

CSR, Sustainability, Ethics & Governance

Series Editors: Samuel O. Idowu · René Schmidpeter

Thomas Osburg

René Schmidpeter *Editors*

Social Innovation

Solutions for a
Sustainable Future

 Springer

CSR, Sustainability, Ethics & Governance

Series Editors

Samuel O. Idowu, London Metropolitan University,
Calcutta House, London, United Kingdom

René Schmidpeter, Ingolstadt, Germany

For further volumes:
<http://www.springer.com/series/11565>

Thomas Osburg • René Schmidpeter
Editors

Social Innovation

Solutions for a Sustainable Future

 Springer

Editors

Thomas Osburg
Intel Corporation
Feldkirchen
Germany

René Schmidpeter
Centre for Humane Market Economy
Salzburg
Austria

ISBN 978-3-642-36539-3

ISBN 978-3-642-36540-9 (eBook)

DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-36540-9

Springer Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London

Library of Congress Control Number: 2013939189

© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2013

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed. Exempted from this legal reservation are brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis or material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the Copyright Law of the Publisher's location, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Permissions for use may be obtained through RightsLink at the Copyright Clearance Center. Violations are liable to prosecution under the respective Copyright Law.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

While the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication, neither the authors nor the editors nor the publisher can accept any legal responsibility for any errors or omissions that may be made. The publisher makes no warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Sustainable Development: Social Innovation at the Interface of Business, Society and Ecology

Nigel John Roome

1 Introduction

Social innovation has attracted much recent attention from academics, policy makers and practitioners during the past 10 years, although examples of social innovation can be traced far back to the early nineteenth century, see for example the pioneering reformer Robert Owen at the New Lanark Woolen Mill (Owen 2012). The main argument about social innovation is that it has the potential to effect change in conventional sectors of the economy and society. These sectors include government and the public sector, non-profits, as well as the for-profit sector. Social innovation can also include more loosely organized actors within a community or engaged in a community venture. By its very nature, social innovation does not conform to the neat boxes of sectors instead it often intersects and overlaps sectors.

This chapter focuses on the link between sustainable development and social innovation in relation to business. It takes the position that the call for sustainable development is the greatest challenge to humanity of our time. Sustainable development represents a new and overarching paradigm for development – it stands as a new way of understanding and promoting human activities that contribute to economic and social development within the environmental limits of our natural resources and processes. Sustainable development raises key questions about how our behavior contributes to the continuation of human life at current or better levels of development given population growth. By definition sustainable development as a new paradigm represents a form of social innovation that has the potential to influence almost every aspect of human existence and cut across all sectors of our societies.

Traditionally, business has been regarded as an engine of innovation, and through that a driver of industrial and economic growth, which is commonly linked to social as well as economic development. Because of its role in development, business will have to be a full-player in the creation of the new patterns of production and consumption necessary to achieve sustainable development.

Therefore, we need to understand better what sustainable development as a form of social innovation will mean for the more traditional routes to innovation in business. To that end the chapter is divided into three sections. The first section provides some introductory remarks about the nature of social innovation. This is followed by a section that addresses the core concepts of sustainable development and links those concepts to social innovation. This leads to some conclusions on what sustainable development as social innovation means for the way business managers and leaders participate in the advance toward sustainable development.

2 Background

Innovation means developing new ideas and having them adopted in practice. Those ideas can be expressed in a range of forms – technologies, physical artifacts, ways of thinking and working, organizational and institutions systems and structures. The label “social” in social innovation signifies that the innovation process involves actors who are not necessarily professional inventors and innovators. It is located in a more social context involving a range of actors. “Social” also says something about the intent of innovation – for example advancing a “social” purpose. In this respect it is important to be clear that no social purpose can be treated in isolation from the rest of society. Innovation implies change and change invariably brings with it unintended as well as intended outcomes and impacts. Moreover, outcomes are rarely perceived by all audiences or actors in the same way: Some will see an outcome as desirable, others as undesirable. Some actors might gain others might lose. This means that social innovation is not inherently any better than any other form of innovation. The process through which ideas become adopted therefore requires the same careful consideration and screening as all innovations.

Interest in social innovation has accompanied growing awareness of the gaps in services provided by states or by traditional business. Markets and public services do not always meet societal needs. Even where public policies and services are well developed the traditional pillared or hierarchic modes of policy-delivery, which can be successful in times of stability, are less flexible and responsive in times of change. These structures are not always as responsive as they need to be in meeting joined-up problems.

