Social Innovation

Definitions, Clarifications, and a New Model

Ram A. Cnaan

*School of Social Policy and Practice University of Pennsylvania and
Graduate Institute for Peace Studies Kyung Hee University*

Diane Vinokur-Kaplan

School of Social Work University of Michigan

NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS AND SOCIAL INNOVATION

According to the Independent Sector (2012), in 2011, there were more than 1.6 million tax-exempt organizations in the United States—a number that has approximately doubled in the last 30 years—and many more worldwide. They are active in many fields, including education, welfare, arts, culture, health, advocacy, and the environment. Their contribution to our quality of life is immense. In fact, without the contribution of nonprofit organizations (NPOs), life in many communities would be quite bleak. Among the noted reasons for the existence of nonprofit organizations, functioning alongside the state and the for-profit sectors is their potential to be innovative and responsive to meet human needs more quickly and creatively than all other types of organizations. This book provides many examples of charitable nonprofits doing just that, and it is limited to those organizations serving the public good (501(c)(3)-type organizations). (Public and business innovation are beyond this book's purview.)

With the emphasis on innovation in nonprofit activities, it is not surprising that a Johns Hopkins University (2010) survey has revealed widespread innovation among the nation's nonprofits. The study found that a vast majority (82%) of responding NPOs reported implementing an innovative program or service within the past 5 years. These are indeed amazing statistics regarding innovation.

Indeed, this estimate of four fifths of all nonprofit organizations innovating seems rather too optimistic. The sample was relatively small (N = 417) and may have attracted the more innovative NPOs to participate. But this was probably only a small part of the problem. The key problem, in our view, is that while nonprofit innovation is highly celebrated in the sector,

there is no clear understanding of what qualifies as innovation and what does not. For example, if an NPO decides to follow funding opportunities and start serving a new group of clients, is it an innovation or mere survival adaptation or both? If an NPO adds an auditing department, is it an innovation or a normal sign of growing organizational complexity? What qualifies as a real social innovation is a serious dilemma for which there is currently no clear answer.

In this introductory chapter, written by the book editors, we first discuss the problematic nature of deciding what an innovation is; by citing a few of the most commonly used definitions of innovation, we show that they are limited in their breadth coverage. In the rest of the chapter, we try to develop a model that presents a more comprehensive view of nonprofit innovation, one that can be used to define many initiatives as innovations while still distinguishing the unique characteristics of each innovation. It should be noted that this opening chapter concentrates on definitional issues, while Chapter 2 by Björn Schmitz provides a broader conceptual analysis of social innovation, social entrepreneurship, social enterprise, social business, democratic enterprise, and their interrelationships. We opted to avoid duplication and focus in this chapter on an attempt to provide a new conceptual road map to categorizing nonprofit innovations. We are aware that for some readers this road map will be a useful tool in distinguishing between the nature of various innovations, while other readers will prefer to dive directly into the cases.

The two opening conceptual chapters do not cover the "how to" of innovation. These chapters attempt conceptually to tackle the muddy definitional world of nonprofit social innovation. A more practical understanding of the innovation process is reserved for the concluding chapter in part 5. In this final chapter titled "Lessons Learned: What Do We now Know of Innovative NPOs and Can They be Replicated?" we provide a summary of the themes that emerge from the cases in this book. These themes are more practical in nature, because they try to find commonalities between the cases that come from different countries, regions, and fields. The summary provides an understanding of what it takes to be innovative, from the conception of an idea to its full implementation. We should note that the concluding chapter is not an action guide, but it provides an outline of the practical dimensions of carrying out nonprofit innovation.

In addition to these three conceptual chapters in Parts 1 and 5, the book is divided into three parts. In the first part of social innovation cases, we present cases in which the innovation involved the formation of a new nonprofit organization. This part of the book contains Chapters 3 to 12 and contains the cases of Welfare Reform Liaison Project (WRLP) (Chapter 3), HelpHOPELive (Chapter 4), Café au Play (Chapter 5), The Mind Trust (Chapter 6), GiveIndia (Chapter 7), The Social Innovation Foundation of Hungary (Chapter 8), Resto van Harte (Chapter 9), Seacology (Chapter 10), Dialogue in the Dark (Chapter 11), and Krembo Wings (Chapter 12).

The second part of the cases is composed of cases emphasizing collaboration. While all innovations require collaboration, in some innovations collaboration is the essential ingredient. This part of the book contains Chapters 13 to 15 and contains the cases of The Center for Rural Development in Appalachia (Chapter 13), Living Cities (Chapter 14), and the New York City Collaboration (Chapter 15).

The third group of cases focuses on innovations that occurred within an existing nonprofit organization. In some cases, this meant that the organizations as a whole changed and in others that the change was partial or related to a certain part of the

organization. This part of the book contains Chapters 16 to 20 and contains the cases of the YMCA (Chapter 16), Third Sector New England (Chapter 17), Metro TeenAIDS (Chapter 18), the Jungbo Foundation in South Korea (Chapter 19), and two faith-based social service organization in Germany (Chapter 20).

