Social Entrepreneurs as change makers

expanding public service networks for social innovation

Hansen, Anne Vorre; Fuglsang, Lars; Gallouj, Faïz; Scupola, Ada

Published in:
Public Management Review

DOI:
10.1080/14719037.2021.1916065

Publication date:
2022

Document Version
Early version, also known as pre-print

Citation for published version (APA):
Hansen, A. V., Fuglsang, L., Gallouj, F., & Scupola, A. (2022). Social Entrepreneurs as change makers: expanding public service networks for social innovation. *Public Management Review* , *24*(10), 1632-1651. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2021.1916065

Social Entrepreneurs as change makers: expanding public service innovation networks for social innovation

Author 1 (Corresponding author)
Anne Vorre Hansen
Associate Professor, PhD
Roskilde University,
Department of People and Technology
Universitetsvej 1
4000 Roskilde, Denmark
Phone +45 6160 1331
vorre@ruc.dk

Author 2
Lars Fuglsang
Professor, PhD
Roskilde University,
Department of Social Sciences and Business
Universitetsvej 1
4000 Roskilde, Denmark
Phone + 45 2173 7164
fuglsang@ruc.dk

Author 3
Faïz Gallouj
Professor, PhD
University of Lille
Faculty of Economics and Sociology
Cité scientifique
59655 Villeneuve d'Ascq, France
Phone +33 (0)3 20 33 61 52
faiz.gallouj@univ-lille.fr

Author 4
Ada Scupola
Professor, PhD
Roskilde University,
Department of Social Sciences and Business
Universitetsvej 1
4000 Roskilde, Denmark
Phone + 45 5054 1141
ada@ruc.dk

Abstract
Social innovation, in the context of public innovation, has gained increased attention in literature, and is either approached relative to the third sector, to social enterprises or as practices initiated by the public sector. But the interplay between these differing actors in enabling social innovation is still underexplored. Therefore, the article investigates the role of social entrepreneurs from outside the public sector as enabling public sector innovation networks. Since social innovation is inherently relational four cases of how social entrepreneurs have been able to push the boundaries of public sector services, and hence expand public innovation networks, are analyzed.

Key words
Public service innovation, social innovation, social entrepreneurs, innovation networks

Introduction
In the field of public services, the paradigm shifts from traditional public administration to new public management and then to new public governance reflect the rise to prominence of innovation in public services and the networked organization of production and innovation (Kelly, Mulgan and Muers 2002; Osborne 2010; Voorberg, Bekkers and Tummers 2015; Mergel 2018; Crosby, Hart and Torfing 2017; Torfing, 2019). Researchers have started to pay attention to the emergence of such new types of innovation networks in the public sector, however, the literature is still immature concerning innovation networks dealing with innovation in public services focusing on social innovation (Sørensen and Torfing 2010). Social innovation and its inherent focus on addressing social needs, is in literature often referred to as a response to 'wicked' problems of today's societies. Therefore, the concern with social innovation is also relevant to the public sector, both as something happening outside the sector, but also as something that may be integrated into public sector organizations.

Theoretically, this has been conceptualized as public service innovation networks for social innovation (PSINSI) – PSINSIs are thus multi-agent collaborative arrangements, which mobilise a variable number of public and private agents, in particular citizens, in order to co-produce social innovations in response to complex problems (Desmarchelier, Djellal and Gallouj 2020). However, while these are described in the literature as mainly collective actors, it is still needed to understand the particular role of the individual social entrepreneur in development of public sector innovation networks for social innovation. Also, since social innovation as targeting social needs, is explicitly concerned with how innovation processes should be fruitful for the people engaged by transforming relations and by giving access to resources and power. The research question guiding the forthcoming analysis is therefore: *How do social entrepreneurs external to the public sector spur and add to public sector innovation networks for social innovation and to which innovation regime may they be associated*?

To answer the research question, a holistic multiple case study of the role of social entrepreneurs in creating public sector innovation networks for social innovation has been conducted. The analysis focuses on how the individual social entrepreneur sets the scene for collective processes of public service innovation, and herein the expansion of innovation

networks targeting social challenges. As such, social entrepreneurs appear critical for the sense making process of such networks, besides for scaling up, or scaling out, innovations (Moulert and MacCallum 2019). Thus, the article addresses a research gap in the literature on public service innovation networks by conceptualizing the role of the social entrepreneur for developing public innovation networks, while also creating a foundation for further research.

The article is structured as follows: firstly, an overview of the transition from public service innovation networks to public service innovation networks for social innovation, and the implications regarding innovation regimes, is given. Subsequently, current understandings of the concept of social innovation and the role of the social entrepreneur is presented. Following the theoretical overview, the research methodology and the analytical findings will be accounted for. Finally the main findings are discussed and future research avenues will be outlined in the concluding remarks.

Towards public service innovation networks for social innovation

Innovation studies have gradually shifted their analytical focus from visible to invisible innovation, and from the individual entrepreneur to the network (via the organization/hierarchy) (Martin 2015; Djellal and Gallouj 2018). According to economic theory, an innovation network is a system of relationships between different agents whose purpose is innovation. The agents in question do not all have to belong to the same organization (otherwise this group of agents would simply be a hierarchy), and the relations that link them can take different forms (cooperation, coordination, collaboration, co-creation, co-production, co-innovation, co-design), the definitions of which have been the object of an extensive literature (Keast, Brown and Mandell 2007; Voorberg, Bekkers and Tummers 2015; Sørensen and Torfing 2013; Agger and Hedensted 2017; Pestoff, Osborne and Brandsen 2006).