The professionalization of roles in providing services can mean that, over time, constructions of policy problems come to reflect how professionals see those problems rather than reflecting the needs and experiences of clients. Professionals often develop models of problems that are abstractions of reality – these models are only as good as the limits of what they explain and, when reality changes rapidly, the models often explain less than they did before.

Professional groups are defined by their professional language as well as the models they use to make sense of the world or system of which they are part. Professional language and models provide the basis for a professional practice but

also serve to separate different professionals into cadres, while separating the providers of services from those they serve.

This means that conventional ways to respond to social needs or problems can encounter “lock-ins” – barriers to change that arise from bureaucracies, professional boundaries, as well as the limits of professional knowledge and the models used to understand the world. These factors contribute to lags in response to changing circumstances and serve to limit the effectiveness and relevance of the responses on offer.

The rigidities of many professionalized systems were recognized over 40 years ago. For example pioneering and innovative ideas about community-based approaches to planning were set out in the Skeffington Report in the UK of 1969. This was before other voices advocated that meeting social needs was best done by moving towards markets and following market signals.

Let us be clear about the historical context of these ideas. This was before globalization of our economies provoked tensions in our system that gave rise to the search for novel social processes and solutions. Well before arguments were put forward that we needed to pursue more sustainable forms of development. And well before globalization and sustainable development collided. Although the environmental and social challenges of sustainability would provoke wider questions about whether public structures were fit for purpose and whether conventional business thinking and practice was able to contribute in any meaningful way to the achievement of a more sustainable future (Roome 2011).

Since 1969 many trends have combined to lead us to revise how we think and act and how we work with others – laying the ground for the social innovation movement of today. Factors include the speed of change; the intersection of economic and social issues – (as exemplified by the environmental catastrophes of the Exxon-Valdez or Bhopal or the problems of child labor encountered by Nike); the challenge to long-held images of what organizations are, as boundaries between businesses, government, and NGOs breakdown; and as we struggle with whether organizations are real or virtual, hierarchical or networked.

The last 40 years have brought forward challenges arising from the complexity we have created for ourselves through our own actions. For example we have moved from a world shaped by the interaction between natural and human systems, to a world where natural systems are dominated by human activities. A phenomenon that has been called the ‘anthropocene’; an era of global history in which humans and their activities dominate the character of the planet (Crutzen and Stoermer 2000). That move was anticipated by those who crafted the agenda for sustainable development and caused them to propose an approach to development that would enable humans to satisfy needs in ways that would not jeopardize the future and the opportunities it would need to provide.

While more and more attention has been placed on the need to address a wide range of social and environmental issues and to meet human needs through approaches that sit outside the normal structures and institutions of our economy and society, we might look back to some of the thinking that inspired the call for sustainable development rather than re-inventing this particular wheel yet again.

3 Sustainable Development and Its Relationship to Social Innovation

This section sets out to examine more deeply the concept of sustainable development. Its concern is to examine the ideas that underpinned the work that led up to the definition of sustainable development rather than with the arguments about the environmental changes that created the need for sustainable development or the agenda for action that followed. It then identifies what this implies about sustainable development as social innovation.

The imperative to move toward more sustainable forms of development was set out in the seminal report of the United Nations Commission on Environment and Development (Brundtland 1987). It was shaped into an agenda for action at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 (United Nations 1992). Despite a seemingly endless discussion of the meaning of sustainable development, the principles behind sustainable development are clear. Human-beings engage in activities that shape economic and social development. These activities require inputs from natural environmental resources, processes and systems and those same human activities can have a positive or negative impact on environmental resources and systems. Looking forward it was anticipated that the environmental demands and impacts of developed economies, the growing demands of developing economies, coupled with the anticipated growth of population and its technological advance could not be supported indefinitely by natural systems, processes and resources. This gave rise to the need to consider how to better integrate environmental considerations into the development process of both developed and developing economies so as to ensure that development could be sustained in the long term. This approach to development was termed sustainable development.

