

## **Evaluating the Public Value of Social Innovation**

Vishanth Weerakkody  
Brunel University,  
Kingston Lane,  
Uxbridge,  
UB8 3PH  
[Vishanth.Weerakkody@brunel.ac.uk](mailto:Vishanth.Weerakkody@brunel.ac.uk)

Uthayasankar Sivarajah  
Brunel University,  
Kingston Lane,  
Uxbridge,  
UB8 3PH  
[Sankar.Sivarajah@brunel.ac.uk](mailto:Sankar.Sivarajah@brunel.ac.uk)

Zahir Irani  
Brunel University,  
Kingston Lane,  
Uxbridge,  
UB8 3PH  
[Zahir.Irani@brunel.ac.uk](mailto:Zahir.Irani@brunel.ac.uk)

Mohamad Osmani  
Brunel University,  
Kingston Lane,  
Uxbridge,  
UB8 3PH  
[Mohamad.Osmani@brunel.ac.uk](mailto:Mohamad.Osmani@brunel.ac.uk)

## **Evaluating the Public Value of Social Innovation**

Services that were traditionally delivered by the public sector are now proving difficult for the state to afford due to economic and socio-political challenges faced by society. In this context, social innovation plays an important role as it encourages civil society, private, public and third sector organisations to work together to find alternative ways of delivering services. This paper evaluates the influence of social innovation in creating public value through services offered to the community at both local and national levels in the UK. Three diverse cases are used from the UK context and analysed through a public value lens to examine the role of community, private, public and third sector organisations in driving social innovation. The findings highlight how social innovation contributes to addressing civil society needs while simultaneously contributing to the political and economic agendas of a country and the exploitation of science for the benefit of communities.

**Keywords:** *social innovation, public value, public sector, community, services*

**Word Count:** 6175

## Introduction

Currently, global challenges present in both economic and social form, issues as widely ranging as climate change to poverty. According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD, 2011) the recent economic crisis highlights the significance of leveraging science, technology and innovation in response to social problems in addition to the usual use in gaining economic benefits. Innovation has commonly been associated with progress in productivity and economic growth (Poole and Van De Ven, 2004). However, this is rapidly changing as private and public sector organizations, non-profit organizations and entrepreneurs realise that societal progress is just as important a consideration as economic growth (Lettice and Parekh, 2010).

In this respect, there is an increasing interest in social innovation among researchers and policymakers as a viable means to improve the welfare of the people and society (Mulgan, 2006). According to Dawson and Daniel (2010), social innovations are usually initiated through a concern for the people and communities in stark contrast to innovations that are triggered by the profit motive or business pressures. Social innovation can occur at multiple levels of society including at a national level, regional level, local communities and organisations (Dawson and Daniel, 2010). It is usually a result of collaboration, creativity and a shared goal that is focused towards sustainability and community orientation. Nevertheless, in order for social innovation to thrive, an awareness of the ideas being used in various sectors is needed with the aim to adopt and learn from different practices (OECD, 2011). Furthermore, it is also vital for social innovation initiatives in any sector to create public value if they are to be successful and sustainable among the society.

Although there has been an increasing interest surrounding social innovation research and considerable development of the concept of innovation, the idea of social innovation and its creation of public value remain underdeveloped. In the current literature, research on social innovation is mostly based on anecdotal evidence and case studies lacking any common themes (Mulgan, 2006; Cajaiba-Santana, 2013). Despite the growing public and academic awareness of new concepts and strategies of social innovation, the literature is still overshadowed by the continuing focus on economic benefits of innovation in the form of business survival and competition. Against this backdrop, it is now important to explore social innovation and to elicit useful observations surrounding its progress and its capacity to create public value. In particular, recent studies have shown that social innovation and public value theory has emerged within the public policymaking debate where it encourages public participation and engagement to create social innovation (see for example Benington and Moore, 2011; Bekkers et al., 2013). Given this context, the aim of this paper is to examine the influence of social innovation in creating public value for society. To do so, the paper uses three diverse and established cases of social innovation at both local and national level in the United Kingdom (UK). In particular, the paper contributes to current understanding of social innovation by synthesising the literature on social innovation and analysing through a public value lens (i.e. service, outcome and trust). From a practical perspective, the paper illustrates how social innovation initiatives evolve to deliver public value through strong community and public sector collaboration.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. Firstly, it outlines the theoretical context of social innovation in public sector. Afterwards, it presents a discussion on public value theory. Thereafter, the paper outlines the research methodology adopted in this study. Then

the analysis of the three case studies is presented along with the research synthesis. Finally, the conclusions, limitations and direction of future research are explained respectively.