Desmarchelier et al. (2020) propose a simple typology of these different forms of innovation networks based on the following different criteria: 1) the main sector in which the network is deployed, 2) the types of agents involved, 3) the role of the public agent, and 4) the main form of the innovation pursued. On this basis, they observe a tertiarization/servitization of the notion of innovation network. This process describes a shift in the analytical focus from traditional innovation networks (focused on technological innovation in manufacturing industry) whose archetype is the triple helix model (Etzkovitz and Leydesdorff 2000) to market service innovation networks (focused on market services and service innovation), and then to public service innovation networks (focused on innovation in all its forms in the field of public services). In innovation networks of any kind, public administration, when present, can play two different roles: an operational role of active collaboration in the production and implementation of innovation (co-production) and a role of support or facilitator (meta-governance) of innovation. Thus, in traditional innovation networks, public administration is involved mainly through the establishment of regulations and financing systems that are favourable to innovation and networking.

PSINSIs

Recently the latest expression of the network lineage (Desmarchelier, Djellal and Gallouj 2020) is devoted to the emergence of social innovation. The concept of ‘public service innovation networks for social innovation’ (PSINSIs) has been introduced to theorize social innovation in public services and how it is implemented through collaborative networks (Desmarchelier, Djellal and Gallouj 2020). PSINSIs are multi-agent collaborative arrangements that develop within public services in the sectoral sense of the term or public

service in the functional sense, i.e. service of general interest. These sorts of collaborative systems for social innovation in public services can be spontaneous or self-organized - in this case, they are the result of the fortuitous convergence of the concerns of agents facing the same problem, often in a given local environment (a neighbourhood, a city, a region). But they can also be set up in a planned way - in this case, they are initiated by an agent who may belong to the public or the private sphere. The private agent can be an individual citizen or an organisation. Planned PSINSIs are generally easier to identify than previous ones. Indeed, it is easier to identify an initiating agent (who will tend to promote his/her/its project) than a subjective moment that would fix the fortuitous convergence of the ideas and initiatives of several actors. Hence, in PSINSIs, the meta-governance role is not excluded, but what is most important is the fact that public administration, when involved, actively (operationally) participates in an innovation that directly concerns its own sphere of activity (the public service itself).

Innovation regimes and PSINSIs

Following a Schumpeterian analysis (Schumpeter 1912, Schumpeter 1942), economic theory makes a distinction between two innovation regimes: the entrepreneurial regime and the routinized regime (Winter 1984). The first is based on the heroic figure of the individual entrepreneur who introduces radical innovations in a discontinuous way. In the second regime, which follows, but does not replace the previous one, innovation is exploitative rather than exploratory. It is therefore rather incremental and takes place on a continuous basis.

Both models or regimes have been applied to both social and public innovation. The literature thus highlights an entrepreneurial regime and a routinized regime for both social and public innovation. The literature on social entrepreneurship is particularly extensive. It is mainly empirical, accounting for innovative initiatives carried out by ‘fiery souls’, pioneers in the field of the social and solidarity economy (Mulgan, Tucker and Sanders 2007). The literature on public or institutional entrepreneurship is in fact essentially devoted to public *intrapreneurship*, i.e. the way in which individuals within a public organisation can autonomously (similarly to entrepreneurship) implement a public service innovation. It thus reflects a form of mixing entrepreneurial and routinized regimes.

PSINSIs, are not considered as a new regime of innovation and learning, but as a modality of innovation organization that can itself fit into the two traditional regimes. In other words, just as entrepreneurial and routinized regimes can be applied to social and public innovation produced by individual entrepreneurs or incumbent firms or organizations, so can they be applied to social innovation produced within networks. It is thus possible to highlight PSINSIs that are set up under an entrepreneurial regime and others that are set up under a routinized regime. Entrepreneurial PSINSIs can be initiated by an individual private agent or they can emerge spontaneously through the convergence of the concerns of several individual entrepreneurs. They are often a response to State failure. It should be noted that, while entrepreneurial PSINSIs are based on the heroic figure of the individual entrepreneur (or several individual entrepreneurs), the constitution of the entrepreneurial PSINSI usually implies the inclusion in the network of a certain number of public or private organizations. Routinized PSINSIs, for their part, are based on the collaboration of already existing third sector organizations (associations, foundations, etc.) and/or public service organizations (administrations at different levels). Entrepreneurial PSINSIs are intended to evolve towards a routinized regime, with individual nodes of the network becoming organisations (for example, when the individual social entrepreneur creates an association or a social and

solidarity economy enterprise). In the following the 'social' aspect of social innovation and social entrepreneurship will be further explored.

The (re-)emergence of social innovation

Historically the term social innovation has been a highly contested concept, since the emergence in the early nineteenth century. Adding 'social' to innovation became more or less a synonym for socialism, which in the beginning (at least to conservatists) were still understood in a negative sense – as the term innovation itself, which referred to revolutionary action and upheaval (Godin 2015). But, later it became a concept related with cooperative forms of social reform more broadly, and by the end of the century, social innovation became a word associated with new social practices or social change. The change perspective was part of the way innovation became an inherently positive term of progress and social development in the twentieth century. This was pushed forward by Schumpeter's theories, and by the middle of the century, innovation were mainly associated with technological development and entrepreneurship – an understanding that also came to dominate Western world policy (Moulaert and MacCallum 2019, 15). But, alongside the focus on radical change and emancipation in the 1960s, a renewed focus on transforming society added to these prevailing streams of thought. Moulaert and MacCallum (2019) identify a number of 'waves' of international social mobilization: a radical emancipation wave based in social theories pursuing equity and emancipation, a wave based on e.g. neighborhood and community development as response to industrial restructuring and a social and solidarity economy wave as an answer to the 2008 global financial crisis (Moulaert and McCallum 2019, 23). These historical trajectories of, on the one hand mainstream economic and entrepreneurship theory and practice, and on the other hand social movements and theories are still mirrored in the differing perceptions and usages of the concept of social innovation today.

