

Theoretical and empirical evidence of public service innovation networks for social innovation (PSINSIs) in Denmark

A Systematic Literature Review

Scupola, Ada; Fuglsang, Lars

Publication date:
2019

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Citation for published version (APA):
Scupola, A., & Fuglsang, L. (2019). *Theoretical and empirical evidence of public service innovation networks for social innovation (PSINSIs) in Denmark: A Systematic Literature Review*. Paper presented at R&D Management Conference , Paris, France.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact rucforsk@ruc.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Theoretical and empirical evidence of public service innovation networks for social innovation (PSINSIs) in Denmark: A Systematic Literature Review¹

Fuglsang, L. and Scupola, A.
Department of Social Sciences and Business, Roskilde University

e-mail: Fuglsang @ruc.dk, ada@ruc.dk

Abstract

The study's main contribution consists of the systematic review of the concept and application of public service innovation networks for social innovation (PSINSIs) in the particular Danish context. It is based on a systematic search of documents from Google and key web sites of Danish governmental and research organizations. The paper highlights that the concept takes several forms and names in the Danish literature, thus contributing to theory. The results show that the literature on PSINSIs can be grouped according to 4 themes: 1) 'Samskabelse' (co-creation), 2) collaboration with the civil society, 3) social entrepreneurs and social innovation, 4) public-private innovation partnerships. The review presents and discusses a number of Danish-based PSINSIs projects, which are the base for interesting learning lessons, thus contributing also to practice.

¹ Paper prepared for the R&D Management Conference 2019, June 17-21, Paris, France
To read the whole research report please click here: <http://www.co-val.eu/>

1 Introduction

This article provides a review of the Danish theoretical, empirical and “grey” literature on Public Service Innovation Networks for Social Innovation (PSINSIs).

In this article, we interpret public service in a broad sense both as specific service functions produced or co-produced by public-sector agents, as well as – more broadly – tasks that can be developed and carried out by other actors. The public sector as an agent can therefore have several roles in public service innovation networks for social innovation, as, for example, provider, co-producer, facilitator, or supporter of an innovation and the network involved.

The article is structured as follows. First, we describe the method used in the literature review, then we describe the four themes identified in the literature. Finally, we provide a discussion of the results in the last section. .

2 Method

To identify and retrieve relevant document we conducted a thorough search of all the relevant databases between the 20th of September and the 5th of October 2018. The documents have been retrieved from Google and the web sites of the following organizations: Local Government Denmark (<http://kl.dk/English/>), Ministry for Economic Affairs and Interior (<https://english.oim.dk/>), the Ministry for Children and Social Affairs (<http://www.english.sm.dk/>), KORA, the Danish Institute for Local and Regional Government Research (<http://www.kora.dk/english>), VIVE – The Danish Center for Social Science Research (<https://vive.dk/english>) (a merger between the previous SFI – The Danish National Centre for Social Research and KORA, the Danish Institute for Local and Regional Government Research), The Danish National Research Database, which is a single entry point for Danish research, Danish researchers and Danish research institutions (<http://www.forskningsdatabasen.dk/en/about>) and finally “Bibliotek.dk” (Bibliotek.dk) which is a portal for all Danish libraries: public libraries, specialized libraries and academic libraries.

In conducting the search, we looked for Danish theoretical, empirical and 'grey literature' according to the definition provided on <https://libguides.rgu.ac.uk/greyliterature>. Therefore we included both reports that have not been through scientific review and scientific literature (Peer –reviewed) about Public Service Innovation Networks for Social Innovation (PSINSI) in Denmark. We looked for documents written both in Danish and in English.

The search resulted into 225 reports that were screened for relevance first by looking at abstracts and introduction and when in doubt by quickly looking through the whole report. We ended up with a total of 23 relevant reports and articles, which were inductively grouped into 4 themes: 1) ‘Samskabelse’ (co-creation), 2) collaboration with the civil society, 3) social entrepreneurs and social innovation, 4) public-private innovation partnerships. The 23 reports are reviewed according to the 4 themes in the following four sections.

3 Theme 1: ‘Samskabelse’ (co-creation)

‘Samskabelse’ has been a prominent term in the Danish literature about public service innovation networks for social innovation. Samskabelse literally means co-creation. However, in the Danish literature, ‘samskabelse’ has also been used in connection with the concept of ‘collaborative innovation’ developed by Danish political science researchers (Torfing 2016). Collaborative innovation refers to collaboration among interdependent actors responsible for or related to public services provision. They collaborate to create new services, solutions and processes in order to solve complex problems. Co-creation/co-production/samskabelse therefore refers both to cross-sectoral collaboration about innovation and user/citizen involvement in service delivery. The literature centres around describing different types of co-creation/co-production as well as their rationale, providing guidelines as to how to organize it, and discussing how the impact can be demonstrated.

Agger and Tortzen (2015) presents a research review of ‘samskabelse’ understood as co-creation/co-production. They review the international literature to qualify the Danish debate on how citizens and public actors together can develop public welfare. Building on Voorberg et al (2013), the authors define co-creation/co-production as “the active involvement of citizens in public service delivery by creating sustainable partnerships with citizens” (Voorberg et al., 2013, p. 2-3). According to Agger and Tortzen (2015), the term co-production has its roots in public sector while the term co-creation has its roots in the private sector, where it signifies user-driven innovation.

The authors argue that two ‘normative’ views on co-creation/co-production can be distinguished: 1) efficiency (new public management) oriented co-creation/co-production. In this view, the user is mobilized to produce part of the service to make it more efficient; 2) democratic co-creation/co-production which is related to the concept of new public governance. In the latter view, co-creation/co-production is understood to be based in networks of public and private actors who collaborate about making priorities, planning and producing welfare. The two approaches are summarized in Table 1.