## **Research Background and Theoretical Context**

### *Concept and the Process of Social Innovation*

The study of innovation began in the field of economics, most notably in the works of Joseph Schumpeter (Hebert and Link, 2006). The concept of innovation was first described in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century as the implementation and dissemination of a novelty, with many aspects still being relevant in the present day as acknowledged by Schumpeter (Hochgerner, 2011). Since then, it has developed within different streams such as technological studies, social psychology, urban development and management. Research on innovation has also progressed to recognise the importance of the social dimension of innovation (Hellstorm, 2004).

In recent times there has been a revival of the social innovation context as it is becoming increasingly evident in policy, scientific and public debates. There is a growing consensus among practitioners, policy makers, the research community and others that widespread social innovation is required to cope with the significant challenges that societies are facing now and into the future. In spite of the urgency, social innovation scholarship is still new, lacks theoretical underpinnings and datasets, and consists of ill proven causal relationships (Howaldt and Schwarz 2010; Franz et al. 2012). According to Cajaiba-Sanatana (2013), the notion of social innovation has only recently entered the field of social sciences despite being around for decades (Simms, 2006). Since its emergence in this field, it has disseminated through various fields such as public administration (Klein et al. 2010), management (Clements and Sense, 2010), education (Schroder, 2012) and social entrepreneurship (Short et al., 2009). In the existing literature, there is varied understanding of the concept of social innovation. Social innovation has many different (and sometimes conflicting) meanings in a variety of areas such as innovation within the management and organisational research, the field of workplace and quality of working life, as part of social economy, in sustainable development, or as an aspect of territorial development (Moulaert et al., 2005; Howaldt and Schwarz, 2010; Rüede and Lurtz, 2012).

Prior studies have described social innovation as a concept which is aimed at meeting the needs of people and society (Franz et al., 2012; Lettice and Parekh, 2010; Bessant and Tidd, 2007). In the Green Paper on Innovation (Cresson and Bangemann, 1995), social innovation is reported as not just an economic mechanism or technical process, but more importantly a social phenomenon. Similarly, Mulgan et al. (2007) define social innovation as the development and implementation of new ideas (e.g. products, services and models) to meet social needs. The authors also emphasise the importance of social innovations particularly in areas where commercial and existing public sector organisations have failed. However, as per Howaldt and Schwarz, (2010) such a description is too broad and could include other sub-fields of innovation. Examples of this include the fields of sustainable innovation and eco-innovation which are associated with social problems as a result of environmental changes and depletion of natural resources. Despite the various interpretations of the concept of social innovation, it is clearly evident that the key focus is on the social dimension of innovation.

The process of social innovations concerns the formation and structuring of institutions as well as behavioural change (Hoffmann-Riem, 2008), and the empowerment of actors (Crozier and Friedberg, 1993). In the “social innovation cycle” (Murray et al., 2010) generation and distribution occurs primarily through “living experiences” and change-oriented “capacity-building” (Moulaert et al., 2005). According to Conger (2003) social inventions only become social innovations when they are introduced into a new environment and become used and effective (Gerber, 2006). The decisive criterion in a social invention becoming a social innovation is its institutionalisation or its transformation into a social fact (Durkheim, 1984), in most cases through planned and coordinated social action. An effective implementation and active dissemination of a new social fact usually follows targeted intervention but this may also occur through unplanned diffusion (Greenhalgh et al., 2004). Unlike technological innovations, social innovations are not always implemented and disseminated by the inventor. As per Schumpeter (1964), the skills needed to invent a new solution, differs from the skills required to scale up and market the invention as an innovation.

A social innovation initially constitutes of an idea of intended change in social practices which can somehow contribute to help overcome social problems or to satisfy the needs of a particular societal actor. Being part of a specific social context, social assessment criteria play an important role in deciding whether all social inventions can be classed as social innovation. These differ with the tangential societal function systems (such as, according to Parsons, 1971: politics, law, science and economy), subject areas (social security, family, education, etc.), as well as pertaining to substantive concepts of reference, e.g. gender mainstreaming, sustainable development, environmental protection. The processes by which social ideas and inventions spread through existing communication paths in a social system, depends on their compatibility with the practical rationale in certain fields and their “utility” in terms of (future) adopters. Social innovations evolve in a given social environment, from which diffusion expands in similar forms of mainly S-curves (known since Tarde, 1903; Rogers, 1962). The “early adopters”, the opinion leaders for the innovation-ready mainstream, follow the handful of “innovators” who believe and are willing to experiment and assume risk. The “late majority” is reluctant with regard to the innovation, and finally the group of conservative “stragglers” may follow later or even not at all. Successful diffusion up to a certain degree of saturation (which differs for varieties of innovation) marks the end of novelty, and the innovation takes hold. With regard to the diffusion processes – of material innovations as well as, in particular, social innovations – network relationships increasingly play a decisive role (Okruh, 1999; Stone, 2004; Ormerod, 2012).