In the classical sense of social innovation, NPOs promote innovation because they are able to see a problem to which most people are oblivious or to come up with an innovative solution. Clearly, such daring organizations are led by people who are courageous and who possess a creative worldview. We aimed to highlight cases of successful innovations both in the United States and internationally. We do so to show that innovation in nonprofit organizations is not exclusively American. Innovation in nonprofit organizations is a worldwide phenomenon. Sometimes, organizations in one culture can replicate and adopt an innovation from another culture and other times the innovation is applicable only in one culture or locale. Regardless, the process of innovation is universal and we believe that one can learn from successful innovations regardless of where they take place. We hope that those who read this book will think creatively and analytically about them. By focusing on the innovative cases we have selected and the thematic analysis we present in these two introductory chapters and the concluding chapter, readers will gain an appreciation and inclination to think creatively and, hopefully, come up with additional successful nonprofit innovations.

THE QUEST FOR SOCIAL INNOVATION

It seems that just about everyone today is encouraged to be innovative. Almost every nonprofit management job advertisement expects the potential candidate to be able to innovate. Every review of directors or presidents of organizations assesses such individuals' achievements in innovating within their organizations. Creativity and innovation are the current major characteristics required of leaders and successful managers, and those individuals who just do reliable, routine, and high-quality work are often looked upon as lacking something. Professional literature reflects the same quest. For instance, in the for-profit realm, Crossan and Apaydin (2010) conducted a meta-analysis and found that articles on innovation in business and economic journals grew, on average, 14% per year from 1981 to 2008.

The quest for innovation is not unique to any sector, because even the public sector has been called on to be innovative (Borins, 2008; Osborne & Brown, 2011). For example, when President Barack Obama was elected to the White House, he reorganized an existing office to become the *Office of Social Innovation and Civic Participation*. One of the Office's principal activities is handling the *Social Innovation Fund*, which holds a total of $124 million. Indeed, social innovation is the current mantra in most human service organizations.

Why this massive quest for innovation? We live in an era of rapid change that has brought forth rising citizen expectations, emerging new social problems, demand for social services that were previously unattended, limited public fiscal resources, and the perception that we face complex social problems that cannot be remedied by standard solutions

even if additional resources become available. Complex reality calls for new solutions by all three sectors, and the way to find these solutions is to be innovative.

Indeed, the future of the nonprofit sector is based on social innovations. The special power of nonprofit organizations is to do what public organizations cannot do because of the lack of political will or the regulations they face; or because they produce goods and services that for-profit organizations will not because it is not profitable for them to do so. The ability to identify new needs, to find means to help people who are not served or are not served well, and the courage to initiate and reorganize service delivery are all innovations that make social nonprofits exciting and hopefully more efficient, effective, just, and sustainable. We set out next to provide to students of nonprofit management and leadership an overview of the typical dimensions arising in defining social innovation in the social innovation literature.

DEFINING SOCIAL INNOVATION

Before providing a set of examples regarding social innovation, we should ask what social innovation actually is. The term is illusive, multidimensional, and still means many different things to different people. There are many concepts and theories that guide the thinking about social innovation. There have been many attempts to understand what social innovation is and what its boundaries are. Yet confusion is often the order of the day. When we entered the concept "social innovation" into Google Scholar, we found over 25,100 academic documents that contain this phrase. And yet there is no clear agreement or understanding of what is, and what is not, social innovation.

Anheier and Leat (2006) defined an *innovation* as ". . . an idea, practice, or object that is perceived as new" (p. 4). While this is a solid inclusive definition, for the purpose of this volume, this definition is too inclusive and unspecified. The Center for Social Innovation at The Stanford University Graduate School of Business (2014) defines *social innovation* as ". . . a novel solution to a social problem that is more effective, efficient, sustainable, or just than present solutions and for which the value created accrues primarily to society as a whole rather than private individuals." Another eloquent definition was offered by Murray, Caulier-Grice, and Mulgan (2010), who defined "social innovations as new ideas (products, services and models) that simultaneously meet social needs and create new social relationships or collaborations" (p. 3). In other words, they are innovations that are both good for society and enhance society's capacity to act. This definition was also adopted almost verbatim by the European Union (2012).

Another example of a well-used definition that is too broad to be of much help is the one proposed by Phillis, Deiglmeier, and Miller (2008). They defined *social innovation* as "a novel solution to a social problem that is more effective, efficient, sustainable, or just than existing solutions and for which the value created accrues primarily to society as a whole rather than private individuals." There are many other definitions of social innovation such as the one by Westley and Antadze (2009), who suggest that "social innovation is a *complex process* of introducing new products, processes or programs that profoundly *change* the basic routines, resource and authority flows, or beliefs of the *social system* in which the

innovation occurs. Such successful social innovations have *durability* and *broad impact*" (p. 2). The essence here is not on newness but on changing an existing routine, resources and authority flows, or beliefs in a manner that leaves a long-lasting impact. Again, the definition is too general and misses the many nuances of social innovation.