Empirical research shows, according to Agger and Tortzen (2015), that co-creation / co-production is often driven by the public sector and that citizens are involved only at the later stages. There can be different motives for citizens to participate, personal relations, social interactions, self-efficacy and contextual relations. Co-creation/co-production may be based in mutual independency between citizens and the public sector. Citizens’ contribution may sometimes replace public services (such as self-help groups) or it may have the character as supplementary co-creation (parents helping their children with schoolwork). Co-creation/co-production may challenge exiting roles among policymakers, professionals and citizens and may lead to the creation of new roles. The empirical impact of co-creation/co-production is difficult to measure.

Table 1 Views on co-creation according to Agger and Tortzen (2015)

Governance paradigm	New Public Management	New Public Governance
Focus	Product (output)	Process and outcome
Benefits	Efficiency 'value for money'	Democracy Empowerment Innovation
Who participate	Individual citizens	Citizens

		Civil society Local society
Where in the policy cycle?	Output-side: Welfare services	Output and input: Services, priorities, political governance

Pedersen-Ulrich (2016) presents a typology of different forms of co-creation/co-production, which he argues can be used when municipalities and other public organizations work with strategy development, role clarification, competence development and management skills in connection with co-creation/co-production processes. An argument for creating the typology is that co-creation cannot be captured by a simple definition. The typology presents four approaches to co-creation/co-production, called: Governed co-creation, responsabilizing co-creation, equal dignity co-creation, and facilitating co-creation. Governed co-creation is defined by municipal actors having an ambition to manage the process of co-creation so that the outcome of the process becomes predictable, while at the same time it is the municipal actors who play a central role in the process. Responsibilizing co-creation is defined by the municipal actors managing the process while playing a retrenched role leaving the main responsibility for the content to external actors – such as citizens, companies or civil society organizations. Equal dignity co-creation is defined by the municipality not having the ambition to control the outcome of the co-creation process while still playing a central role in the process of co-creation. In this case, the municipality may have a problem that it wants to solve through a co-creation process. The result is not known, but the problem is defined. Facilitating co-creation is defined by the result of co-creation not being provided in advance, while the municipal actors play a retrenched role and leave the main responsibility for the content of the co-creation to external actors. The paper also discusses different employee roles in the different types of co-creation as managing, motivating, assisting and facilitating.

Mandag Morgen (2011), in a policy-oriented and practical report, describes the concept of welfare alliances and innovative social prevention as solutions to complex problems of prevention in the social- and health care areas. The report describes some strategic issues of social prevention through collaboration across sectors. These are as follows: Why we need social prevention, how social prevention can be collaboratively organized with different values and starting points for the different actors, how organizations can find their roles in this, and what potential resources are available and can be identified. It also contains a number of working questions for organizations concerning collaboration and exemplary answers to these questions. Questions concern the responsibilities of organizations, how the organization works with social prevention, what ‘value’ is for the different involved organizations, a dating profile (for collaboration with other organizations), and why and how much collaboration is needed.

Agger et al. (2018) focuses on the value and measurement of co-creation/co-production. How can this value be measured and documented? The report describes two traditions of measurement called the traditional and the systemic. The report claims that among both researchers and practitioners, a normative approach has leveraged expectations about co-creation/co-production. It is supposed to create positive gains for both society and individuals. However, to what extent do concrete initiatives live up to these expectations? Four bottom lines for measuring the outcomes are discussed: democracy, efficiency, innovation and public value. The benefits of co-creation/co-production may be measured in terms of better public service, better relation between the public sector and citizens,

better democratic quality as well as 'public value', including increased responsibility, responsiveness, fairness and public-sector legitimacy. The report makes a distinction between traditional evaluation (measuring the effect, such as cost-benefit and effect evaluation) and systemic evaluation (iterative and dialogue-based evaluation). Systemic evaluation is described as a type of measurement where participants have a meaning in the co-creation/co-production and evaluation process.

Torfig et al. (2017) deal with collaborative innovation in crime prevention activities. They present the results of a development project aimed at creating a measuring instrument to measure 1) collaboration, 2) innovation and 3) crime prevention effectiveness in local projects. Four parameters are identified to measure the degree of collaboration, four parameters to measure the degree of innovation and another four parameters are included in an additive index that measures the crime prevention effect. The report presents the results of the empirical testing of the measuring instrument in 24 crime prevention projects in the Municipality of Copenhagen. Two results are important: 1) the parameters involved in the construction of the three main variables lead to consistent measurements; 2) collaboration has a clear impact on innovation, and that innovation leads to an increased crime prevention effect.

Torfig et al. (2017) generally refer to a distinct concept and research approach of 'collaborative innovation' (Sørensen and Torfig, 2011; Torfig 2016) which focuses on collaboration between various public and/or private actors (state, regions, municipalities, self-governing institutions, experts, private companies, interest groups, civil society associations, users, citizens, etc.) as a decisive driving force in the creation of innovation. It is argued that when players with different types of experience, professional knowledge, resources, competencies and ideas are brought together in constructive collaboration over time, it often contributes to better understanding of problems, greater idea richness, more thorough selection and testing of new solutions, better coordinated implementation, and shared ownership of new and 'daring' solutions. Systematic measurement and evaluation is key to optimize efforts and prioritize them. However, according to Torfig et al. (2017) there is a tendency to either measure the result and the effect or measure the process and the use of specific methods, which is since we should do both

4 Theme 2: Collaboration with the Civil Society

This theme deals with the collaborations between citizens, the professionals and the civil society at large in the production and delivery of welfare services. The Danish literature uses different names for these forms of co-operation: co-creation, co-production, partnerships, private-public partnerships, citizen budgets, networking and youth panels. The Danish literature reviewed in this section shed light on these different terms from a theoretical point of view, investigate how these collaboration forms take place empirically in a Danish context as well evaluates some of the major projects taking place in Denmark.

Andersen and Espersen (2017) argue that in Denmark, in recent years, there has been an increasing interest in developing new ways of establishing collaborations between citizens, the professional and civil society in the production and delivery of welfare services. Different names are used for these co-operations: co-creation, co-production, partnerships, private-public partnerships, citizen budgets, networking and youth panels, just to name a few frequently mentioned (Socialstyrelsen, 2017). Andersen and Espersen (2017) discuss these forms of cooperation on a continuum as well as the benefits and challenges in the various types of public-private partnerships. The article also shows how the collaborative wave is far from new, but it has characterized the development of welfare benefits

in Denmark over many decades, though in different versions. At present, Andersen and Espersen (2017) point out both the development of a pragmatic approach in the use of the term as well as they provide an international perspective on the new forms of cooperation.