A practical and a critical take on social innovation

In current literature this has become evident through two main streams of thought, which according to Moulaert and MacCallum (2019) primarily differ in regards to how the transformative role of social innovation is presented, and as a consequence how social innovation is positioned in the current political-economic order. They label these streams of social innovation scholarship, the 'practical' stream and the 'critical' stream respectively. The former is rooted in the mentioned entrepreneurship and business theories and urges to find new and better solutions to address social needs. It rests on a market ideology that sees social problems as something that avoid people/individuals participating in the market economy, and hence focuses on 'what works' –with diffusion of knowledge and scaling up as success parameters. The perspective implies that social innovation is something, which can be managed, and this understanding has been highly influencing the approach to social innovation in the private, the public and the third sector. The presented PSINSI framework is positioned herein. The latter is rooted in the emancipatory tradition, which sees social problems, and solutions to these, as inherently linked to socio-economic structures and institutions. Thus, social innovation is not solely about problem solving, but more far-reaching about spurring counter-hegemonic approaches of development based on solidarity - success parameters therefore becomes the transformative potential for more wider scales of social mobilization (also referred to as scaling out) (Moulert and McCallum 2019, 35). This perspective implies a concern with social innovation as driver for reconfiguring democratic governance.

Due to the trans-disciplinary nature of social innovation theorizing, the 'practical' and the 'critical' streams are to be seen as a spectrum within which nuances and varied discussions

and development of social innovation thinking is taking place. Especially since there are some commonalities across the two ends of the spectrum, illustrated by a shared understanding of the following key characteristics of social innovation; social innovation addresses social problems and/or human needs, and social innovation is as much about processes than outcomes. This is reflected in the widely applied narrow definition of social innovation as being social in both means and ends (Gallouj et al. 2018; OECD 2000; Mulgan et al. 2007). However, a more encompassing definition is the one presented by the EU-project TEPSIE, which defines social innovation as: 'New approaches to addressing social needs. They are social in their means and in their ends. They engage and mobilize the beneficiaries and help to transform social relations by improving beneficiaries' access to power and resources' (TEPSIE 2015). In this definition, the main focus is both on outcome and empowerment of the people concerned by supporting relational changes. As such social innovation is an emancipatory process leading to social transformation, but might also be specifically concerned with developing new approaches to support such change in itself.

The social entrepreneur as individual or collective actor

The approach to social innovation also influences how the social entrepreneur is perceived. Much literature based in the practical stream of thought has focused on the *individual* entrepreneur as driver of innovation, and often the social entrepreneur is referred to as a sort of 'heroic' actor that enables social change through creativity (Montgomery, Dacin and Dacin 2012). A focus of this literature has been to discuss to what extent the social entrepreneur resemblances entrepreneurs in general, and the argument is that the traits are quite similar. What is added, besides the entrepreneurial mindset and the capacity to balance a dual purpose, is that the social entrepreneur should be able to creatively and innovatively combine existing resources or create new ones – oriented towards a social goal (Lortie and Cox 2018). Literature based in the critical stream of thought focuses more on the interplay between multi-level governance and discourse, and collective actors and communities (Moulaert and McCallum 2019). This more collective perspective is increasingly emerging based on the argument that social entrepreneurship, as broader domain, is inherently collective-oriented and considered to rely on collaboration and alliances. Hence, collaborative action, among similar or diverse actors is seen as paramount for solving wider societal challenges (Montgomery, Dacin and Dacin 2012).

In sum, the theoretical framework that will be applied in the analysis consists of the following three conceptual understandings: public service innovation networks for social innovation as theoretical lenses to understand cross-sectorial collaboration targeting social challenges, social innovation as process and outcome, and social entrepreneurs as both individual and collective actors. As such, the framework opens up for a broader and more nuanced analysis of the interplay between social entrepreneurs, existing networks and collective action.

Methodology

To empirically explore the role of the social entrepreneur for public sector innovation in different contexts, the analysis is based on a holistic multiple case study (Yin 1014); holistic in the sense that there is one single unit of analysis: the role of social entrepreneurs in expanding public service innovation networks for social innovation, and multiple since four different cases are taken as point of departure. To get as nuanced a picture as possible case selection criteria were focused around the following: actors from the private sector

(exemplified by case 1 and 4), an actor from the third sector (exemplified by case 2) and an actor from within the public sector (exemplified by case 3).

Finally the founders, and now the organizational networks, of Cycling Without Age, Mind Your Own Business, E-Bro and Citybee were chosen as cases. All four cases stems from Denmark, and are in the Danish field of social entrepreneurship perceived successful (Fuglsang, Hansen and Scupola 2019). Hence, it is therefore relevant to better understand the preceding conditions for social innovation to happen and become sustainable, herein identifying the main actors and exposing the institutional factors (understood broadly). As such the cases are somehow paradigmatic since they might set the standards for future likely cases (Flyvbjerg 2006).

Cases and data material

Case 1: Cycling Without Age (CWA)

Cycling Without Age is, by its founders and employees, mainly perceived as a movement that is nevertheless based on a number of legal and organizational units as foundation for the movement to operate, collaborate, apply for funding and hire employees. The movement started in 2012, but was not formally and legally established before 2015. The main idea is that elderly people living in care centres or elderly people offered home care are given the opportunity to get a bike ride in a trishaw. The trip involves, what is referred to as the three Ps: pilots, passengers and personnel. The pilot (driver) is either a volunteer or an employee from the care centre or home care, the passenger is the elderly person and personnel refer to the employees and/or administration at the care centre/home care. The main objective of Cycling Without Age is presented as giving the elderly *the right to wind in the hair* by ensuring mobility and active partaking in society.