Damanpour (1991) contended that innovation involves change, but not all kinds of change can be termed innovation. Innovation must involve a break from the existing practices and mindsets and the creation of something new. While this definition excludes *regular change* from *innovative change*, it is still difficult to determine its borders. Damanpour and Schneider (2008) stated that innovation can be either radical or incremental, and it can be based on either the generation of an original invention or the adoption and adaptation of known innovations into new places or new contexts.

We could have cited numerous other definitions, but none were not sufficiently encompassing. When definitions try to tackle a complex field that is composed of many variants and to simplify it into a generic definition, the important nuances of social innovations are lost. Instead of celebrating the many variations of nonprofit and social innovation, the definitions are generic and do not help us classify the variety that exists in social innovations. Our aim is to provide a conceptual framework that will capture most forms and variations of social innovation in an organized manner. But before turning to this discussion, we need to clarify the relationships between social innovation and social entrepreneurship. It is clear that any social innovation starts with a great idea about a problem or an issue that is either ignored or underserved (Amabile, Conti, Coon, Lazenby, & Herron, 1996). But ideas are never enough. They are a prerequisite that is not sufficient. While creativity is related to the production of novel and useful ideas, innovation is related to the successful implementation of creative ideas within an organization, a community, or society (Amabile et al., 1996; Oldham & Cumming, 1996). The innovative idea needs champions who advocate for it and persuade others of its relevance and its utility. Hence, social innovation is the combination of a creative idea and someone (or more than one person) investing numerous hours, resources, and skills to make it real. To go back to the French origins of "entrepreneur," it is someone who undertakes to actualize a novel idea. (Note that the concept and role of social entrepreneurs is elaborated in the next conceptual chapter [Chapter 2] and is discussed in the concluding chapter [Chapter 21].)

In sum, it seems that most academic treatments of social innovation regard it as a unidimensional category devoid of real complexity. At times, some authors went as far as offering a two-by-two model of social innovation (cf. Osborne, 1998, 2002), but the reality is that when we critically analyze social innovations, there are more dimensions that can be used to distinguish between them.

We believe that we should complement the many existing sources with a comprehensive view of social innovation that can serve as a guiding theory for describing the complexity of social innovation and its boundaries (DiMaggio, 1995; Van Maanen, Sørensen, & Mitchell, 2007). In this respect, we follow DiMaggio (1995) who contended that "good theory" is multidimensional and that the best theories are hybrids, resulting from combining different approaches to theory. The technique we use in this chapter to highlight the complexity and multidimensionality of social innovations is known as a *mapping sentence.* We explain it later on in this chapter. For now, our concern is if there is a way to say that one nonprofit activity is definitely not an innovation and another activity is definitely a social innovation.

THE BOUNDARIES OF SOCIAL INNOVATION

It is important to note that in many aspects of life, innovation is not always a priority. On an individual level, the authors of this chapter would not like the pilot who flies the plane to be innovative in the sense of not following protocol and possibly endangering lives. We want said pilot to follow procedures, be reliable, and avoid risk taking, unless an emergency warrants it. The pilot should be applauded and rewarded for being precise and following procedures. Yet, on a systematic level, we also want someone to find innovative ways to make flights safer, cheaper, more comfortable, and to meet unforeseen emergencies.

Furthermore, it is not clear if being innovative is always a good thing. If an organization is serving young people with disabilities by effectively helping them find employment year in and year out, and many people with disabilities are being successfully served, why should innovation be instituted? There are many college-counseling services that effectively and efficiently help students prepare for college, and, as such, they do important work. There are soup kitchens that night after night feed numerous homeless people and are effective and nourishing for years without being innovative. These and many other wonderful services do not need to innovate simply because it is fashionable to innovate. If we fail to financially support these routine services and seek only to support new innovations, the world will suffer. Yet the quest for innovation in general, and for social innovations in particular is stronger today and more valued than at any time in history. It seems that social innovation is in high demand, even though what it is and what it does in particular are not always very clear.

The world is changing, resources are fewer, and social innovation is essential. Yet it is important to note that many quality organizations provide high-level services with minimal innovation. In fact, the majority of nonprofit organizations do not fall into the social innovation definition, and that is no way a sign of disrespect or a stain on their reputation.