Two critical points emerge from this description of sustainable development. First, at the time of the Brundtland report contemporary approaches to economic and social development in developed and developing economies were not seen as sustainable. Second, this implied that any move toward sustainable development would require changes in the way actors in all sectors of society including business understand and act out their contribution to the development process. This means that sustainable development is best understood as a new paradigm for development. A paradigm represents an intellectual perception or view that is held by a group of actors or a society providing a clear example, or model, of how things work in the world (Kuhn 1970). Sustainable development was advanced to replace traditional models of development that were not regarded as sustainable. By definition the development of a new paradigm involves innovation and change, requiring the inclusion of a wider range of human considerations and environmental limits in the frame of the many choices that contribute to economic and social development – in other words sustainable development constitutes a ‘grand social innovation project’.

Insight into the nature of sustainable development as a form of social innovation is gained by looking more deeply into the core ideas that fed into the Brundtland

report and Agenda 21 that defined the need and the approach to sustainable development.

Three lines of thinking can be detected: Ideas from systems science and cybernetics, approaches that deal with social complexity, and, the functional interaction of people in teams and organizations in ecologies.

3.1 Systems Science and General Systems Theory

In the lead up to the Brundtland report there were a series of influential reports and meetings addressing environmental concerns provoked by human activity. Notably these included the work of the Club of Rome (Meadows et al. 1972), the Stockholm Environment Conference (United Nations 1972) and the World Conservation Strategy (IUCN 1981). The thrust of this work was to draw attention to the increasingly precarious state of the planet in terms of natural processes, the use of resources, the reduction of key habitats and ecosystems and the limits on pollution sinks and the effects of human activity. It drew attention to the need for new public policies and institutions that would attach greater account to environmental issues that had until then been the province of specialized ministries at the periphery of government. The focus was on public policy but the concern was with the continued lack of attention in social choices to environmental limits and concerns.

The analysis of problems and the suggestions for institutional change were informed by the work of authors such as Ashby (1962), Beer (1972, 1984), Boulding (1966), and von Bertalanffy (1968). While these authors came from a variety of backgrounds each explored ideas that linked biological systems, organizational systems, physical systems and social and economic systems. They suggested that there were fundamental system archetypes and that these would offer insights into how to function at the interface between natural and social and organizational systems. Their work had significant impact on the search for solutions to environmental degradation and change. At the core of this body of work is systems thinking which stands in stark contrast to 'classical' models of human and natural behavior and 'classical' views of knowledge that are found in the discipline-based approaches to knowledge and the functional divisions in practice that have characterized development since the enlightenment. In contrast, systems thinking seeks to develop a more holistic view of relationships within and between systems and to strive to link knowledge and theory more closely with the realities of everyday life.

Systems thinking and the systems theories that derive from it represent an innovation in how we develop knowledge, how we think about problems and how we model the World. In practical terms the new paradigm of sustainable development was based on models themselves based on systems thinking, whereas conventional development had been associated with the reduction of knowledge and the division of knowledge and practice. Of course since the concept of sustainable development was presented to a wider public the tendency has been for academics

and practitioners to interpret sustainable development through the lenses of reductionist science and knowledge. Trying to understand a new paradigm through the lens of the old paradigm and its theories is somewhat paradoxical.

3.2 *Social Complexity*

Insights into organizational responses to complex social problems also contributed to the development of the sustainable development paradigm. Since the 1960s a class of social problems had been identified that were variously called meta-problems (Chevalier and Cartwright 1966), wicked problems (Rittel & Weber 1973) or messes (Ackoff 1974). The characteristics of this class of problems is that they are problem sets that are made up of interconnected problems. These individual problems and their solutions are ambiguous and contestable. Moreover, the interactions between problems in the problem-set mean that when an organization goes about responding to the problems of concern to it, its policies and actions have the potential to impact other problems in the set and through that the interests of other organizations. Individual un-coordinated actions undermine the ability of other organizations to meet their mission and obligations.

Normally no organization has an overview of the problem-set as a whole. It is more common for organizations to have distinct responsibilities and interests and to take into account only their view of the problems they are addressing. Summing these different perspectives does not constitute a picture of the system as a whole. When Chevalier and Cartwright first discussed meta-problems they centered on public sector organizations and their interests in relation to problems such as poverty, pollution and health. Yet the same principles of their analysis apply to other types of organizations.

The solution they advanced to the problems created by meta-problems required some coordination of policies and actions. As different organizations see the meta-problem through different lenses they all have a contribution to make in constructing a picture of the problem-set as a whole. The search for policy options and actions that would address problems; the assessment of the possible outcomes arising from those options; their implications for other problems and interests in the set; and the selection of which options are pursued, are regarded as necessary pre-conditions for the development of actions to improve conditions in the problem-set as a whole.