Case 2: Mind Your Own Business (MYOB)

Since 2010 the organisation Mind Your Own Business (MYOB) has been organising and facilitating development projects for young boys, between the age of 13 and 19, from marginalised housing areas. The program is centred around entrepreneurship and in cooperation with voluntary venture pilots from civil society and business partners the young boys are given the opportunity to start their own micro-enterprise. An established team of approximately 10-12 boys, 8-9 venture pilots, a business partner and contact persons from the engaged youth club or the non-profit housing department runs each micro-enterprise. Thus, almost 200 people are partaking in the program each year. The philosophy behind MYOB is that the program develops the professional and social competencies of the young boys and thereby enables a stronger association to the educational system and the job market. The organisation itself employs 12 employees, who mainly work as either project managers, project coordinators or project workers.

Case 3: E-bro

E-bro is a company that has developed IT solution called “JobIntra” targeting the flexi-job scheme, an initiative within the Danish unemployment scheme. The flexi-job scheme targets people in any profession with permanently and significantly reduced ability to work. In many ways, a flexi-job is a normal employment, where tasks and working hours in the flexi-job are just adapted to what the individual flexi-job employee can handle. “JobIntra” is an IT solution that has made the process of finding a flexi-job more efficient for job centres. The basic model is that of "no cure-no pay model". Hence, E-bro develops the system, which they sell to job centers; there are establishment costs, then a unit price for each citizen inserted into the system is charged, which applies for six months. At the end of the six month, if the

citizen does not get a job, then E-bro does not get the money. The goals of E-bro are the following: 1) help society to improve for all citizens; 2) not to be capitalist; 3) ideology and politics to contribute to making the world a better place for all parties.

Case 4: Citybee
The association Citybee was established in 2009, founded on an urge to find a model of production that would contribute to a richer environment and inclusive communities. Finding a new model in the face of climate change and social transformation was seen as urgent – and honeybees and pollination seemed to offer both a model and a metaphor. Citybee rents beehives to public, private and social organizations in the city of Copenhagen. The beehives are placed around the city, on the rooftops of or near buildings of these organisations, and Citybee is in charge of processing and selling the honey produced by the rented beehives. Citybee also conducts beekeeping and honey production courses and organise workshops and events. There are 5 employees at Citybee of different backgrounds and several volunteers helping out with practical work (changing from 2-15 during the bee season). The association describes itself as working for enriching the environment and believing that everyone has something to contribute whatever their background.

Table 1 gives an overview of data material collected in each case.

Table 1 to be inserted here

Analytical strategy
The data material has been subject to a thematic analysis consisting of three main steps (Silverman 2011): firstly themes were identified across data sets; what was at stake to the interviewees and in key documents and how was this articulated and expressed. These themes were grouped under twelve 1. order categories summing up the substance of data. The second step in the analysis involved recognizing the links and patterns between these categories and then establishing 2. order categories, based on the joint analysis of the researchers. Lastly, the 2. order categories were organized into three overall analytical themes. The conceptual construct of first and second order categories supports transparency in the analytical process, which is visualized in figure 1 below.

Figure 1 to be inserted here

Analysis
In the next section the analytical findings based on the following main themes identified in data are presented: 1) the ethos of the social entrepreneur, 2) network enabling and network enabler and 3) social entrepreneurs as triggering public sector innovation.

The ethos of the social entrepreneur
The foundational stories of the four cases are all characterized by a degree of chance and personal commitment to a certain cause. The founders of Citybee and CWA tell how they more or less by chance in a daily situation, cycling from home seeing a lonely elderly on a bench and discovering a barely concealed beehive, got an idea and an urge to action. Diving deeper into these narratives it is also evident that ideas and action do not happen out of the

blue, and that both founders were already focused on making change, as part of either their personal life or their work life. In the case of MYOB and E-bro the trigger for doing something differently evolved over time by their experience in a certain work field. Both founders were already working closely with the actors and in the context, that they later came to develop answers to. To illustrate; the CEO of MYOB had for years been working with marginalized families and children as part of a large NGO. As such she witnessed first-hand that especially young boys fell through the security net of the welfare state.

She accounts: '*…there were times where I thought to myself 'we could have prevented this', I mean if it is a family with four boys and three of them were already placed in care... So, to me it became about prevention instead of being part of a system just waiting to sanction. That was my motivation*'.

The founder of E-bro, by working at a job center in a municipality had seen the importance for disabled citizens of getting and being in job. He experienced the significance for all people to contribute to society and how they got 'stuck' if they had nothing to do. To him this was the main motivation for helping a specific citizen group in the direction of finding employment.

The motivational triggers, be that a spontaneous idea or an evolving insight into a specific domain, led all four founders to take action. But even though they in retrospect can be perceived social entrepreneurs, and they as such all resemblance the heroic entrepreneurial figure, only the founder of CWA was on beforehand an entrepreneur and idea generator. Thus, it seems like a key characteristic of the social entrepreneur is rather the 'necessity to act' than an urge to become an entrepreneur as such. All four founders identified a problem in society and instead of solely pinpointing the challenge they reacted to make a change.

The reaction and the ability to take action is deeply linked with their individual skills and competences. In the case of CWA, the founder was a skilled event maker and business man, in the case of MYOB, the founder had deep knowledge about the target group through experience and education as social worker, in the case of Citybee, the founder was concerned with kinship and how to create meaning-full communities, and lastly the founder of e-bro was working from within the public administration knowing the regulations and the people concerned.

Interestingly the clear narrative of making a change has in all four cases evolved over time. So, what started out as an urge to react based on a felt indignation is today discursively constructed as a systems critique. Hence, the objective of the organizations is two-fold: to create value at a subjective level for the people involved and targeted through the different initiatives, while also creating societal value by changing practices and perspectives at a systemic level. To illustrate the subjective value creation, a manager at CWA tells: '*We see ourselves as a tool to make people who normally do not have a voice in society heard. And this is based on the intimacy created by cycling – in this manner they are "talked" back into society*'. Whereas the focus on making change at a societal level is mirrored in the saying of the organization: "*Ride by ride we change the world*".