What we are looking for in this chapter is a means to conceptually define what is, and what is not, a social innovation, and, offer a model that will distinguish between different types of innovation. Maybe the oldest and seminal definition and classification of social innovation is attributed to the economist Joseph Schumpeter (Dodgson, 2011; Pol & Carroll, 2006). Schumpeter introduced new ways to look at innovation, economic transformation, and the notion of creative destruction (Schumpeter, 1912). Schumpeter does not focus on the traditional supply and demand but on innovation, entrepreneurial activities, and market power. For example, he suggests that technological innovation can create conditions that are ripe for monopolies, which are outside the supply-demand equation. He also observed that nearly all businesses that fail are victims of innovation by their competitors (McCraw, 2010).

Schumpeter's contribution to the understanding of innovation outside the market was even greater. He provided us with the first classification of five types of economic innovation. These five types are (1) introduction of a new good or a new quality of a good, (2) implementation of a new production method, (3) accessing of a new sales market, (4) accessing of a new source of supply of raw materials or intermediate goods, and (5) rearranging of the market position (e.g., a bursting of an existing monopoly or market order). The influence of Schumpeter's classification of innovation is so pervasive that it is still the one most used

today. For example, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD & Eurostat, 2005) refers to innovation in the following manner: "An innovation is the implementation of a new or significantly improved product (good or service), or process, a new marketing method, or a new organizational method in business practices, workplace organization or external relations" (p. 46).

As such, Schumpeter provides us with the first differential classification and an understanding that not all innovations are the same. We did not use his classification as such, because it is better suited to the economic sphere of production and business, and we follow the footsteps of scholars who contend that for-profit and nonprofit innovations are not the same. For example, Hull and Lio (2006) compared innovations in these two sectors and concluded that key differences exist in vision, strategic constraints, and financial constraints between the sectors. However, Schumpeter's contribution definitely helped shape our thinking, as can be seen in the following section, and it is further addressed in the next conceptual chapter.

MAPPING SENTENCES AND THEIR APPLICABILITY

When attempting to provide a theory of a concept as wide and complex as *social innovation*, one cannot expect to achieve a grand theory that will be all inclusive, but rather to provide merely a systematic overview that offers a wide but limited set of possibilities. One way of systematically organizing the universe of observations regarding a social phenomenon or a field of investigation is through developing a mapping sentence. This method was developed by Louis Guttman (1959) as a means to systematize a field of study.

Mapping sentences proved helpful in many areas of investigation in which the universe of possibilities seemed endless and when no coherent picture of the field had emerged. They were used in areas such as the study of values (Levy, 1976); intelligence (Guttman, 1965; Guttman & Levy, 1991); achievement motivation (Talsma, Van Den Bercken, Houtmans, & De Bruyn, 1992); interpersonal behavior (Schutz, 1992); volunteering (Cnaan & Amrofell, 1995); children's perception of their family environment (Guttman, Goldschmidt, & Fischbein, 1997); developmental psychology (Bergling, 1999); and self-personality (Levy & Sabbagh, 2008).

Guttman proposed that mapping sentences can be used as a definitional system for analyzing a universe of observations to make explicit in a reliable way which items belong to the content universe and which do not. While a mapping sentence can be tested empirically using "facet analysis," its key contribution is taking the variations or different components of any field of study and presenting them in a series of related facets. Each facet contains a limited set of related and often mutually exclusive options or categories.

For example, in analyzing the concept of social innovation, one facet may be "the innovator." This facet can take many forms based on what is most commonly presented in the literature. The social innovator can be a person suffering from the problem area in which the innovation takes place, a person familiar with someone who suffers from the problem, someone not directly related to the problem, a professional working in the field of the problem, a committee charged to study the problem, an organization active in this field, or any combination thereof.

Once a facet is completed, it is related logically to another facet. In our example, the above facet may be linked to the auspices under which the social innovation took place and so on. Once the full sentence with all its relevant facets and their related options and/or categories is established, each social innovation in general, and specifically each one in this book, can be presented as a unique case of the mapped sentence by selecting one or more categories in each facet.

In sum, the mapping sentence specifies the facets and the relationships between them. It is characterized by (1) its domain, which contains information about the conditions that set the stage for recording observations, and by (2) its range (i.e., response facet), which specifies the relevant set of observational outcomes and their meanings. The mapping sentence's phrases link the facets together, and they make available the semantic structural unity implied by the content universe. A mapping sentence also provides a definitional framework that can be used for generating hypotheses about the relationships among both the facets and their elements.

It should be noted that some categories might overlap between facets, while some categories in one facet may be more often linked with a few but not all categories of another facet. For example, the category of "identifying a new target population" appears both in the facet of "*who benefits*" and in the facet of "*what is being innovated*." Each of these two facets answers a different question, and not in all cases will the presence of "new target population" be appropriate in both facets. Put differently, members of a new population may be the beneficiaries but what is innovated is a new technology and the discovery of a new population. It is possible, for example, that what is innovated is a new method of intervention but that the primary beneficiaries are people who were previously underserved. As such, for each case in the book, we draw the most relevant social innovation mapping sentences based on the proposed facets and categories.