### *Social innovation in the UK public sector*

At the present time of economic recovery, the UK government is seeking community and third sector involvement in tackling social problems. In this context, social innovations are often seen as novel responses to social problems which were in the past addressed by government. Therefore, it is important to foster social innovation as it tackles social challenges that are resilient to traditional problem-solving approaches. It needs creative thinkers and innovators to work together bringing in their individual expertise and assets (Lettice and Parekh, 2010). In the public sector, social innovation is responding to several challenges and having a positive impact (OECD, 2011). One of the most important changes being brought about is the contribution towards the modernisation of public services. This is being achieved for example, through social enterprises which deliver new welfare services in

a personalised manner, often in partnership with the public sector at both national and local levels. This in turn results in better services and new processes, thus leading to improved public sector efficiency. Furthermore, it is becoming more user-centred through increasing involvement of citizens in the designing and co-creation of these services (Horizon 2020, 2013).

The UK, like many other countries, is facing challenges both economically and socially (OECD, 2011) and these are varied across core public services such as health, social services, education, environment and transport. Recent economic downturn and high expectations from communities coupled with restricted budgets make these challenges more difficult for the state (Goodridge et al., 2012). According to OECD (2011), innovation and in particular social innovation would be a key in overcoming these barriers. However, several important studies have emphasised that the social innovation system in the UK is still immature as outlined below:

- *Local social innovation is hidden in traditional metrics policy:* according to Bacon et al. (2008), much social innovation starts locally (practitioners, local authority leaders etc), as a result of which it can be easily hidden from policymakers and researchers.
- *Government is often perceived as stifling innovation:* as per Borins (2001) governments are generally seen as being risk-averse, following strict rules and regulations in line with bureaucracy.
- *Strict guidelines and regulations:* public sector approaches including budget criteria, strict policies and audit controls do not allow for social innovation (Mulgan, 2007).

Despite these challenges, it is strongly believed that innovation holds the key to delivering the most needed public services (Murray et al., 2010). The existing literature presents recommendations for strategies that could be used to overcome these challenges. NESTA (2008) suggests a strategy to incentivise innovation within the local government. Some examples of this in practice included the Big Green Challenge which is a £1 million open innovation challenge prize for communities to address climate change and Age Unlimited; a programme aimed at designing new services for older people. Similar to this recommendation, Pol and Ville (2009) highlighted the decisive role that governments could take in providing incentives to social innovators. An example described was that of giving a reward (e.g. prize money) to an innovator who performs a task of public benefit (e.g. an innovation to reduce infant mortality in a remote area). Another strategy is the use of emerging technologies such as the use of social media in government (Mergel, 2012). This however goes hand in hand with the expectation for improved online interactions between the government and its stakeholders. Advocates of this strategy claim that these technologies provide the opportunity for citizens to participate and engage in public sector activities such as policy making (*ibid*). However, Pot and Vaas (2008) highlights that continued innovation and growth in productivity cannot be achieved simply through new technologies, changes in management and improved budgeting. It requires fundamental and systemic change within an organisation going against the status quo (Mulgan et al., 2007).

In the existing literature, there is a level of agreement on the nature and complexity with regards to social innovation (Lettice and Parekh, 2010). It is certain that a significant level of change to the extent of challenging societal norms and tackling extremely difficult problems is required in order to achieve social innovation (Murray et al., 2010). However, much of the current literature is fragmented and scattered focusing on fields such as public policy,

management and social entrepreneurship. Furthermore there is still a lack of literature and research on how public value can be achieved from social innovation. In this respect, public value theory has emerged within the public policymaking debate where it encourages public participation and engagement to create social innovation. Public value concept insists on government organisations to work jointly as it intends to increase public value that cannot be created through a single organisation (Bardach, 1998). In line with these arguments social innovation supports the collaboration of creative thinkers and innovators to tackle some of the major challenges faced within their communities.