The fashioning of coordinated and integrated actions in response to problems of this kind requires organizations simultaneously to hold a focus on their area of policy and interest while also developing a shared perspective on the problem-set as a whole. That process requires a forum or platform through which actors can contribute to a strategy for the problem set as a whole that also determines the freedom of manoeuvre for the strategy, policies and actions of individual organizations.

This account suggests the need for innovative organizational structures to address meta-problems such as pollution, poverty and health. Of course those approaches are also appropriate in tackling sustainable development, which constitutes a meta-

problem of even greater proportion than the problem-sets' identified in the 1960s – pollution, health and poverty. Add to this the complexity of sustainability development that comes from the multiple overlapping levels of organization and scale it has to consider – local, regional or bioregional and global – and it is evident that sustainable development demands innovation in the way organizations work together. It also requires organizations and their managers to work together to build a collective or holistic view of the problem set.

3.3 People, Teams, Organizations and Ecologies

Other authors built on these ideas, notable Fred Emery and Eric Trist. Their work began by looking at participative work designs and how team members work together, then at how the parts of organizations interact with one another and then at how organizations work in the context of social ecologies (Emery and Trist 1973). This echoes the idea gained from general systems theory that systems conform to common properties, irrespective of scale. That is they have recursive properties.

Trist also developed ideas about how actors respond when faced by turbulent fields that link with the ideas of Ackoff, and Chevalier and Cartwright, about meta-problems. Trist (1983) argued that turbulent fields arise when the actions of one actor interact with the field and with the actions of other actors. These interactions can become very complex and under these circumstances the pursuit of organizational self-interest can create chains of interaction that potentially contribute to systems collapse. Faced with this possibility actors in the field have to join together and agree 'new rules for the game' that seek to eliminate the cause of the turbulent interactions so that the actors can then continue to compete but in a stable field (Trist 1983). This approach implies the ability of actors to be able to discriminate between when and how to co-operate and when and how to compete.

Emery and Trist's contribution to the paradigm of sustainable development is also found in the process used at the Earth Summit at Rio de Janeiro in 1992. This was organized along the lines of a 'search conference' following the model they first developed in 1958 (see for example: Emery and Purser 1996). Search conferences are platforms where individuals (managers, citizens, politicians, policy-makers) become a 'planning or design community', learning together. In these settings participants do not represent others – they are not then stakeholders representing an interest rather they are co-actors that come together to develop a plan or design for the future, that supports their shared human aspirations and ideals. The process leading to the plan involves establishing those shared values, appreciating the nature of the changing context, knowing where the 'system' they are dealing with comes from and assessing and agreeing where it is going. The plan involves creating a practical vision of the future, establishing some appreciation for current reality and identifying the steps to move from today toward that future. The plan is put into action by the participants. This process offers a practical response to

any socially and institutionally complex system confronted by turbulence and uncertainty. Despite being established in the late 1950s the approach of the search conference is an innovation in planning and action even when it involves collaboration. Its adoption is hampered by many things – not least the very simple but unhelpful notion that there are stakeholders that represent interest claims rather than actors who are committed to innovation and change.

3.4 Relationships to Social Innovation

The description above presents in brief the major strands of thinking that contributed to the generation of the new paradigm of sustainable development as well as the thinking that underpinned the design of the process of the Earth Summit that led to Agenda 21 (United Nations 1992). It shows something of the qualities of the process as a way of thinking, a way of planning and a way of acting. The basic perspective derives from the notion of building a holistic view through a collaborative systems perspective. It brings together natural processes and systems on the one side and human and organizational systems on the other. The approach recognizes that no one actor, individual or organization, possesses adequate knowledge of the system or has the capacity to construct a vision and design of a more desirable future or take meaningful action on their own. The search conference provides one means to facilitate a collective, participative process that draws on the knowledge and perspectives of participants as well as building the commitment of many people to change. Practicing this approach more widely would constitute a social innovation with major impacts for how we think and learn and act when confronted by social and environmental problems and needs – as well as for how we define knowledge and measure progress. Sustainable development then has to be regarded as a new paradigm precisely for these reasons and, as with all paradigm shifts, its adoption would make many aspects of our past understanding of the World obsolete.