Ibsen and Espersen (2016) argue that through changing governments and political flows, Danish municipalities and civil society have always had a mutual dependent relationship. It is almost impossible to understand the state (and municipalities) without civil society or civil society without the state. However, they argue that in recent years, the relationship between municipalities and civil society has moved from a largely parallel relation to a more common practice. The municipalities and civil society experiment with new "co-operation" and interaction forms in different configurations. Expectations for the new collaborations are great, but there is no knowledge as to the extent and nature of the municipalities' cooperation with civil society, how different forms of cooperation function, or what forms of cooperation create values, whether the value is for example social, democratic, economic, innovative in relation to specific issues. In this study, The study is the first attempt to generate a systematic insight into the extent and nature of new collaborations in and around Danish municipalities across administrative areas. The results of the survey show that the municipalities' cooperation with civilian actors is extensive and that cooperation takes place on virtually everything. However, it is uncertain how close the cooperation is in practice. Some collaborations can take the form of loose network-based links while others can have for example the form of few individual volunteers at municipal institutions that solve completely delimited tasks. Still, other collaborations may take the form of common problem identification, common practice and common problem solving (co-operation or co-production) and thus contain completely other elements. However, it is clear that the collaborations are complex, as they often involve more civilian actors and administrative areas at the same time.

Andersen et al (2014) develop a so-called "Oresund Model" or "NEO Model", which is a normative model to reduce youth unemployment across the Øresund region. NEO stands for cross-sectoral cooperation between NGOs, business and public institutions, and it is a cross-sectoral employment method/model that can help reduce youth unemployment. The model is based on successful collaborations between NGOs, industry and public authorities and it is based on a consideration that good results can be achieved in cross-sectoral cooperation where different complementary resources and competencies can come into play and so optimize the effort. The NEO model (Andersen et al. 2014) draws on the two theoretical perspectives of social capital and co-production, contributing to the creation of sustainable arenas for unemployed young people. Both co-creation, partnerships and co-production offer platforms for long-term cooperation for unemployed young people. This implies that all other actors around the young people such as municipalities, companies, NGOs, family / networks must help establish equal relationships with young people where their opinions and experiences are heard and given importance.

Ankestyrelsen, a government organization that takes care of complaints within the social sphere (Ankestyrelsen 2010) has written a report entitled "The 2009 report: The Municipal Cooperation with Voluntary Social Societies" (own translation). In the report, the authors investigate the amounts that the Danish municipalities have invested in 2009 in support of voluntary social work according to section 18 of the Service Act established by the government. The conclusions are that nearly a third of the municipalities paid more for voluntary social work than they received as grants from the

government, while almost every fourth municipality pays less than 50 percent of the amount they received in government grants.

The same organization (Ankestyrelsen 2013) conducts again in 2012 an analysis of the municipal investments in support of voluntary social work. The report shows that in 2012, the municipalities again paid more in support of voluntary social work under section 18 of the Service Act than they received in governmental grants. This was the first time since 2009 that the municipalities paid more than the state subsidy received.

Espersen (2016) evaluates the project “Bookstart”, a nationwide initiative, rooted in the Danish Building and Property Agency, consisting of 20 municipal libraries, which distribute age-matched book packages to families in vulnerable residential areas when the child is ½ years and 1 year respectively. In addition, it offers families to pick up a book package at the library when the child is 1½ years old. In the project, Library employees also provide a bookcase for three-year-old children in selected kindergartens in vulnerable residential areas.

The evaluation finds that in forward-looking preventive efforts it might be advantageous to focus on the following main points:

- Establish a clear strategic framework and management priority in relation to how - and why - the libraries can progressively play their role in preventive efforts in local communities in close interaction with other actors at national, municipal, and individual library level.
- Strengthen and further develop the cultural role of libraries in the existing arenas of vulnerable housing (associations, cultural houses, social housing plans, etc.) by establishing collaborations with other local actors.
- Strengthen and disseminate the libraries' relational negotiation skills both in relation to the families, the day-to-day activities of the library, and in relation to establishing collaboration across the local area.
- Strengthen the structural and cultural conditions for inter-organizational cooperation by prioritizing the building of strong organizational competencies based on network-based horizontal collaborative work, and enhancing employee readiness and opportunities for potential collaboration.

Socialstyrelsen (2017) in the anthology “Partnerships and collaboration between public and civil society. Support for people with mental difficulties” (own translation) focuses on various aspects of partnerships and cooperation between public and civil society. The focus is to provide inspiration to try out new and other forms of cooperation in social work. The anthology mainly reports the results of a state initiated project where the government had allocated 15M DKK in 2012 to develop and test preventive interventions for people with mental difficulties through partnerships and cooperation between public and civil society. The project, evaluated by Rambøll Management Consulting (a big Danish consulting company) focused on two overall themes: 1) Partnerships and cooperation between the public and civil society, 2) Inclusion and participation in the community for people with mental difficulties. The concepts of partnerships and collaborations are illustrated in slightly different ways and to varying degrees across the articles.