### *The Public Value Theory*

The concept of public value theory was first introduced by Moore in the US (Moore, 1995). Since its emergence the public value theory has grown interest among both academics and practitioners. Moore's value theory proposed a strategic triangle which posits that a strategy for a public sector organisation must meet three broad tests. First, it must be aimed at creating something significantly valuable, secondly it must be legitimate and politically sustainable, and thirdly it must be operationally and administratively feasible (Alford and O'Flynn, 2009). In the UK, the concept of public value theory was first introduced in a cabinet office report (Kelly et al., 2002). The cabinet report observed that public value can be outlined in three broad dimensions; services, outcomes and trust.

Services value can be achieved through cost effective provision of high quality services (Try and Radnor, 2007; Try, 2008). Kearns (2004) highlighted five underlying factors that influence the perception of high quality services. These are service availability, satisfaction of services, importance of services offered, fairness of service provision and cost. Moreover, Kelly et al. (2002) observed that user's satisfaction is important determinant of creating value in services and user satisfaction is formed by implying factors including; Customer service, information, choice and use of services. In addition, Grimsley and Meehan (2007) found that satisfaction has great impact on creating service value. It is evident from these studies that citizen satisfaction plays a key role in maintaining the value through services.

The second component of public value identified by Kelly et al. (2002) is the achievement of the desired outcomes or end results. The value of outcomes is experienced individually by a user who is directly using the services and collectively by citizens as a community who have never personally used the services directly (Grimsley and Meehan, 2007). The public expects better outcomes from government in areas such as peace and security, poverty reduction, public health, high employment, low crime rates, clean streets, an improved environment and better educational achievements. These outcomes may overlap with services; however, services and outcomes are clearly different and should be managed separately by public managers (Kelly et al., 2002).

The third component of public value is trust and it is highly valued by the public. Public managers should maintain a high level of trust between citizens and government as it is the heart of relationship between them (Kearn, 2004). For example if level of trust in public organisations increases over time then citizens are most likely to accept government actions. A failure of trust will effectively destroy public value even if improved services or outcome targets are met (Kelly et al., 2002). Trust in government can be determined in three main ways; firstly the way politicians behave and public organisations behave, secondly the way

government manages its economy and deliver services, thirdly the general level of social trust and trust in public organisations.

This paper will therefore draw from the public value theory to show how socially innovative and sustainable initiatives can occur through the collaborative efforts of civil society and the public sector. In particular, the three dimensions of public value, 'services, outcome and trust', are used to evaluate three diverse and established cases of social innovation.

## **Research Design**

The philosophy of research adapted for this study draws on the suggestions of Yin (2009), Creswell (2003), Walsham (1993), Denzin and Lincoln (2003), and Miles and Huberman (1994) and follow an interpretive, qualitative approach. In this respect, the research approach combined the review and synthesis of literature with secondary analysis of established social innovation cases in the UK. Firstly, due to the emerging nature of the field of research, a comprehensive and broad literature review was needed to investigate the phenomenon of social innovation. This literature review enabled to scope the defined area of research and identify the void in literature and issues surrounding social innovation as a concept. Secondly, the case analysis helped determine how the process of social innovation evolves and the role that different stakeholders (i.e. civil society, public sector and private sector) have to play in creating public value. The selection of the three cases was based on the following criteria: a) how social innovation can be initiated by different actors, b) the diverse beneficiaries, and c) the varied age of the cases. These criteria were used to: i) ensure diversity of the cases and hence the broader applicability of the research outcomes derived from the study, and ii) determine the impact of the different stakeholders and their role in delivering social innovation outcomes. The review of these three cases selected for the study helped achieve the aim and objectives of the study and therefore it was deemed not necessary to examine further cases (Walsham, 1993; 1995).

## **Social Innovation in the UK: Analysis of Three Established Cases**

Social innovation refers to the power of the society to address social challenges and unmet needs through new strategies and ideas. A review of examples of social innovation initiatives in the UK reveals several new strategies and ideas by individuals, communities and organisations that are in place to meet these needs. Of these, three case studies of social innovation have been drawn from both local and national level in the UK and explored in this section. Table 1 provides an overview of these case studies and its purposes which are then discussed in more detail.



<i>Case Study</i>	<i>Beneficiary</i>	<i>Purpose</i>
<b>Meals on Wheels</b> (Founded in 1943)	Community Services	To help provide meals to individuals at home who are unable to purchase or prepare their own meals.
<b>Sure Start</b> (Founded in 1998)	Education	To address child poverty and improve long term opportunities to young families in deprived parts of the UK through a cross-departmental Government policy initiative.
<b>Modernisation of Hearing Aids Services (MHAS)</b> (Founded in 2000)	Health Care	To modernise the NHS Audiology services in the UK and provide patients with the latest technology in hearing aids.