4 Sustainable Development, Social Innovation and Business

This chapter argues that sustainable development is a new paradigm that will involve all actors in society that participate in economic and social development and to envision their role in the processes of development in practical terms that has consequences for all organizations including business. If business is to contribute to sustainable development in an effective way it will have to participate in the types of processes described above. This will mean business and its managers participating in a grand form of social innovation.

It will require a capacity for managers to engage in platforms that bring actors together in a planning or design process that builds through steps from the development of shared values, constructing a practical vision of the future, establishing

the character of current reality, identifying and assessing the options to move toward that future and agreeing among the partners which pathway to take.

This will require new skills to communicate and collaborate across old divisions created by disciplines, functions and sectors – it goes beyond professionalism as specialization promoting instead professionalism as the capacity to engage with diverse communities of actors to facilitate learning, innovation and change. It goes beyond competition as the driver of change to a more complex blend of co-operation coupled with competition. Co-operation that helps to define where it is we want to go and where we are now, and competition in terms of how to get there and where opportunities and performance are measured in terms of economic, environmental and social impacts rather than returns.

It will mean trying to develop an agreed view on the key systems on which the quality of human existence depends. These include: nutrition; energy; water and the hydrological cycle; household services; transport & communication; health; entertainment; finance and insurance; the carbon-cycle and weather system and our ecology.

It will involve far greater attention to environmental limits and impacts than has been the case to date as well as attention to the demands of those confronted by poverty and lack of opportunity. This is a completely different orientation to innovation than is normal for business. It is a process that turns every actor into a potential agent of change.

It will turn much of our current understanding of management education and leadership on its head.

This is a radical vision of business and management. To be realistic it seems unlikely that companies and managers who have only recently begun to emerge from a period of hyper-competition and a belief in the supremacy of market signals will yet accept the need to address more fundamental questions about the role of business and its guiding purpose. Sustainable development and the principles outlined above, on which it is founded, seem to run counter to the thinking dominant in most business education programs and to the practices found in many companies. But this is precisely why what is discussed above represents a social innovation – innovation without which sustainable development will simply be a grand illusion rather than a paradigm in practice.

References

- Ackoff R (1974) *Re-defining the future*. Wiley, London
- Ashby WR (1962) Principles of the self-organizing system. In: Von Foerster H, Zopf GW Jr (eds) *Principles of self-organization: transactions of the University of Illinois symposium*. Pergamon Press, London, pp 255–278
- Beer LS (1972) *Brain of the firm*. Allen Lane/The Penguin Press, London
- Beer LS (1984) The viable system model: its provenance, development, methodology and pathology. *J Oper Res Soc* 35(1):7–25

- Boulding K (1966) The economics of the coming spaceship earth. In: Jarrett H (ed) *Environmental quality in a growing economy*. Resources for the Future/Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, pp 3–14
- Brundtland G-H (1987) *Our common future*, report of the United Nations commission on environment and development. Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Chevalier M, Cartwright T (1966) Towards an action framework for the control of pollution. In: National conference on pollution and our environment. Canadian Council of Resource Ministers, Ottawa, paper D 30–1. Meta-problems
- Crutzen PJ, Stoermer EF (2000) The anthropocene. *Glob Change Newsl* 41:17–18
- Emery M, Purser RE (1996) *The search conference: a powerful method for planning organizational change and community action*. Jossey-Bass Public Administration, San Francisco
- Emery F, Trist E (1973) *Towards a social ecology: contextual appreciation of the future in the present*. Plenum Press, New York
- IUCN (1981) *World conservation strategy*. IUCN, Gland
- Kuhn T (1970) *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago University Press, London
- Meadows D, Meadows D, Randers J, Behrens W (1972) *Limits to growth*. Universe Books, New York
- Owen R (2012) <http://www.robert-owen.com/>. Accessed 10 October 2012
- Rittel H, Webber M (1973) Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sci* 4:155–169
- Roome N (2011) A retrospective on globalization and sustainable development: the business challenge of systems organization and systems integration. *J Bus Prof Ethics* 30(3&4):193–228
- Skeffington (1969) *Report on people and planning*. HMSO, London
- Trist E (1983) Referent organizations and the development of inter-organizational domains. *Hum Relat* 36(3):269–284
- United Nations (1972) Report of the United Nations conference on human development. <http://www.unep.org/Documents.Multilingual/Default.asp?DocumentID=97>, 10 October 2012
- United Nations (1992) Earth summit – Agenda 21, the United Nations programme of action from Rio. United Nations, New York
- von Bertalanffy L (1968) *General system theory: foundations, development, applications*. George Braziller, New York

Sustainability and Social Innovation

Matthias S. Fifka and Samuel O. Idowu

1 Introduction

Since the publication of *Our Common Future* by the World Commission on Environment and Development in 1987 and Elkington's (1997) *Cannibals with Forks: The Triple Bottom Line of Twenty-First Century Business* 10 years later, it is widely accepted that sustainability has three dimensions: an economic, an environmental, and a social one.