The founder of Citybee, even more explicitly, emphasizes the objective of changing prevailing production systems by the metaphor of bees and honey. The case both adds to environmental enrichment (bees and flowers in the Copenhagen city-environment) while also

developing new forms of inclusive production and co-production, which is founded on a systemic critique of existing practices and terminologies.

The founder stresses that honey is not '*seen as a product in itself, but as an invitation to plant a flower, to see the environment in a new way, to connect the homeless person or the refugee from Syria with the buttered toast and honey that you might enjoy in your kitchen with your children*'.

In sum, the ethos of the social entrepreneur in the cases is that of a change maker/someone who takes action – based on a wish to create change at both an individual and a societal level. This is on the one hand realized through personal skills and competences, but on the other hand the surrounding network and contextual factors play a key role.

Network enabling and network enabler
One thing is to be part of a relevant network, another thing is to bring that network into play. Throughout the four cases the use of existing platforms and networks have been a prerequisite for establishing and making the organizations sustainable.

The founder of MYOB developed the program from a position in the Danish Refugee Council. The NGO acted as platform for pilot-testing the idea and for developing the structure of the initiative, so MYOB was not established as an independent institution before the whole program was in place and working. CWA has from the beginning strategically used social media as a platform for storytelling, creating events and for reaching out to volunteers and stakeholders. Also, the founder has widely drawn upon his existing personal network in both the private and the public sector. And the stories that began flourishing on social media platforms supported and created a legitimate outset for reaching out to key actors in the Copenhagen Municipality. One of these municipal managers tapped into the idea, and later became a co-founder of the organization.

Besides these two concrete examples of using existing platforms, be that professional, personal or digital, this key aspect of releasing resources is seen across all cases. And to do so, the use of storytelling and creating a story that actors could envision and react to have been crucial in not only mobilizing networks, but also in creating and expanding networks. The founder of E-bro reflects upon how the established collaboration is based on the story of a 'good cause':

'*We have created an interaction platform that makes it possible to exchange information. The problem today is that there are many people around the individual who do not work together. It can be the job center, the child administration, a physiotherapist and, for example, an employer, each of whom works for 'the good cause'. Instead of acting individually, it is now possible to work together with the vulnerable towards common goals'.*

Another factor that more founders refer to in this regard is timing. Timing has to do with the current meta-stories and condition of society. To exemplify, MYOB and Citybee both address CSR strategies of large companies (which in Denmark is a legal demand if the organization have more than 250 employees). Thus, the companies that are either part of the MYOB program or are hosting beehives can integrate and document this as CSR initiatives and actions. Another example of timing, but from within the public sector, is seen in the case of CWA where the contemporary state of affairs within elderly care made a room for the initiative:

'*I think the CWA was introduced at a time where the pressure was so hard within elderly care that is was possible to realize. If it had been years before, when there was more money it probably would already have been part of the service offering*', a public manager reflects.

Besides timing, an interesting aspect of network enabling is the ability to find and mobilize the *intra*preneurs of collaborating organizations to be able to succeed. As already mentioned, the founder of CWA was pointed in the direction of a public manager, that someone in his network perceived open-minded and positive to change. Also, in recruiting care centers to be part of the initiative, it is told that managers in the public administration know which center managers are the most pro-active and receptive to new ideas – and that these have played a key role in rolling out the program. The founder of MYOB adds to this picture by stressing that organizations first and foremost consist of people, which is why it is important to identify the actors that are willing to take a risk and build up relationships:

'*I have had rejections from the former integration ministry who didn't believe in it, because they didn't believe the target group were capable of this. Therefore, I have been very happy that some funds have helped building this up, that they dared and were willing to take some risks in their donations saying 'this sounds interesting, but it also sounds difficult', because it is a difficult target group. It is a lot of actors who are collaborating, so it has been very hard work! It has required many cups of coffee, since this is built on networks, relations...'.*

As the above illustrates, mobilizing existing networks and platforms becomes the outset for expanding and creating new networks. As such network enabling is a dynamic process influenced by timing/the ripe moment and being pointed in the direction of intrapreneurs.

Social entrepreneurs as triggering public sector innovation

The four cases are examples of social innovation in the sense that the social entrepreneurs succeeded in releasing existing resources and by collective mobilizing, the creation of new processes and offerings targeting societal challenges. But they are not examples of structured and deliberate innovation processes, since the founders did not set out to *do* innovation; even though they were motivated by and acted to create change, they did not think in terms of innovating the public sector. Still, all four cases are somehow dependent on and engage to different degrees in collaboration with the public sector. The implication to both the public sector and to the case initiatives is intertwined: 1) the organizations needed to become an actor the public sector could collaborate with, that is, a legal unit. This led to organizational maturity and establishment. 2) the urge to engage in collaboration from a public sector perspective has led to public sector innovation due to the way the cases challenge existing norms and practices.

As the case of CWA mirrors, it became clear to the founders that at some point the time was ripe to move from being '*a movement for a good purpose belonging to the people*' to a foundation that had the ability to ensure stable funding, that is, '*to become someone to be addressed legally*'. An informant from MYOB adds to this perspective by realizing that being pushed towards finding new solutions within the frame of existing logics has developed the organization itself: '*We almost never fall into existing boxes and hence we need to ensure specially designed solutions – which has become a competency of ours in itself*'.

There is a shared understanding across cases that they push the boundaries of what is possible to do and achieve in cross-sectorial collaboration. In the case of CWA the initiative rely on

mobilizing public sector resources since the actors from the domain of elderly care play a key role. As such, CWA has supported new forms of organizing both internally at the care centers and externally by the involvement of volunteers and the immediate environment.

'*It (CWA) somehow forces the public sector and civil society to enter each other's domains and to explore and understand what kind of logics are at stake respectively*', a public manager states.

To MYOB the public actors are not part of the program itself, but they are important as practical enablers at a local level regarding access to venues and the boys through the youth club – besides offering professional back-up should the boys need it. This more facilitating role, being in the background, has caused some discussion and adaptation from the public sector actors.