In this chapter, we attempt to apply the logic of mapping sentences to the domain of social innovation. We first provide a set of four facets and their respective options and/or categories. We do so by focusing on each facet separately and providing examples from the book for as many options and/or categories as possible. We then link all the facets into one logical sentence. The final product is a road map for categorizing and understanding what is included under the concept of social innovation and its many possible variations.

MAPPING THE CONCEPT OF SOCIAL INNOVATION

Based on reading many texts that define and explain social innovation, it seems that we need four key facets to capture the domain of social innovation. The first facet deals with *What is being innovated* and consists of six categories. It is followed by analyzing *Who benefits* (consisting of four categories), which is then followed by identifying *Who is the innovator* (consisting of six categories). It concludes with an assessment of the *Magnitude of innovation* (consisting of four categories). Each case in the book and each case of social innovation can find a specific path through these four facets and identify its unique set of relevant categories. At minimum, there are 576 distinct paths if each analysis of social innovation selects one and only one category from each facet. But because it is possible to

choose two or more categories within one facet and at times to decide that no category in a given facet is relevant, the number of possible paths is much larger and reflects the complexity and variety of possible social innovations.

Facet 1: What Is Being Innovated?

Often, when we discuss the concept of social innovation, the first thing that comes to mind is an organization that has revolutionized a certain domain for a social purpose; for example, Habitat for Humanity revolutionized the field of building homes for poor families. But innovations can be undertaken in many shapes and forms and still be innovative. In this facet, we discuss six categories of what can be innovative. We are likely not inclusive enough, and the categories are not mutually exclusive. Often an innovation is large scale and spans over more than one category (see Figure 1.1). The key options and/or categories we use that render positive change and produce social benefits are identifying (1) A new group of clients; that is, moving to serve those who are not recognized as people in need or are seriously underserved; (2) A new subgroup of clients for the organization including people who the organization found out to be effective with (as in the case of providing disaster counseling when needed by an organization with the relevant expertise) or a new group of clients that is served by others maybe faraway but not by this specific organization; (3)An innovative intervention that was not used before; (4) A known intervention used differently than others or differently than the organization applied it before; (5) An intraorganizational innovation that changed the way the organization works and moved it to better effectiveness and efficiency; and (6)An innovation in the relationships with stakeholders in the organization's environment (from funders to ex-clients).

The first thing that comes to mind when discussing "real" social innovation is identifying a new target population. While this may be the Holy Grail for all social innovation scholars, the reality is that such social innovation is rare. Among the chapters in this book, HopeHELPLive (Chapter 4) to some extent identified a new target population (people needing or recovering from organ transplants), but it more so identified an innovative way to address their financial need. In the context of South Korea, Jungbu Foundation (Chapter 19) identified a new target population of professional social workers who suffer from severe cases of burnout. However, given that these types of clients are served in other countries, it may be more a case of the second category; that is, a new group of clients that is served by others but not by their home organization.

HopeHELPLive is an excellent example of the third category. While its clients are also identified as an underserved group of people (the first category in this facet), it also developed a new intervention (community-based fundraisings by friends and relatives of those in medical need). After trying to raise funds from foundations and affluent neighbors, the organization's leaders realized that the best source of help is within the ill person's own social network. HopeHELPLive developed a new method of how to guide friends and relatives to fundraise, and a new intervention emerged. Similarly, Krembo Wings (Chapter 12) for disabled children and Dialogue in the Dark for blind people (Chapter 11) offer innovative interventions to known target populations, but for which organizations were not yet developed.

FIGURE 1.1 Typology Of Social Innovations

What is being innovated?

Social innovation is focused on…

(1) A new group of clients that is moving to serve those who are underserved

(2) A new subgroup of clients including those who the organization found to be effective with or new group that is served by others but not by the organization

(3) An innovative intervention that was not used before

(4) A known intervention used differently than others or differently than the organization applied before

(5) An intraorganization innovation that changed the way the organization works and moves it to better efficiency

(6) An innovation in the relationships with the organizational environment

to the benefit of…

Who benefits?

(1) Individuals or families who were previously not served

(2) Individuals or families who were previously served but for whom a new service and/or treatment was invented

(3) Organizations that serve people who can now do their job in a better or more efficient manner

(4) Communities at large where quality of life is enhanced due to the innovation, even if no particular person is served

performed by…

The Innovator

(1) A person suffering from the problem

(2) A person familiar with someone who suffers from the problem

(3) Someone not directly related to the problem

(4) A professional working in the field of the problem

(5) A committee charged to study the problem or an organization active in this field

(6) Any combination hereof

at the following scope…

Magnitude of Innovation

(1) Totally new

(2) New regarding a specific target population

(3) New in a certain region or country

(4) New within a given organization

10

The Welfare Reform Liaison Project (WRLP) (www.wrlp.net; Chapter 3) is an excellent case of the fourth category in this facet. The clients are known across the United States (welfare-to-work single parents) as those who need technical skills and support. However, WRLP organized itself differently by newly bridging different institutions within a community and as such was socially innovative and effective. Other organizations that applied modified intervention to a recognized group of clients are Café au Play (for parents and their young children; Chapter 5) and Resto van Harte (for the socially isolated; Chapter 9).