Out of these three dimensions or pillars, as they are sometimes known, the social one has received the least interest, also when it comes to reporting (Fifka and Drabble 2012). While the economic dimension seems to be the overriding pillar, the ecological one has also been given considerable attention, especially with regard to the development of new environmentally friendly technologies. Thus, in this regard, a mutual interdependency between sustainability and its ecological dimension can be observed. On the one hand, ecology can be regarded as one vital element of sustainability. On the other hand, sustainability can be seen as a driver for eco-friendly technologies, as it (be it on a company or government level) encourages the drive for the respective innovation in the environmental arena. On the company level, it has also been argued for a considerable period of time that environmental awareness and eco-friendly innovation lead to competitive advantage (e.g., Welford and Gouldson 1993; Azzone and Bertele 1994; Dechant et al. 1994).

In contrast, the possibility of sustainability as a driver for social innovation has been discussed to a much lesser extent, though pioneers like Peter Drucker had already elaborated on the subject in the 1980s. Drucker (1984) argued for turning social problems into business opportunities: "The proper social responsibility of business is to tame the dragon, that is, to turn a social problem into economic opportunity and economic benefit, into productive capacity, into human competence, into well-paid jobs, and into wealth." Though he sees opportunities arising due to the scope of addressing existing social problems, the motivation, according to him, is grounded in increasing economic benefit through innovative business

practices and not the pursuit of social innovation. Rake and Grayson (2009) provide a more recent dimension to the capability of CSR being a catalyst which could be used to turn social problems into social opportunities. These two scholars and senior business executives argue that the issues we face as a global economy and increasingly as a global society are very real and indeed very urgent but these challenges if managed sustainably could turn out to be great sources of social opportunities for everyone.

It is the purpose of this chapter to discuss how sustainability can perform this function. Thus, the central question we pursue is how sustainable corporate behavior can create or lead to social innovation. Before we discuss this question, it is necessary to define what the phenomenon of social innovation constitutes and how it could create sustainable value.

2 Social Innovation

Social innovation is a broad term that defies a singular understanding and has been discussed from the perspective of various academic disciplines for a considerable time. Moreover, the borders to related concepts such as social entrepreneurship or social enterprise cannot be clearly drawn, which we will discuss below.

2.1 Defining Social Innovation

Despite the existing differences, there are some commonalities in the perception of what social innovation means. There is general agreement on the idea that social innovation refers to innovations that have been made with the explicit intention of finding solutions for current social problems or future challenges. In a narrow sense, social can be seen as relating to human interaction. Thus, social media could be considered a social innovation, as it has changed how people communicate. In a broader and more normative sense, social can mean “good for society and its members”. Disagreement can arise as there will be different opinions on what is good for society. Moreover, social benefit is difficult to measure or quantify. Consequentially, there is dispute on when an innovation, e.g. of technical nature, can be considered a social innovation. Social media is undoubtedly a technical innovation, but whether it has created a social benefit or not is subject to opinion. Regardless of that potential dispute, there is widespread agreement that social innovation does not only aim at changing how people communicate, but at generating benefit for society in its entirety. This is reflected by a definition by Adams and Hess (2011), who point out that “innovative social action can create social value beyond the capability of existing systems.”

Furthermore, there is dispute on who should benefit primarily from social innovation. As pointed out above, Drucker emphasized that addressing social

problems should be seen as business opportunities, and thus focused on the benefit of business. Young (2011) in turn focuses on the members of society who make use of innovation. He defines social innovation as “a novel mechanism that increases the welfare of the individuals who adopt it compared with the status quo.” Phills et al. (2008) even takes this understanding a step further and explicitly claims that the benefit must fall to society as a whole and not only private individuals: “A novel solution to a social problem that is more effective, efficient, sustainable, or just than existing solutions and for which the value created accrues primarily to society as a whole rather than private individuals.” Thus, in contrast to the understanding of Drucker, society in its entirety should be the benefactor of social innovation and not private individuals, who can be seen to include companies or their owners and shareholders; in other words: stakeholders should be the benefactors. Nevertheless, even this view displayed by Phills et al. (2008) does not exclude the possibility that a company should benefit from social innovation, but it should not be the primary or sole motivation behind activities directed towards social innovation.