As the founder of MYOB stresses: '*What is important is that the municipalities accept that they are stepping into something new, a change model, where they need to be involved, but where they should not control or manage. They have to accept this as it is and not perceive us as consultants doing everything – but instead see us as an organisation gathering some actors to leverage this program, so their municipality and housing area are taking to another place*'.

At a more systemic level, there are in the cases of Citybee and MYOB also traces of disruption. MYOB pushes the formal collaborators to change their way of operating and to invent new modes that are aligned with the need of the micro-enterprises. MYOB has deliberately approached trade organizations and Head Quarters to make it easier for, for example, the local bank offices to find solutions - which they have managed to do. In this manner, they succeed in obtaining specially designed solutions due to the wish from the formal institutions to be flexible and to support the program.

Talking to one of Citybee's partners about hosting a beehive and following the process of honey production, they reveal how the daily dialogue around lunch table has changed from everyday discussion to talks about the environment and how to act in a sustainable manner. These kinds of more substantial changes are what Citybee aims for. As the founder reflects upon:

'*It is easier to act your way into new ways of thinking than to think your way into new ways of acting. The only thing that we can say for certain about how life will be in 20 or 30 years from now for our children and grandchildren is that it is not going to be anything like what we have now. But we can create structures now that will allow new systems to emerge'.*

To sum up, all four cases are examples of social innovation emerging in the interplay between the public sector and the third sector and/or civil society. Yet, the cases of social innovation are not initiated or "owned" by the public sector itself, but are highly dependent on and situated within a network of cross-sector collaboration. As such they are examples of bottom-up social innovation and not examples of specific public sector innovation processes per se.

Discussion

In literature on public sector innovation networks for social innovation (PSINSIs), the focus is on social innovations targeting complex or 'wicked' social problems (Desmarchelier et al., 2020). The public sector itself might play different roles (if any), from initiator to facilitator, but either way the sector is involved in innovation that directly has to do with its own sphere of activities. The four cases analyzed can all be seen in the light of PSINSIs; they represent cases of social innovation initiatives mainly triggered from outside the public sector, while still being dependent on establishing cross-sector collaboration and networks based on different degrees of association with the public sector.

But as earlier mentioned the concept of social innovation stems from two different historical trajectories: mainstream economic theory and social movement theory. As most conceptualizations of social innovation in public administration, PSINSI theorizing is positioned in the former. That is, social innovation is seen as solution and as outcome. On the contrary the latter stream of thought emphasize the transformative potential of social innovation, and is as such understood as collective processes empowering the people concerned ((Montgomery, Dacin and Dacin 2012).

The cases at hand are not examples of structured deliberate innovation processes with the main aim of delivering solutions to identified challenges – and hence to 'fix' a public sector problem. They are rather initiatives triggered by a personal concern/indignation with existing practices and structures, which is why they are not only focusing on solving a challenge at a subjective level, but reach further and seek to change the system itself. In this manner the cases are based on ideas of the dynamics of change; that if you are able to make a change at an individual level you also set the ground for making a cultural change that can lead to societal or institutional changes at a collective level. The implication relative to innovation is that of a processual perspective on innovation; not understood as a specific method or model for innovation, but merely as an approach to explore and develop the overall objective of change (Barinaga 2012). Hence, the four cases resemblance social innovation in line with both the practical *and* the critical stream of thought, that emphasizes collective action and change.

These social innovation aspects are furthermore mirrored in the cases as they have not only succeeded in upscaling, they have also, despite to different degrees, succeeded in scaling out (Moulaert and MacCallum 2019). Regarding upscaling, especially MYOB, E-bro and CWA have managed to be spread across Danish municipalities. Moreover, these three organizations have strategically worked with an internationalization strategy: CWA is now represented in 27 countries, E-bro has a unit in Ukraine and MYOB is establishing a unit in Greenland. Citybee has not developed geographically since they are mainly positioned in the capital area of Denmark. But regarding out scaling, Citybee has managed to mobilize a wide range of partnerships across sectors and to reach a large amount of people due to sale of honey products through a Danish supermarket chain. MYOB, CWA and E-bro can also be seen in the light of scaling out insofar they in both communication and practices seek to create and spur counter-hegemonic approaches to public service offerings based on mobilizing citizens, private and public actors in collective action.

As such, the organizations are in themselves part of creating new structures, understandings and practices since the innovation of the cases are not solely that of the outcome of the initiatives, but the process of establishing the organizations and becoming able to offer the service, the product and/or the program become ongoing innovation processes in themselves.

Relative to the increased focus on cross-sectorial collaboration for public innovation (Sancino, Rees and Schindele 2018) , the initiatives are exactly what the critical perspective on social innovation implies: social innovation as driver for reconfiguring democratic governance.

Returning to the role of the social entrepreneur, the cases furthermore refine the understandings of the different innovation regimes, and how they might be enacted in a public sector context. Seen through the lenses of innovation regimes theory, the ethos of the social entrepreneur in the cases somehow transcends the entrepreneurial and the routinized regime (Winter 1984). All four founders mirrors the heroic entrepreneurial figure in so far that they do not only identify challenges, they actually take action on behalf of people, that do not have a voice in society, or at least only a small voice. But the ability and the platform for taking action are highly dependent on having and expanding existing networks and is furthermore conditioned by current tendencies and changing mindsets in society at large. Hence, despite the individual 'fiery soul' being a key factor in all cases, the initiatives have evolved over time and in close collaboration with a network of actors representing the private sector, the public sector and civil society. The process is thus rather incremental than radical innovation.