The study by Espersen, Olsen and Tortzen (2018) aims to answer the following questions: “How can publicly supported national actors help to develop and support the voluntary social area?” The study focuses on five main actors: 1) The Danish Institute for Voluntary Effort, 2) the Social Responsibility Fund (own translation), 3) The National Council for Volunteering, 4) Volunteer Centre and Self-Help Denmark (own translation) and 5) The National Board of Health and Welfare. The report analyzes the relationship between development trends and challenges in the voluntary social area on the one hand and the instruments of the five national infrastructure organizations in the form of advice, courses

and networks, on the other hand. The study draws on a focused literature study; desk research of infrastructure organizations' actions and activities; a qualitative interview survey combined with three seminars with informants. The report summarizes the results and provides some suggestions for both continuity and change in the current support and development of voluntary social work. One main result is that the interaction with local infrastructure plays an important role in the functions of the national infrastructure. The report by Espersen and Olsen (2018) presents the results of the evaluation of two partnerships between municipalities, volunteers and other actors in Copenhagen and Fredericia that have been collaborating to develop service offerings for disabled citizens who receive support from the state through "voluntary professionalism". Voluntary professionalism is understood as volunteers who use their professional knowledge (crafts, cultural, social, health or other) in relation to citizens with disabilities. The main focus of the evaluation has been:

1. How are the two partnerships being developed, organized, implemented and operated?
2. Which volunteer offerings do the partnerships develop for the target groups?
3. How are volunteers engaged and educated?
4. How are the target groups engaged in the voluntary professional offerings?
5. How do the partnerships implement their offerings with voluntary professionalism?
6. What results and experiences are achieved through the voluntary collaboration of: a) volunteers, b) the target group, c) employees and d) the partnership and its partners?
7. What are the impacts on: a) volunteers, b) the target group, c) employees and d) the partnership and its partners?

The data collection consisted of case studies, observations and interviews with partners, volunteers, citizens and employees. The overall main results show that in both partnerships, the partners have had different motivations to participate, and the partnerships have provided mutual benefits for all participating partners. The partnerships also relied on good personal relationships, even before the partnerships were established, as well as a willingness to learn from each other and from the activities. There has been a mutual and equal relational exchange in the form of shared learning and sharing of knowledge and resources. All partners had support from their own organization to make decisions and act in the partnership. Finally, there has been a continuous prioritization of time and resources from all participating partners.

5 Theme 3: Social entrepreneurs and social innovation

A different take on PSINSI starts from notions of social entrepreneurship and social innovation. It focuses on civil society actors and their roles in solving societal problems through social innovation. The literature discusses what social innovation is, how it can become more visible and better organized, how it contributes to public service innovation, who the actors are and what types of planning are involved.

Bach (2015) reports about social enterprises around the Baltic Sea. It maps stakeholders and educational initiatives and discusses impact analysis based on information collected by grassroots organizations that actively contribute to the development of the social economy sector in Denmark, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Sweden, Finland and Poland. Bach (2015) presents the actors in the social economy in Denmark to help other actors finding the most relevant institutions to cooperate with.

Bach (2015) also contains a situational analysis of the social economy and social enterprise in Denmark. 46% of social enterprises in Denmark has started within the past 6 years (as of 2015). As of 2013, there were an estimated number of 300 social enterprises. They employed 3,500 full-time

workers. A Committee for Social Enterprises was established in 2013 in Denmark which resulted in a Government proposal in September 2014 to create more and stronger social enterprises in Denmark. This included the establishment of a National Centre for Social Enterprises. An Act on registered social enterprises was adopted by the Danish Government. Since January 2015, social enterprises have to meet 5 criteria to be able to register as a social enterprise: 1) must have a social purpose - a primary purpose beneficial to society with a social, cultural, employment-related, health-related or environmental aim. 2) Conduct significant commercial activity. The enterprise must sell either goods or services. This activity must constitute a significant element of the revenue generated by the enterprise. 3) Independence from public authorities. The public authorities must not have any significant influence on the management or operation of the enterprise. 4) Maintain inclusive and responsible governance. The enterprise must involve employees, customers, partners and stakeholders and be managed in accordance with the social objectives. 5) Social management of profits. Profits must be reinvested in social purpose activities. The report also gives an overview of the development in formal education in this area. Finally, the report concludes that only very few organisations and social enterprises in Denmark have been and are analysing the social effect of their work using approved models such as SROI. No survey or research is available to give a full picture of the use of impact analysis in Denmark.

Damvad Danmark A/S (2012) explores challenges facing social innovation in Danish peripheral and remote regions, thereby aiming to spread good practice for inspiration and learning. Damvad Danmark A/S (2012) defines social innovation as: activities carried out with the aim of meeting a societal problem or need that is not otherwise taken care of and which is aimed at delivering new solutions in a more efficient or fair way. The value created by social innovation concerns society as a whole rather than individuals. Social innovation is therefore not something developed by either the public sector or private sector companies. Social innovation has a cross-sectorial point of departure, and the potential for innovation therefore often occurs across sectors, where knowledge and ideas are exchanged between public sector actors, volunteers (civil society) and the private sphere. Therefore, collaborative relations between different actors are very central. Social entrepreneurs are seen as the individuals who, through their innovative qualities and ability to create social change, provide social innovation in the peripheral regions.

In order to identify challenges of social innovation in the Danish outer areas, a survey was conducted among representatives of citizens, private companies, the public sector, educational institutions and NGOs. The report concludes that: 1) Social innovation requires an enthusiast (ildsjæl). 2) Initiative to social innovation is primarily driven by enthusiasts and NGOs. 3) The composition of the group of participants is paramount. 4) The municipalities have a broad impact on social innovation (67% of Danish municipalities are found to participate in social innovation projects in collaboration with NGOs, companies, knowledge institutions, etc.). 5) The supply of funds to projects is important but difficult. Three recommendations to improve the framework conditions of social innovation are provided: 1) Strengthen project management of projects within social innovation; 2) Share and make visible networks of resources and competences; 3) Administration of funds should be made in such a way to avoid hampering innovation.

Hulgård et al. (2008) focus on alternative jobs on special terms for socially disadvantaged. The research questions addressed are: What types of incentives work best when the aim is to ensure socially disadvantaged abusers and homeless people better living conditions and a dignified life? Does

it change too much in the work ethic of the general society, if the employment conditions for drug addicts, homeless people and people with a combination of violent social and psychological problems are relaxed? The report builds on interviews with 23 experts. It concludes by describing two dilemmas, a moral and a political-administrative dilemma. The moral dilemma is about the schism between doing something specific to certain groups without others having the same access to these services. The political-administrative dilemma is whether abusers, homeless people and others with big and heavy social problems for short or long periods will be able to claim salaries and social benefits at the same time. However, Hulgård et al. (2008) argue that it is an empirical fact that such arrangements already exist in practice.

