper, K. R. (1966). *The open society and its enemies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Powell, W. W., & Grodal, S. (2005). Networks of Innovation. In J. Fagerberg, D. C. Mowery, & R. Nelson (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation* (pp. 56–85). Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Prahalad, C. K., & Hammond, A. (2002). Serving the world's poor profitably. *Harvard Business Review*, 80(9), 48–57.
- Ragin, C. C. (2006). Set Relations in Social Research: Evaluating Their Consistency and Coverage. *Political Analysis*, 14(3), 291–310. doi:10.1093/pan/mpj019
- Ragin, C. C. (1989). *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ragin, C. C. (2000). *Fuzzy-Set Social Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Reay, T., & Hinings, C. R. (2005). The Recomposition of an Organizational Field: Health Care in Alberta. *Organization Studies*, 26(3), 351–384. doi:10.1177/0170840605050872
- Reficco, E., & Marquez, P. (2012). Inclusive Networks for Building BOP Markets. *Business & Society*, 51(3), 512–556. doi:10.1177/0007650309332353
- Rihoux, B., & Ragin, C. C. (2009). Configurational Comparative Methods: Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) and Related Techniques. *Applied social research methods series: Vol. 51*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Rittel, H. W. J., & Webber, M. M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, 4(2), 155–169. doi:10.1007/BF01405730
- Rodríguez-Pose, A., & Comptour, F. (2012). Do Clusters Generate Greater Innovation and Growth?: An Analysis of European Regions. *The Professional Geographer*, 64(2), 211–231.

- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of Innovations* (5th ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Ronald, C. J. (2012). A Framework for Studying Organizational Innovation in Research Libraries, 2012, 525–542.
- Rosenberg, D. (2002). *Cloning Silicon Valley: The Next Generation High-Tech Hotspots*. London, New York: Pearson Education.
- Salamon, L. M., & Anheier, H. K. (1998). Social Origins of Civil Society: Explaining the Nonprofit Sector Cross-Nationally. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 9(3), 213–248.
- Saperstein, J., & Rouach, D. (2002). *Creating Regional Wealth in the Innovation Economy: Models, Perspectives, and Best Practices*. Financial Times Prentice Hall books. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Financial Times Prentice Hall.
- Saxenian, A. L. (1994). *Regional Advantage: Culture and Competition in Silicon Valley and Route 128*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Schmitz, B. (2015). Beyond Structural Governance: Tension Moments and the Preservation of Core Values in Hybrid Organizations. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 45(3), 241–258. doi:10.1080/00208825.2015.1006029
- Schneider, C. Q., & Wagemann, C. (2006). Reducing complexity in Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA): Remote and proximate factors and the consolidation of democracy. *European Journal of Political Research*, 45(5), 751–786. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6765.2006.00635.x
- Schneider, M., & Paunescu, M. (2012). Changing Varieties of Capitalism and Revealed Comparative Advantages from 1990 to 2005: A Test of the Hall and Soskice Claims. *Socio-Economic Review*, 10(4), 731–753.
- Shaw, E., & Carter, S. (2007). Social Entrepreneurship: Theoretical Antecedents and Empirical Analysis of Entrepreneurial Processes and Outcomes. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 14(3), 418–434. doi:10.1108/14626000710773529
- Simon, H. A. (1978). Rationality as Process and as Product of Thought. *The American economic review*, 68(2), 1–16. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1816653>
- Strand, Ø., & Leydesdorff, L. (2013). Where is Synergy Indicated in the Norwegian Innovation System?: Triple-Helix Relations Among Technology, Organization, and Geography. *Future-Oriented Technology Analysis*, 80(3), 471–484. doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2012.08.010
- Turró, A., Urbano, D., & Peris-Ortiz, M. (2014) Culture and Innovation: The Moderating Effect of Cultural Values on Corporate Entrepreneurship. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, (0). doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2013.10.004
- Vedres, B., & Stark, D. (2010). Structural Folds: Generative Disruption in Overlapping Groups. *American Journal of Sociology*, 115(4), 1150–1190.
- Wagemann, C., & Schneider, C. Q. (2015). Transparency Standards in Qualitative Comparative Analysis. *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research*, (Spring), 38–42.
- Williamson, O. E. (1981). The Economics of Organization: The Transaction Cost Approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, 87(3), 548–577. doi:10.2307/2778934

The Young Foundation. (2012). Social Innovation Overview: Part I - Defining Social Innovation. A Deliverable to the Project "The Theoretical, Empirical and Policy Foundations for Building Social Innovation in Europe" (DG Research). Brussels.

Zapf, W. (1989). Über Soziale Innovationen. Soziale Welt, 40(1-2), 170–183.