To sum up, the presented cases reveal new aspects of social innovation – based in a new domain where innovation and change take place on the borders of the public sector. All cases are concerned with systemic change: be that through the means of physical movement (a bike ride), figuratively as getting somebody from a to b (becoming readier for the labour market), IT innovation as change maker or through new philosophies of production. As revealed this focus on systemic change challenges existing social innovation processes in the context of the public sector, which is why a deeper understanding of social entrepreneurship logics and the social entrepreneurial ethos, might open up for actors outside the sector to contribute to institutional and public sector change through interactive and collective processes.

Hence, to spur and promote such forms of social innovation, that are not necessarily structured or set out as public innovation, the public sector itself needs adhere to a more entrepreneurial mindset of innovation. Especially since the cases also show that the more the case organisation is dependent on collaborating with the public sector, the less transformational potential. CWA is for example by the public managers merely considered an add on to existing public service offerings. Therefore, to embrace these types of innovation processes and to emphasize the dynamic aspects of social innovation, a refined framework of PSINSIs is proposed: social innovation networks are to be seen as enablers of public innovation and not solely as outcome of public sector innovation networks.

Concluding remarks

The paper sat out to explore the following research question: How do social entrepreneurs external to the public sector spur and add to public sector innovation networks for social innovation and to which innovation regime may they be associated?

Through a holistic multiple case study of four cases from Denmark it became clear how the ethos of the social entrepreneur external to the public sector, the way he/she enables existing and new networks, and how a social entrepreneurial mindset, encompassing both a practical and a critical approach to social innovation, triggers public sector innovation are key factors

in understanding the dynamics between social innovation networks and public sector innovation.

Moreover, it is concluded that social entrepreneurs by taking action at an individual level are able to create collective action through relationship building and community mobilizing. Hence, in regards to innovation regimes the entrepreneurial regime shall in this context, be seen as an interactive collective co-creational process, which over time both lead to incremental innovation, that is, a routinized regime, and to more radical innovation.

In sum, the contribution to the PSINSIs literature is adding such a dynamic understanding of the processes that lead to/is to be understood as social innovation, whereas the contribution to social innovation literature is a dual focus on both the individual social entrepreneur and the collective actions he/she stimulates. The implication is that individual and collective processes and that entrepreneurial and routinized innovation regimes are not solely representing poles of a spectrum, but rather they might be understood and analyzed as intertwined in time alongside being mutual interdependent.

Therefore, future research, to better understand social innovation in the context of the public sector, could further explore studies on social innovation initiatives and networks stemming from outside the public sectors and how these not only create new solutions, but also new structures that might spur further innovation. Consequently, the unit of analysis shifts from public sector innovation networks *for* social innovation to social innovation networks *as* public innovation.

Declaration of interest statement
This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 770356. This publication reflects the views only of the authors, and the Agency cannot be held responsible for any use, which may be made of the information contained therein.

References

Agger A. and Hedensted D. L. 2017. "Collaborative Innovation in the Public Sector – New Perspectives on the Role of Citizens?". *Scandinavian Journal of Public Administration*, 21 (3): 17-37.

Barinaga, E. (2012). Overcoming Inertia: The Social Question in Social Entrepreneurship. In D. Hjorth (Ed.), *Handbook on Organisational Entrepreneurship*. Edward Elgar Publishing, 242-256

Bekkers V., Edelenbos J., Nederhand J., Steijn B., Tummers L. and Voorberg W. 2014. "The Social Innovation Perspective in the Public Sector: Co-creation, Self-organization and Meta-Governance". In Bekkers V., Edelenbos J and Steijn B (eds*), Innovation in the public sector: linking capacity and leadership*, Palgrave McMillan, 223-243.

Bekkers V., van Duivenboden H., and M. Thaens. 2006. “Public Innovation and Communication technology: relevant backgrounds and concepts”. In Bekkers V., van Duivenboden H. and Thaens M. (eds), *Information and Communication Technology and Public Innovation*, IOS Press, Amsterdam/Berlin/Oxford/Tokyo/Washington DC, 3-21.

Cels S., De Jong J. and Nauta F. 2012. “Agents of Change: Strategy and Tactics for Social Innovation”. Brookings Institution Press, Ash Center Series, “Innovative Governance in the 21st Century”.

Crosby, B.C. Hart, P. and J. Torfing. 2017. “Public value creation through collaborative innovation”, *Public Management Review*, 21 (1): 655-669.

Desmarchelier B., Djellal F. and Gallouj F. 2020. “Towards a servitization of innovation networks: a mapping”. *Public Management Review*, vol. 22, n° 9. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2019.1637012

Djellal F. and Gallouj F. 2018. “Fifteen challenges for service innovation studies”. In Gallouj F. Djellal F. (eds), *A Research Agenda for Service Innovation*, Edward Elgar Publishers, 1-25.

Djellal F., Gallouj F. and Miles I. 2013. “Two decades of research on innovation in services: Which place for public services?”. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, 27: 98-117.

Etzkovitz H. and 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: 109-123.

Flyvbjerg, B. 2006. Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2): 219–245.

Fuglsang, L., Hansen, A. V. and Scupola, A. (2019). Danish Case-Studies Report: Case study report. Case studies WP6: Denmark. In *Empirical approach to value co-creation in public services: structural transformations: EU-H2020 Co-VAL, Deliverable 6.1* (p. 197-285). European Commission.

Gallouj F. 2002. “Interactional innovation: a neoschumpeterian model”, in Sundbo, J. and Fuglsang, L. (eds), *Innovation as strategic reflexivity*, Routledge, 29-56.

Gallouj F., Rubalcaba L., Toivonen M. and Windrum P. 2018. “Understanding social innovation in services industries”. *Industry and Innovation*, 25 (6): 551-569.

Godin, B. 2015. Innovation Contested – the idea of innovation over the centuries. Routledge, NY and London.

Halvorsen T., Hauknes J., Miles I. and R. Rannveig. 2005. On the differences between public and private sector innovation, PUBLIN report D9.

Hartley J. 2005. “Innovation in governance and public services: Past and present”. *Public Money and Management*, 25 (1): 27-34.