It must be pointed out that there is usually no trade-off between individual (economic) benefit and social value, as the latter is often created with the drive for commercial innovation in mind. Pharmaceuticals are a prime example. They allow the respective companies to generate profit and at the same time improve public health. Thus, in many cases, social problems are addressed through market mechanisms, like Drucker had in mind. However, when markets fail, which usually happens in the case of public goods, then traditional commercial innovation does not contribute to finding solutions, as incentives are non-existent, and social innovation becomes necessary (Phills et al. 2008).

2.2 Social Innovation Versus Social Entrepreneurship and Social Enterprise

Another question that arises is what sets social innovation apart from the concepts of social entrepreneurship and social enterprise? Is it something new, (if we choose not to say innovative), in comparison to what is currently available? Social entrepreneurship, like the traditional concept of entrepreneurship, focuses on the personality of the entrepreneur and the respective qualities that are needed in order to be successful, like creativity, ambition, resourcefulness, and perseverance (Bornstein 2007). Social entrepreneurs can be defined as “nonprofit seeking executives who pay attention to market forces without losing sight of their organizations’ underlying missions and seek to use the language and skills of the business world to advance the material well-being of their members or clients” (Dees et al. 2001). Likewise, social enterprise places an emphasis on the organizational dimension and the necessary structures to set up a successful social venture. Both social entrepreneurship and social enterprise aim at creating social value (Elkington and Hartigan 2008).

The two concepts essentially stem from the nonprofit sector and thus neglect companies and public organizations, with the exception of venture philanthropy, where a business or a business entrepreneur establishes or supports a social enterprise. As Phills et al. (2008) correctly point out, social entrepreneurs and enterprises are important for delivering innovation, but “they are not the only, and certainly not always the best, ways to achieve these goals.” Social innovation can also originate from profit seeking and public organizations. Due to their resources, networks, and experience they might even be better suited to generate social innovation.

Thus, social innovation does not remain confined to one sector of society – government, business, and non-profit/civil society – but encompasses all and often occurs out of a cooperation between one or more of these sectors. As a hybrid model, it takes economic and social considerations into account, with the focus being upon the latter. As sustainability is a concept also incorporating these two dimensions, it can be seen as a natural driver of social innovation.

3 Sustainability as a Driver of Social Innovation

In this section we will discuss and give examples of how sustainability can drive social innovation. As pointed out in the introduction, there is wide agreement on sustainability being built on an economic, social, and environmental pillar. Thus, individuals or organizations that pursue sustainable behavior attempt to achieve progress in one dimension, while at the same time also making progress in another or at least not worsening the conditions to be found in the other dimensions. Reduced economic profit or benefit may be accepted as a consequence.

As we have agreed on the social dimension being central to social innovation, sustainability could be seen as leading to social innovation if the respective behavior or action improves the social conditions in a society and improves or at least maintains the status quo with regard to the economic and environmental dimensions.

A prime example of when sustainability leads to social innovation is the establishment of fair trade networks. It also shows how the involvement of different groups from different sectors of society – the farmers as producers, the workers as employees, the buyers as vendors, an NGO as labeling organization, and finally the consumers – can produce sustainable social innovation. Fair trade as a principle is based on modified market-principles and a social movement. Its aim is to improve the situation of farmers and farm workers, mostly in third world countries, and to foster agriculture under environmental premises. The central principle of fair trade is that producers and the cooperatives they are organized in receive a price premium for their products if they meet certain standards determined by FairTrade Labeling Organizations International (FLO), a labeling organization. The buyer, usually a large trader or vendor from an industrialized country, agrees to pay the premium, which is then passed on fully or partially to the producer (Nicholls and Opal 2004).