Metro TeenAIDS (Chapter 18) is an excellent example of the fifth category of intraorganizational innovation, namely, changing the way the organization works and moving it to better efficiency. The organization kept serving the same target population in the same geographical area, but shifted focus from direct service to advocacy. The client group, the intervention, and the scope are all familiar from other social service organizations. But the internal change within key mode of service was innovative and made the organization more effective in meetings its goals.

Seacology (Chapter 10) is a good example of the sixth category; change the relationships with key stakeholders. While it deals with environmental protection, its key innovation is regarding the relationships it forges with the local inhabitants of the island ecologies it selects to preserve. By applying patience and support to the locals' priorities, Seacology is more effective than most similar environmental protection organizations.

Facet 2: Who Benefits?

Osborne (1998), Osborne, McLaughlin, and Chew (2008), and Walker (2007) talked about the magnitude of the innovation. However, their proposed typology is binary: new customers versus existing customers. This typology, in our view, is too limited, and we thus proposed a more refined facet. The term *new customers* can mean people that were never served before or people who are new to the organization as is discussed in the first facet above. For us, the facet focuses on the people who benefit from the innovation and the degree to which they were served before. The key options and/or categories we use are (1) Individuals or groups who were previously not served, (2) Individuals or groups who were previously served but for whom a new treatment and/or service was invented, (3) Organizations that served individuals or groups and can now serve them in a better or more efficient manner, and (4) Communities at large whose quality of life is enhanced due to the innovation even if no one particular person is specifically served.

HopeHELPLive is one organization in which its founders identified a group of individuals and families who were previously not served and developed a service for them: those medically eligible for heart transplantation but who could not afford it. The second category, individuals or groups who were previously served but a new treatment and/or service was invented for them, includes such programs as Dialogue in the Dark, Resto Van Harte, Jungbu Foundation, Welfare Reform Liaison Project, and Café au Play. The third category, organizations that found ways to serve individuals or groups in a better or more efficient, effective, just, or sustainable manner, includes such programs as GiveIndia (Chapter 7), YMCA (Chapter 16), and Metro TeenAIDS. The final category,

communities at large where quality of life is enhanced due to the innovation, includes such programs as presented in the following cases: The Mind Trust, Living Cities, The Center for Rural Development in Appalachia, Third Sector New England, and Seacology.

Facet 3: The Innovator

This facet can take many forms since the literature presents many characteristics of innovators. We start with a few possible characteristics that we do not use, for instance, the demographics of the innovator such as age, gender, nationality, and so on (for example in the case of Krembo Wings, the innovator was a teenager). We elected not to include demographics because they served more to answer the question of how the innovator looks rather than who the innovators are. It seems to us that the most interesting aspect of the innovator is the person/group/organization's relationship to the problem. When viewing social innovation from this perspective of who is the innovator, the following are the key options: (1) It can be a person suffering from the problem, (2) A person familiar with someone who suffers from the problem, (3) Someone not directly related to the problem, (4) A professional working in the field of the problem, (5) A committee charged to study the problem or an organization active in this field, or (6) Any combination thereof.

It seems that in most of the cases in this book, the innovator was not the person directly suffering from the problem, although they somehow had interest or empathy for it. In the cases of Krembo Wings, the innovator was familiar with people who were affected by the problem. In the cases of HelpHopeLive, Metro TeenAIDS, and Seacology, it was someone familiar with the problem but without a personal relationship to it. In the cases of Welfare Reform Liaison Project, The Mind Trust, Resto Van Harte, GiveIndia, and Dialogue in the Dark, the innovator was a professional working in the field or in a related field. Finally, in the cases of the Jungbu Foundation, Third Sector New England, Living Cities, and the YMCA, the innovation came from the work of a collective or a committee within an organization. Only in the case of Café au Play did the innovations start with a person in need. The person behind the initiative found herself a single mother in Portland with no public spaces to meet people like herself.

Facet 4: Magnitude of Innovation

The final but not least important question to be asked is how new a social innovation must be. This book is filled with amazing stories of social innovations. When the authors met to discuss these cases, we were all in awe of the astounding stories and the great diversity regarding social innovations. Yet in many cases people noted that the innovative aspect of what was presented was locally limited, and the innovator might not be the first to come up with the idea and program. If a solution to a problem is invented in Guatemala, and a few years later it was found that the same solution was already in existence in Nepal, is the Guatemalan social innovation no longer considered an innovation? Is the Guatemalan case, although it produced an invention, merely a diffusion of an innovation? As such, one debate is whether an innovation must be totally new and almost like a patent or whether adopting a solution from one place to another is also an innovation.