Kristensen (2012) explores the creation of a social innovation, Café Clare, a night café for women. The paper shows that it was a long-standing effort, where employees and managers in social services and organizations in the homeless area had more or less strategically made use of and negotiated opportunities for improved efforts for homeless women, including the café. The paper draws on research on social entrepreneurship, public innovation and commercial innovation. Social innovation is defined based on Mulgan as: “innovative activities and services that are motivated by the goal of meeting a social need that are predominantly diffused through organizations whose primary purpose are social” (Mulgan 2006:14). It is also defined as a “process involving the innovative use and combination of resources to pursue opportunities to catalyse social change and/or address social needs” (Mair and Martí 2006:37). Social innovations must represent something new (radical or incremental) and generate social value. It is argued that social innovation processes are often characterized by adaptations and changes. In some processes, the goal is formulated in advance. In others, it is more diffuse as it was the case of Café Klare, whose the shape and content became concretized along the way.

Delica (2016) deals with cultural planning. Culture is not understood in a narrow sense as art, but as cultural resources in a broader sense. The paper focuses on the formation of library based community centres in disintegrated areas in Denmark as a social innovation. It examines the actual work done in the community centres. It argues that ‘culturized planning’ can help develop disadvantaged urban areas. The paper is based on the cultural planning researcher Greg Young’s work who has developed a distinction between cultural planning and ‘culturized’ planning. Unlike cultural planning, the field of culturized planning is “... more likely to be community based and closely related to a civil and public culture that reflects international standards in terms of culture, diversity and human rights.” (Young 2008, p.77). “Planning of a culturized kind is usually undertaken by communities, governments and responsible NGOs, and has inclusive and ethical objectives in mind” (Young 2008, p.75). The paper also refers to Bianchini (2013) who emphasizes the transformative potential of thinking in territorial rather than sector-based initiatives. Innovation is understood as new cooperation areas between different sectors in relation to cultural production (Bianchini 2013, p.378). The aim is to map and mobilize cultural resources and strategically develop sites and locations. Moulert’s concept of ‘Integrated area development’ is also mentioned and his definition of social innovation is central to the article:

“... social innovation occurs when the mobilisation of social and institutional forces succeeds in bringing about the satisfaction of previously alienated human needs, the relative empowerment of previously silent or excluded social groups through the creation of new ‘capabilities’, and, ultimately, changes in the existing social – and power – relations towards a more inclusive and democratic governance system” (Martinelli, Moulart and González, 2010, p.54).

The paper, concludes that the development project 'from library to citizen center' can be seen as cultural planning with territorial aim and as an initiative that has a broad ambition to address non-fulfilled socio-cultural needs. It is then an expression of 'culturized planning' as it enables a practice that goes beyond sectoral divisions and geographically divided areas.

Lauritzen (2012) discusses social innovation in a municipal context and explains its potential for creating social and economic benefits. It describes how municipalities can help promote social innovation as an integral part of social action. The report seeks answers to the following issues: 1) why municipalities should be interested in social innovation; 2) what the role of the municipality can be in promoting social innovation. Social innovation is seen as a way to solve social challenges by mobilizing unused resources in society to create new solutions to social challenges often across the public, private and third sectors. Social innovation is defined as "new solutions (products, services, models, markets, processes, etc.) that meet social needs while leading to new or improved features and partnerships and better utilization of assets and resources." Five characteristics must be present to count as social innovation (cf. also Damvad Danmark A/S 2012): newness, realization of the new, it should work, it should be meeting social needs (in integration, health, elderly care, isolation, vulnerability, employment, environment, crime, education, etc.), it should promote society's capacity for action. In addition, it is claimed that social innovation is often characterized by open and collaborative approaches, bottom-up approaches, co-production, joint efforts, better use of assets and resources, development of participants' resources, and the formation of new partnerships. Social innovation can be seen as an important supplement to other instruments, for example increase in public revenue, budget cuts and streamlining. Social innovation can potentially contribute to solve problems in areas that municipalities can no longer cover, it can lead to better solutions than the municipalities themselves can provide, and solutions that can reduce the need for increased public income, budget cuts or streamlining. Finally, the report provides a number of examples of social innovation.

6 Theme 4: Public-Private Innovation partnerships

Public sector innovation is about developing new products, processes or forms of work that create added value on the public bottom line (Moore, 1995 in Brogaard and Petersen 2014). A public-private innovation partnership is a development-oriented collaboration between public and private actors. The purpose of public-private innovation partnership is to innovate and develop public welfare services through new products, processes or by testing an existing solution in a new context (Groes et al., 2011 in Brogaard and Petersen (2014). In addition, according to Brogaard and Petersen (2014) public-private innovation partnerships are often more development and collaboration-oriented than traditional supplier-buyer relations and puts knowledge sharing, common innovation and developing ideas into focus. Innovation partnership might lead to results and added value that would not otherwise have been realized. Brogaard and Petersen (2014) argue that compared to more traditional offerings or competitive procurement, where the private sector provider delivers a well-defined performance to the public sector, a public-private innovation partnership is often highlighted as a breach of this approach. Public-private innovation partnership in the Danish theoretical, empirical and

grey literature is closer to partnerships than to supplier-buyer relationship. This section presents the Danish literature in this field.