Keast R., Brown K. and Mandell M. 2007. “Getting the right mix; unpacking integration meanings and strategies”. *International Public Management Journal*, 10 (1): 9-33.

Kelly G., Mulgan G. and Muers S. 2002. “Creating public value: an analytical framework for public service reform”, Cabinet Office Strategy Unit, United Kingdom Cabinet Office, London.

Windrum, P. and Koch P. (eds). 2008. *Innovation in Public Sector Services*, Cheltenham, UK, Edward Elgar, 3-20.

Lallemand D. 2001. ”*Les défis de l’innovation sociale*”. ESF éditeur, Issy-les-Moulineaux.

Lortie, J. and Cox, K. C. 2018. ”On the boundaries of social entrepreneurship: a review of relationships with related research domains”. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 14, 3: 639–648. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-018-0514-7

Martin B. 2015. “*Twenty challenges for innovation studie”s*, SPRU Working Paper Series, SWPS 2015-30, November.

Mergel, I. 2018. “Open innovation in the public sector: drivers and barriers for the adoption of Challenge.gov”, *Public Management Review*, 20 (5): 726-745.

Montgomery, A. W., Dacin, P. A. and Dacin, M. T. 2012. ”Collective Social Entrepreneurship: Collaboratively Shaping Social Good”. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 11 (3): 375–388. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1501-5

Moulaert, Frank, and Diana MacCullum. 2019. *Advanced Introduction to Social Innovation*. Elgar Advanced Introductions. S.l.: EDWARD ELGAR PUBLISHING

Mulgan G., Tucker S., Ali R. and Sanders B. 2007. “*Social Innovation: hat is it, why it matters and how it can be accelerated*?” The Young Foundation.

O’Byrne L., Miller M., Douse C., Venkatesh R. and Kapucu N. 2014. “Social Innovation in the Public Sector: The Case of Seoul Metropolitan Government”. *Journal of Economic & Social Studies*, 4 (1): 53-71.

OECD LEED Forum on Social Innovations. 2000. http://www.oecdorg/document/53/0,3343, fr 2649 34459 39263221 1 1 1 1,00.html-28k-.

Osborne, S. 2006. “The New Public Governance?”, *Public Management Review*, 8 (3): 377-388.

Osborne, S. (ed.). 2010, *The New Public Governance*?, London: Routledge.

Pestoff V., Osborne S.P. and Brandsen T. 2006. “Patterns of co-production in public services: Some concluding thoughts”. *Public Management Review*, 8 (4): 591-595.

Sancino, A., Rees J. and Schindele, I. 2018. Cross-Sector Collaboration for Public Value Co-Creation: A Critical Analysis. In From Austerity to Abundance?, *Creative Approaches to*

Coordinating the Common Good. Critical Perspectives on International Public Sector Management, 6. Emerald: 59–73.

Schumpeter J.A. 1912. Theorie der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung, Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. English translation (1934), *The Theory of Economic Development*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

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

Silverman, D. 2006. *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analyzing Talk, Text and Interaction*. SAGE Publications.

Sørensen E. and Torfing, J. 2013. "Enhancing Social Innovation by Rethinking Collaboration, Leadership and Public Governance". Paper presented at NESTA Social Frontiers, London, United Kingdom.

Sørensen E., Torfing J. 2010. "Collaborative Innovation in the Public Sector: An Analytical Framework". Working paper n°1/2010, Research project (CLIPS) funded by the Danish Strategic Research Council, Roskilde: Roskilde Universitet

TEPSIE. 'Doing Social Innovation: A Guide for Practitioners'. A deliverable of the project: "The theoretical, empirical and policy foundations for building social innovation in Europe" (TEPSIE), European Commission – 7th Framework Programme, Brussels: European Commission, DG Research

Torfing, J. 2019. "Collaborative innovation in the public sector: the argument", *Public Management Review*, 21 (1): 1-11.

Vickers I., Lyon F., Sepulveda L. and McMullin C. 2017. "Public service innovation and multiple institutional logics: The case of hybrid social enterprise providers of health and wellbeing". *Research Policy*, 46 (10): 1755-1768.

Voorberg W., Bekkers V. and L. Tummers. 2015. "A systematic review of co-production and co-creation: embarking on the social innovation journey". *Public Management Review*, 17 (9): 1333-1357.

Windrum P. 2008. "Innovation and entrepreneurship in public services", in Windrum P. and Winter S. G. (1984), "Schumpeterian competition in alternative technological regimes", *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 5, 287-320.

Yin, Robert K. 2014. *Case study research, design and methods*. 5th ed. Los Angeles: Sage.

Ziegler R. 2017. "Social innovation as a collaborative concept". *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 30 (4): 388-405.

Table 1: Overview of data material

Type of data	**Case 1: CWA**	**Case 2: MYOB**	**Case 3: E-bro**	**Case 4: Citybee**
In-depth interviews	1 interview with CEO 2 interviews with managers 3 interviews with public managers	1 interview with CEO 1 interview with manager 1 interview with third sector collaborator	1 interview with CEO 3 interviews with public managers	1 interview with CEO 1 interview with employee 1 group interview with private collaborators
Document studies (in selection)	External evaluation: "Wind in the hair gives life quality – and positive numbers at the bottom line", AskovFonden & CUA Brand Book, CWA	"MYOB's annual cycle of work", MYOB Evaluation Report: "Effect- and Process Evaluation of Mind Your Own Business 2014-2017", Als Research APS	External evaluation: "Evaluation of reform of early retirement benefit and flex job", Deloitte 2018 "Active labour market policy measures", The Danish Agency of Labour Market and Recruitment	Internal evaluation "Honey is something we create together", City-Bee Project description: The House of the Bees, City-Bee Video: Pleasure, partnerships and productivity, Meaning 2016

Figure 1: Analytical process