There are no agreed upon answers to this question regarding the boundaries of social innovation. Instead of answering the above questions, we turn to what the literature tells us about social innovation. So one key facet when assessing social innovations is the degree to which the innovation is absolutely new, at least to the particular site. It seems that in this facet the key categories are (1) Totally new (never been done anywhere in the world), (2) New regarding a specific target population, (3) New in a certain region or country, and (4) New within a given organization.

It is difficult to state that any of the cases contained in the book is indeed totally innovative and that nothing like it has ever been done before. It seems that this category is more an ideal rather than a practical category. In the context of this book, some social innovations were easy to place within the remaining three categories. For example, when HelpHOPELive was founded, it was geared to a totally new population of people needing heart transplantation, but fundraising to help sick people was done formally and informally in many parts of the world. The Center for Rural Development in Appalachia and the focus of the Jungbu Foundation in Korea on helping social workers cope with burnout are good examples of regional and national innovations. Metro TeenAIDS of Washington, DC, is a good example of an organization that existed and was actively helping in the domain of HIV/AIDS but that later innovated its focus to shift from service provision to advocacy.

The overall mapping sentence that includes all four facets is presented in Figure 1.1.

Limitations

In this introductory chapter, we presented a model to understand and differentiate between varieties of social innovations. The drawback of this model is its inability to determine when a change is no longer an innovation. When one organization finally adopts a practice that is commonly used in its geographical environment by many organizations, it may be an in-house innovation but it is not a social innovation. Such cases that others may include as nonprofit or social innovation are, to us, more cases of institutional isomorphism (where organizations mimic others in their environment) than real innovation. Our model is helpful in categorizing and differentiating social innovations; but it is limited by its inability to determine what is *not* a social innovation. Such a determination can only be made independently and subjectively by each observer and is contextually based. Put differently, the boundaries of what is outside the realm of social innovation are still an open challenge to social innovation scholars.

Finally, we did not discuss the conditions that deter or enhance innovations in existing organizations. Three chapters in this volume, about innovations in the YMCA, Third Sector New England, and in a large German social service organization, relate to innovation within existing organizations. There is a large body of literature on conditions that support or prohibit "intrapreneurship" innovation, and we did not include them in Chapter 2. The reader is advised to look for good reviews of this topic to complement the benefit of this mapping sentence. See, for example, an excellent review of this topic by Van Gurp (2012).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

There is no doubt that both social innovation and social entrepreneurship are two concepts in vogue. Directors of public benefit nonprofits are expected to possess the ability to innovate and the relevant style of leadership that is associated with it. While we noted that many organizations should not seek innovation simply for the sake of innovation, but rather in accordance with their mission, we also acknowledge that innovation is hard to define and thus hard to explain or teach. Yet progress is predicated on social innovation, and to be able to assess what is and what is not social innovation and to be able to compare various social innovations, we introduced the logic of mapping sentences.

Mapping sentences are logical tools used to bring a sense of order to a field of study that is complex and hard to understand systematically. We use the mapping sentence here in an experiential manner, and we do not test it empirically. It is our hope that when readers encounter a social innovation, they will form a specific and relevant mapping sentence for that nonprofit organization's social innovation. By applying four key facets, with each consisting of four to six categories, and organizing them as a logical sentence, we prepare future discussions of social innovation to be more precise and introduce the possibility for various social innovations to be compared.

REFERENCES

Amabile, T. M., Conti, R., Coon, H., Lazenby, J., & Herron, M. (1996). Assessing the work environment for creativity. *Academy of Management Journal, 39*(5), 1154–1184.

Anheier, H. K., & Leat, D. (2006). *Creative philanthropy*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.

Bergling, B. M. (1999). Extending facet design to such complex psychological structures as Piaget's theory. *Quality and Quantity, 33*(10), 13–26.

Borins, S. (Ed.). (2008). *Innovations in government: Research, recognition, and replication*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Center for Social Innovation at The Stanford University Graduate School of Business. (2014). *Social innovation*. Retrieved from http://csi.gsb.stanford.edu/social-innovation

Cnaan, R. A., & Amrofell, L. M. (1995). Mapping volunteer activity. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 23*(4), 335–351.

Crossan, M. M., & Apaydin, M. (2010). A multi-dimensional framework of organizational innovation: A systematic review of the literature. *Journal of Management Studies, 17*(6), 1154–1191.

Damanpour, F. (1991). Organizational innovation: A meta-analysis of effects of determinants and moderators. *Academy of Management Journal, 34*(3), 555–590.

Damanpour, F., & Schneider, M. (2008). Characteristics of innovation and innovation adoption in public organizations: Assessing the role of managers. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 19*(3), 495–522.

Dimaggio, P. (1995). Comments on "What theory is not?" *Administrative Science Quarterly, 40*(3), 391–397.