Brogaard and Petersen (2014) aim to elucidate experiences with Public-private innovation partnership based on eight in-depth case studies across four core welfare areas: health, elderly, day care and education. The focus is on highlighting both the challenges and success criteria as well as the results and effects achieved in these collaborations. Data collection included 23 semi-structured interviews with a total of 26 public and private actors as well as publicly available documents and documents provided by the eight cases (Brogaard and Petersen 2014). The case evaluation has been conducted as a theory-based impact assessment (Brogaard and Petersen 2014). This involves the preparation of a program theory for the evaluation, which describes the (theoretically) expected connections between public-private innovation partnership, the mechanisms (in terms of key success criteria and challenges) affecting them and the expected results. In other words, a theory-based effect chain is used to identify which mechanisms can lead to the expected effects of a public-private innovation partnership. The individual cases and cross-sectional analysis have been then evaluated based on this theory. Brogaard and Petersen (2014) identify a number of success factors that have been central to implementing the partnerships and the realization of results and effects, including : criteria for identifying a clear problem to be solved; a commercial potential for the solution; trust and continuous communication rather than a formal cooperation contract and how the procurement rules had to be handled. Finally, enthusiasts who can drive cooperation forward as well as mutual understanding of differences between public and private cultures and decision-making are key success factors in the evaluated partnerships.

Challenges and barriers instead include: a lack of clarification of possible risks in the cooperation, lack of clarity about the purpose of the project and a lack of expectation between the parties at the start of the cooperation. In addition, the analysis shows that limited technical skills and readiness as well as organizational support and engagement can present challenges in relation to implementation and goal achievement. Other barriers such as technical competencies relate primarily to the private party, while, for example, limited or swinging organizational support is a challenge especially for the public parties (Brogaard and Petersen 2014).

Finally, Brogaard and Petersen (2014) state that the evaluated public-private innovation partnerships cover different types of innovation, of which product innovation and process innovation have been the target in the cases investigated. The evaluation shows that in four cases the goal of the intended product innovation (in the form of an implementable version or prototype) has been achieved. In addition, there appears to be a close link between product and process innovation. However, the evaluation also shows that in several cases, it has not been possible to implement innovation in practice (Brogaard and Petersen 2014).

By zooming up in some of the issues of the above report, Brogaard (2015) investigates the research question “What driving forces and barriers are essential for innovation in public-private innovation partnerships in the welfare sector?” (Brogaard 2015). The article examines the importance of exogenous, institutional and collaborative factors in public-private innovation partnerships in a comparative case study of four public-private innovation partnerships in the field of health and elderly in Denmark. The analysis shows that where innovation is achieved, barriers such as procurement rules are handled through management of cooperation and trust-based relationships.

The analysis also shows that institutional risk taking and support, trust and willingness to invest in a collaborative process based on common purpose have contributed to the development and implementation of new solutions.

Finally, the municipality of Copenhagen in 2011 (Københavns Kommune 2011) wrote a report on Public-Private Partnerships that served as a basis to define how to use Public-Private Partnerships as a concept and form of cooperation in a project called “Carbon 20”. In this project seven municipalities, two universities and the organization Local Government Denmark (KL) collaborated with 100 companies in order to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions. Cooperation between municipalities and companies took the form of PPP (Public-Private Partnership).

The report concludes that the types of PPP to be used in the “Carbon 20” project differ from the current widespread Danish perception by not having a legally binding contractual element. The PPPs of the Carbon 20 project are based exclusively on voluntary cooperation between municipalities and companies and no funding is included as part of the partnership.

7 Discussion and Conclusions

In the following we summarize and discuss some characteristics of the Danish theoretical, empirical and “grey” literature on national public service innovation networks for social innovation (PSINSI). The discussion concerns what it is, what it is for, how it is organized, and what the results are. The section is structured as follows. First, we discuss which agents are involved in the PSINSIs, then we focus on the role played by the public agents, then the nature of the target innovation is discussed and finally the main sector concerned by the innovation in question is reviewed.

7.1 The types of agents involved in the network

The analysis shows that at least four types of actors are involved in the Danish public service innovation networks for social innovation: public sector organizations, social enterprises, civic organizations including volunteers and private companies. Most of the literature refers to the public sector as an important agent in such networks, see also below. With regard to the other three actors’ roles there is more variation in the literature. Part of the literature has a strong focus on social innovation and social economy/social enterprises. The role of social enterprises, their contribution to public value services, and the support structures and planning processes for social economy are investigated. Another stream of literature gives attention to the role of civic network organizations (small/large) and volunteer groups (including “professional volunteers”) often with a focus on specific projects and particular service areas, such as projects with self-help groups, vulnerable families, handicapped or people with mental difficulties. This literature also examines how the public sector can support voluntary initiatives. Some literature explores public-private partnerships/networks paying attention to good and less good experiences, and success criteria such as identifying a clear problem to be solved, a commercial potential for the solution, trust and continuous communication (Brogaard and Petersen 2014; Brogaard 2015). The analysis also shows that a particular research tradition of ‘collaborative innovation’ has emerged in the Danish public administration literature. It stresses

collaboration between interdependent agents in solving complex problems as a driver of innovation. Public, private and social agents can be part of collaborative innovation efforts.

There is not much literature that directly addresses PSINSIs. Focus is on social innovation or public innovation rather than public service networks for social innovation. Two examples that come close are the territorial and 'culturized' planning approach (Delica 2012) and perhaps 'collaborative innovation' (Torfing et al. 2017), which may also focus on social innovation.

However, there is a basic understanding in the literature that innovation for public services should generate public and social value and requires specific processes of cooperation across many actors. How to mobilise civic (social) actors is seen as important in order to create effective and legitimate solutions. Further, this requires public support and facilitation in order to overcome barriers.

The literature also shows how the various actors can take varied roles in social innovation (Damvad Danmark A/S; Pedersen-Ulrich (2016)). There are also examples that the Danish grey literature stresses innovation processes rather than innovation outcomes (see Delica 2016; Kristensen 2012). The innovation process is described as a combination of a planned process and an iterative, emergent, involving and mobilizing process. The process can be a goal in itself to mobilize social actors around development and innovation, thereby strengthening peoples' social roles and social capital (Andersen et al. 2014). There is generally a strong focus on inclusion and participation in the community of vulnerable people, such as people with mental difficulties (Socialstyrelsen 2017). Several reports also point out that extensive relations between public sector and social sector has existed for a long time in Denmark (Andersen and Espersen 2017; Ibsen and Andersen 2016). A great variety of relations exist between the social sector and the public sector. Volunteers are involved in many different ways, however this may sometime rely on personal relations (Espersen and Olsen 2018). However, the social sector has recently been more strongly emphasized in policies for public innovation as a strategic actor in innovation processes and partnerships.