The vendor and the consumer agree to pay the social premium because it will be used for socio-economic development purposes in the producers' countries, e.g., in the construction of health care facilities, clean water supply, schools, sanitation, and other community projects (Elad 2012). The social premium which the retailer and final consumer pay would also be used to address environmentally related factors in the farmers' country. Another noteworthy effect of the "social premium" is that it goes to the farmer directly to enable him to improve his and his family's social and economic situation or to the cooperative that can use it for investments in schools or hospitals and other social services. Under traditional market principles, where the price is the overriding determining factor, such transactions would not occur. Still market principles exist as no participant is forced to buy or sell the product at a higher price and can also choose from non-labeled alternatives. The labeling is usually provided by non-governmental organizations, among which Fairtrade International is the most famous one. The respective standards are determined in a multi-stakeholder process, and the certification is then provided by the sister organization FLO-CERT.

The idea to support small farmers, who otherwise suffer from insufficient negotiating power when dealing with large buyers, through a guaranteed price premium – usually 10 % above the regular market price – has found wide acclaim. There are now 827 Fairtrade certified producer organizations in 58 countries, which represent more than 1.2 million farmers and workers. Fair trade certified sales amounted to app. €3.4 billion (Fairtrade International 2012).

Thus, the cooperation from different actors creates social and environmental benefits through an innovative model of sales and purchases. What is characterized here is that an existing social progress was not addressed by creating a social enterprise or through governmental intervention, but by designing novel market structures through the participation of all actors involved along the value chain.

Another prime example for social innovation is microfinance. The core idea of microfinance, or to be more specific microcredit in our case, is to provide loans to people who otherwise would not be able to obtain a loan because they lack the necessary collateral, do not have a credit history or stable employment, or simply do not have access to financial services in general. The aim is to support the creation of businesses and, thus, to create income and reduce poverty. Moreover, microcredit can be seen as a way to improve education and health, and empower the poor and also women in some of the less advanced countries of the world where they are still under-privileged.

Modern microcredit is generally regarded to have begun with the founding of Grameen Bank by later Nobel Laureate Muhammad Yunus in Dhaka, Bangladesh in 1976 (Islam 2007). Thus, it has started out as a form of social entrepreneurship as Yunus invented a new business model that created considerable social benefit. However, when microlending expanded, it turned into a social innovation, as it did not remain confined to newly created organizations specialized in microlending. Today, microcredit is also provided by commercial banks, governmental organizations and even by individuals who can engage in lending through platforms such as Kiva or Zidisha. Traditionally, credit was almost exclusively provided by

commercial banks, which only lent to customers that would meet certain requirements on collateral or income. The innovation here is twofold. First, lending is now being done by actors from all three sectors of society. Second, credit is given to people who would not have been able to obtain a loan under traditional standards.

Though the effects of microcredit are disputed, it is an excellent example for how traditional economic processes can be changed into social opportunities and how social benefits can be created through innovation, when different sectors of society participate.

4 Conclusion

Despite the great contribution that social innovation can make to address social problems, it should not be regarded as a panacea. It is not a cure for all social ills. Social innovation can hardly be generated in the same way as technological innovation, which can be made through continuous and systematic research processes. Social innovation, however, is created through individual ideas that are capable of being applied on a larger scope. This application or adaptation process is a difficult one, as social innovation will be most effective when many different actors from different sectors of society participate. This means that the reluctance among important groups will endanger or even prohibit the potential successes of social innovation. Fair trade would not exist if consumers were unwilling to buy the products, even if producers and vendors were eager and ready to pursue the idea. Microfinance would be much less effective if commercial banks had not joined in, because non-profit organizations have neither the resources or the organizational skills and capabilities to provide loans on a wider geographic and financial scale. Therefore, we believe there are multiple ways in which social innovation can contribute to progress in our ever changing world.

References

- Adams D, Hess M (2011) Social innovation and why it has policy significance. *Econ Labour Relat Rev* 21:139–156
- Azzone G, Bertele U (1994) Exploiting green strategies for competitive advantage. *Long Range Plann* 27:69–81
- Bornstein D (2007) *How to change the world: social entrepreneurs and the power of new ideas*. Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Dechant K, Altman B (1994) Environmental leadership: from compliance to competitive advantage. *Acad Manage Exec* 8:7–28
- Dees JG, Emerson J, Economy P (2001) *Enterprising nonprofits a toolkit for social entrepreneurs*. Wiley, New York
- Drucker PF (1984) The new meaning of corporate social responsibility. *Calif Manage Rev* 26:53–63