Dodgson, M. (2011). Exploring new combinations in innovation and entrepreneurship: Social networks, Schumpeter, and the case of Josiah Wedgwood (1730–1795). *Industrial and Corporate Change, 20*, 1119–1151.

European Union. (2012). *Strengthening social innovation in Europe: Journey to effective assessment and metrics*. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/innovation/files/social-innovation/strengthening-social-innovation_en.pdf

Guttman, L. (1959). A structural theory for intergroup beliefs and action. *American Sociological Review, 24*, 318–328.

Guttman, L. (1965). A faceted definition of intelligence. *Scripta Hierosolymitana: Studies in Psychology* (pp. 166–181). Jerusalem, Israel: The Hebrew University.

Guttman, L., & Levy, S. (1991). Two structural laws for intelligence tests. *Intelligence, 15*(1), 79–103.

Guttman, R., Goldschmidt, N., & Fischbein, S. (1997, September 22–24). How school children perceive their family environment: Using DISCO to compare twins with singletons, Jerusalem with kibbutz children. In *Proceedings of the Sixth International Facet Theory Conference* (pp. 85–94). Liverpool, United Kingdom.

Hull, C. E., & Lio, B. H. (2006). Innovation in non-profit and for-profit organizations: Visionary, strategic and financial considerations. *Journal of Change Management, 6*(1), 53–65.

Independent Sector. (2012). Scope of the nonprofit sector. Retrieved from http://www.independentsector.org/scope_of_the_sector#sthash.pVzmnQZf.dpbs

Johns Hopkins University, Center for Civil Society Studies. (2010). *Nonprofits, innovation and performance measurement: Separating fact from fiction.* Baltimore, MD: Author.

Levy, S. (1976). Use of mapping sentence for coordinating theory and research: A cross-cultural example. *Quantity and Quality, 10*, 117–125.

Levy, S., & Sabbagh, C. (2008). The wellbeing of the self's personality: A structural analysis. *Social Indicators Research, 89*, 473–485.

McCraw, T. K. (2010). *Prophet of innovation: Joseph Schumpeter and creative destruction.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Murray, R., Caulier-Grice, J., & Mulgan, G. (2010). *The open book of social innovation*. London, United Kingdom: The Young Foundation.

OECD & Eurostat. (2005). *Oslo manual: Guidelines for collecting and interpreting innovation data* (3rd ed.). Paris, France: OECD. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/sti/oslomanual

Oldham, G. R., & Cumming, A. (1996). Employee creativity: Personal and contextual factors at work. *Academy of Management Journal, 39*(3), 607–634.

Osborne, S. (1998). Naming the beast: Defining and classifying service innovations in social policy. *Human Relations, 51*(9), 1133–1154.

Osborne, S. (2002). The voluntary sector in the UK: Key trends and emerging issues. *Nonprofit Review, 2*, 11–21.

Osborne, S. P., & Brown, L. (2011). Innovation, public policy and public services delivery in the UK: The word that would be king? *Public Administration, 89*(4), 1335–1350.

Osborne, S., McLaughlin, K., & Chew, C. (2008). The once and future pioneers? The innovative capacity of voluntary organizations and the provision of public services: A longitudinal approach. *Public Management Review, 10*(1), 51–70.

Phillis, J. A., Jr., Deiglmeier, K., & Miller, D. T. (2008, Fall). Rediscovering social innovation. *Stanford Social Innovation Review, 6*(4), 36.

Pol, E., & Carroll, P. (2006). *An introduction to economics with an emphasis on innovation*. London, United Kingdom: Thomson.

Schumpeter, J. A. (1912). *Theorie der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung*. Berlin, Germany: Duncker und Humbolt.

Schutz, W. (1992). Beyond FIRO-B—Three new theory-derived measures—Element B: Behavior, element F: Feelings, element S: Self. *Psychological Reports, 70*, 915–937.

Talsma, P. A., Van Den Bercken, J. H., Houtmans, T. J., & De Bruyn, E. J. (1992). Assessment in the domain of achievement motivation: Facet design based item classification. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 8*(2), 135–148.

Van Gurp, S. A. (2012). *Innovation in the nonprofit organizational context: Examining the strategic significance of systems trust and individual resistance to change* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Iowa City: University of Iowa. Retrieved from http://ir.uiowa.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article = 3150&context = etd

Van Maanen, J., Sørensen, J. B., & Mitchell, T. R. (2007). Introduction to special topic forum: The interplay between theory and method. *Academy of Management Review, 32*(4), 1145–1154.

Walker, R. (2007). An empirical evaluation of innovation types and organizational and environmental characteristics: Towards a configuration approach. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 18*, 591–615.

Westley, F., & Antadze, N. (2009). Making a difference: Strategies for scaling social innovation for greater impact. *Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal, 15*(2), article 2. Retrieved from http://www.innovation.cc/scholarly-style/westley2antadze2make_difference_final.pdf