7.2 The role played by the public agent (the public administration)

The public sector can play at least four different roles: 1) as a co-producer of services (basically in control of the whole process from creation to delivery), 2) as a service development facilitator and support system (leaving more responsibility to civic actors in the creation and delivery of services), 3) as a complementary service provider (the civic actor provides services independent of, but complementary to public services). 4) Furthermore, the public sector can be a driving force for the involvement of social actors in innovation and development processes.

In the Danish literature that deals directly with 'samskabelse' and is based on public administration research, the public sector is considered to be a driving force and is most often seen as involved as a co-producer. The public sector is understood to have the initiative, make decisions, be responsible for implementation and often also to deliver the service. In the Danish literature on social enterprises, social entrepreneurship and civic organizations, this is opposite. Here, the starting point is social actors and opportunities for civil society actors to collaborate with and supplement public services, for example through the establishment of social enterprises, social networks and through the involvement of volunteers. The literature also analyses how the formation of social enterprises can be

supported through public support, and how public support can help develop voluntary areas. The public sector's role can be to stimulate civic and social-economic involvement, to advise, facilitate or engage in collaboration with these actors in order to provide activities and services that complement public services.

The civic actors mobilised for social innovation in public services are described in two ways: as commercial entities (social enterprises) and as networks (including social movements and voluntary groups/people). Social enterprises are often described as based in a local context. The enterprise, such as a café for women, is part of a local micro-ecosystem. Networks may appear to have ambitions beyond the local level, for example cycling without age (delivering cycling trips for elderly) that is today a global effort ('Specialisterne' is another much cited example). It is characteristic of many of the examples given in literature that innovation processes and projects are locally rooted in the local micro-ecosystem.

7.3 The nature of the targeted innovation

Innovations described in the Danish literature can be characterized as service offerings aimed at supporting specific groups of vulnerable citizens towards living a dignified and meaningful life. The innovations that come from PSINSI can be located both in the public sector and in the civil sector. Although they often form part of a larger portfolio of public services, they often have the character of being local innovations that have the potential to inspire activities beyond the local level. Examples mentioned are the Nightravens (Lauritzen 2012), a local city area developed for care families and seniors, a cafe (Kristensen 2012), community centers around libraries (Delica 2016), various local projects for work integration, e.g. the Specialists (Hulgård et al. 2008), projects with crime prevention (Torfing et al., 2017) or projects like cycling without age for elderly care (Agger et al 2018). This means that many of the innovations arising through PSINSI are not universal public services, but solutions that occur locally in an organic context with local actors. Often volunteers are involved. They are determined by the presence of critical actors and factors in the local contexts where they come to operate. Their role for public services more generally may be to inspire other similar activities in other places, which will also be anchored locally in microsystems.

The varied and scattered offers of social innovation for public services also raises the question of how the effects of PSINSI can be managed, maintained and especially measured. Agger et al (2018) and Torfing et al. (2017) both emphasize the need for both hard and soft ways of measuring effects. The effects measured should include, for example, whether the projects solve the policy problems they set out to solve, such as crime prevention.

7.4 The main sector concerned by the innovation in question

The literature focuses mainly on the implications for the civic and public sectors. There is less focus on the implications for the private sector. However, the issue of outsourcing to private companies and its implications, including risks and barriers, for public service has been highlighted in research reports (Brogaard and Petersen 2014). It has not been investigated how public-private networks can contribute to social innovation or what the implications are for private companies.

In most of the Danish literature describing networks for social innovation, the public sector is concerned directly and/or indirectly. Most notably in the public administration oriented literature, the services described are co-developed, co-produced and co-delivered by the public sector. However, the Danish literature also pays attention to services that are developed by social actors to complement public service. This means that the civic sector achieves a more important strategic role in public service delivery. There can be several reasons for stressing social innovation developed by social actors. It shows how social innovations created, produced and delivered by social actors can make an important contribution to welfare services. At the same time, this can make it easier for the public sector agents to streamline their own services and cut budget. Civil actors can contribute by supplementing or replacing public services (Agger and Tortzen 2015). Given that they have other obligations and experiences, civic actors can better interact with citizens and meet their needs on a daily basis. This can indirectly inform the legitimacy of public sector services during restructuring. In this way, social innovation does not represent a counterpart to, for example, efficiency improvements and increased budget control, but instead creates a space for this.

However, the up scaling of social innovations developed and delivered by civic actors may be a difficulty. For example, social enterprises are often described as stand-alone micro enterprises with a social profile visible only in a local area. They solve problems on the spot by using the available resources in an effective way. Yet their real contribution often remains local. Thus, it is often the single municipal sector, which is concerned by the social innovations.

Acknowledgments



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 author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use, which may be made of the information contained therein.

8 References

- Agger, A. and Tortzen, A. (2015), *Forsknings review om samskabelse*, Roskilde: Roskilde Universitet and University College Lillebælt.
- Agger, A., Tortzen, A. and Rosenberg, C. (2018), *Hvilken værdi skaber vi med samskabelse - og hvordan kan den måles og dokumenteres?* Roskilde: University College Absalon.
- Andersen, L. L. and Espersen, H. H. (2017), 'Samskabelse, samproduktion og partnerskaber - teoretiske perspektiver', in Socialstyrelsen (ed.), *Partnerskaber og samarbejder mellem det offentlige og civilsamfundet*, Odense: Socialstyrelsen, pp. 107-137.
- Andersen, L. L., Fæster, M., Bisballe, L., Grander, M. and Björg, F. (2014), *Samarbejde omkring unges indtraeden på arbejdsmarkedet: En tværsektoriel Øresundsmodel*, Roskilde: Interreg IV A.
- Ankestyrelsen (2010), *§18-Redegørelsen 2009: Det kommunale samarbejde med frivillige sociale foreninger - En kvantitativ analyse af kommunernes fordeling af §18-midler*, København: Socialministeriet.
- Ankestyrelsen (2013), *§18-Redegørelsen: Det kommunale samarbejde med frivillige sociale foreninger - En kvantitativ analyse af kommunernes fordeling af §18-midler*, København: Social-, Børne- og Integrationsministeriet.

-
- Bach, P. (2015), *Socialøkonomiske virksomheder - øjebliksbillede fra landene omkring det Baltiske Hav*, Aarhus: Sociale entreprenører i Danmark / Social Entrepreneurship Support Network of the Baltic Sea Region.
- Brogaard, L. (2015), 'Drivkræfter og barrierer i offentlige-private innovationspartnerskaber (OPI) på sundheds- og ældreområdet i Danmark', *Politica*, 47(4), 541-560.
- Brogaard, L. and Petersen, O. H. (2014), *Offentlige-private innovationspartnerskaber (OPI) – Evaluering af erfaringer med OPI på velfærdsområdet*, København: KORA.
- Damvad Danmark, A. S. (2012), *Social innovation og sociale entreprenører i yderområder: Et inspirationskatalog med danske eksempler*, København: Ministeriet for By, Bolig og Landdistrikter.
- Delica, K. N. (2016), 'Kulturplanlægning som social innovation: om udvikling af biblioteksbaseede medborgercentre i udsatte boligområder i Danmark', *Nordisk Kulturpolitisk Tidsskrift*, 19(2), 163-182.
- Espersen, H. H. (2016), *Evaluering af samarbejdet i projekt Bogstart - En opsøgende biblioteksindsats over for familier med før-skolebørn i udsatte boligområder*, København: KORA.
- Espersen, H. H. and Olsen, L. (2018), *At skabe deltagelse for borgere med handicap gennem frivillig faglighed – Evaluering af to partnerskaber mellem kommuner, frivilligcentre og andre aktører*, København: VIVE.
- Espersen, H. H., Andersen, L. L., Olsen, L. and Tortzen, A. (2018), *Understøttelse og udvikling af det frivillige sociale arbejde – En analyse af udviklingstendenser og behov for kontinuitet og forandring i nationale virkemidler*, København: VIVE.
- Hulgård, L., Bisballe, L., Andersen, L. L. and Spear, R. (2008), *Alternativ beskæftigelse og integration af socialt udsatte grupper - erfaringer fra Danmark og Europa*, Roskilde: CSE, RUC.
- Ibsen, B. and Espersen, H. H. (2016), *Kommunernes samarbejde med civile aktører – Forskelle og ligheder i forventninger, praksis, samarbejdspartnere og oplevet udbytte*, København: Københavns Kommune.
- Kristensen, C. J. (2012), 'Social innovation i indsatsen for hjemløse kvinder – tilblivelsen af en natcafé', *Dansk Sociologi*, 23(4), 55-73.
- Københavns Kommune (2011), *OPP og projektets tilgang til samarbejde mellem kommuner og virksomheder Udarbejdet af Københavns Kommune*, København: Københavns Kommune.
- Lauritzen, J. R. K. (2012), *Social innovation i kommunerne*, Aarhus: Teknologisk Institut, Center for Analyse og Erhvervsfremme.
- Mandag Morgen (2011), *Guide til fremtidens velfærdsalliancer – gode råd til samarbejde om social forebyggelse*, København: Mandag Morgen Innovation.
- Pedersen-Ulrich, J. (2016), 'Samskabelse – en typologi', *CLOU Skriftserie VIA University College*, 1(2016), 1-15.
- Socialstyrelsen (2017), *Partnerskaber og samarbejder mellem det offentlige og civilsamfundet. Støtte til mennesker med psykiske vanskeligheder*, Odense: Socialstyrelsen.
- Torring, J., Krogh, A. H. and Ejrnæs, A. (2017), *Samarbejdsdrevet innovation i kriminalpræventive indsatser: Slutrapport om sammenhængene mellem samarbejde, innovation og kriminalpræventiv effekt og måling heraf*, Roskilde: Roskilde Universitet.

Other references

-
- Bianchini, F. (2013), 'Cultural planning and its interpretations', in Young, G. and Stevenson, D. (eds.), *The Ashgate research companion to planning and culture*, Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, pp. 377–392.
- Groes, L., Barter, T. S., Vittrup, C. and Øllgaard, S. (2011), *Kommunal nytænkning - en håndbog om hvordan kommuner involverer virksomheder i udvikling af velfærdsydelse*, København: Væksthus Hovedstadsregionen
- Mair, J. and Marti, I. (2006), 'Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight', *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 36-44.
- Martinelli, F., Moulaert, F. and González, S. (2010), 'Creatively designing urban futures: a Transversal analysis of socially innovative initiatives', in Moulaert, F., Martinelli, F., Swyngedouw, E. and González, S. (eds.), *Can neighbourhoods save the city? Community development and social innovation*, London: Routledge, pp. 198–218.
- Moore, M. H. (1995), *Creating public value: Strategic management in government*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Mulgan, G. (2006), 'The Process of Social Innovation', *Innovations*, 1(2), 145-162.
- Niemi, I., Aps, J., Bach, P., Lukjanska, R., Danys, M., Cebula, A. and Bergstrand, B.-O. (2015), *Social enterprise sector snapshot around The Baltic Sea: Stakeholders, education, impact analysis*, Bruxelles: Erasmus+.
- Sørensen, E. and Torfing, J. (2011), *Samarbejdsdrevet innovation i den offentlige sektor*, København: DJØF-forlaget.
- Torfing, J. (2016), *Collaborative Innovation in the Public Sector*, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Voorberg, W. H., Bekkers, V. J. J. M. and Tummers, L. G. (2015), 'A systematic review of co-creation and co-production: Embarking on the social innovation journey', *Public Management Review*, 17(9), 1333–1357.
- Young, G. (2008), 'The Culturization of Planning', *Planning Theory*, 7(1), 71–91.