**Table 1: Social Innovation Case Studies in UK public sector**

### **Meals on Wheels**

Meals on Wheels (MOW) is a service that started in the UK during World War 2 when many people lost their homes and were therefore unable to cook their own food (MOWAA, 2014). At the time, the Women’s Volunteer Service for Civil Defence (now better known as the WRVS) took charge of this, providing meals for people. This has evolved over the years to now being a programme that delivers meals to individuals at home who are unable to purchase or prepare their own meals (Winterton et al., 2012). This is mainly now a service for housebound people (mostly the elderly) which is provided either free or with a small donation. The service is run by volunteers, many of whom are also elderly (MOWAA, 2014). The global phenomenon of an ageing population is having a major impact on how care in the community is delivered and addressing the needs of this population subgroup. Home care services provided are usually dependent on how health, social and community services are organised and financed in individual countries (Stoddart et al., 2002). In most countries this is provided informally by family and friends. In the UK there are support services provided by community groups and volunteers (Skinner and Joseph, 2009), with MOW being an important organisation within this context.

The service provides a degree of safety in eliminating unsafe use of stoves/appliances and also provides the elderly with some much needed social contact on a regular basis. Despite being a concept that has been around for several decades, the innovation in MOW stems from the way the concept has been modified and has evolved to meet the current social needs of the community. MOW as a service enables many housebound and elderly people to continue living at home and maintain a degree of independence. Although starting as a voluntary service, MOW has now evolved into a service that is being provided by commercial organisations rather than voluntary services or local authorities (Mason, 2014). This is due to the increasing demands and local authorities not being able to continue to meet these needs through the existing services. In this respect, there is a need for stronger collaboration and stakeholder (i.e. civil society, private sector, third sector) engagement to sustain and continue provision of this service to the community.

## **Sure Start**

Sure Start is a UK Government area-based initiative which provides early learning and full day care for pre-school children in England (Gov.uk, 2014). It was first announced in 1998 by the Chancellor of Exchequer at that time applying mainly to England, with slightly different versions of the initiative being started in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland (Johnson, 2011). The main goal of Sure Start is to work in partnership with parents and children to promote physical, intellectual and emotional development of young pre-school children (Gov.uk, 2014). The centres' are open to all children with most of the services being free of charge. In addition, it also provides assistance to parents and carers by providing help and advice on family health, parenting, money, training, employment and other difficulties families maybe facing. Each Sure Start locality has locally based programmes that are built around and tailored to meet the needs of the local community (Caulier-Grice, 2008). They ensure provision of a basic set of core services which include; outreach services and home visiting; support for families and parents; good quality play, learning and child care; community healthcare and advice about child health and development; support for those with special needs. In addition to this, additional services are often provided in keeping with the local needs which can include skills training or employment advice for parents or language and literacy training.

The Sure Start programme represents innovation in addressing a long neglected area of children's early year's development (Glass, 1999). In addition, it is also unique in its service delivery as it brings together professional, voluntary and private providers of social, education and health services to provide one combined service targeted specifically at a population subgroup of families with young children (Mulgan et al., 2007). Its emphasis on the future through focused support for young children ensures a unique approach to investing in the betterment of the community in the long run (Johnson, 2011). The idea is that through these centres, young pre-schoolers will gain the necessary exposure and support to their development so as to ease their transition into school. This is particularly relevant for more disadvantaged children and families who often do not have the same opportunities. In addition to this, the assistance provided to parents and carers through help and advice on employment, debt management, skills training, parenting skills makes helps in aiding the development of the whole family. In addition, the availability of a free child care service encourages parents to seek employment thus having a positive effect on the overall economy. The long-term goal overall is to achieve better educational performance, employment along with reduced levels of teenage pregnancy and less criminality within the local community (Glass, 1999). Whilst progress on the long term impact of this initiative is currently still being monitored, it again provides an excellent working example of social innovation within the public sector.

## **Modernisation of Hearing Aids Services (MHAS)**

The Modernisation of Hearing Aids Services (MHAS) is a programme funded by the Department of Health (DoH) which aims to modernise hearing services within the NHS across England (MHAS, 2014). This initiative was first brought to the fore by the Royal National Institute for Deaf People (RNID) to fulfil the needs of over 2 million NHS hearing aid users. Previously, NHS patients would only receive analogue-type hearing aids, with those who wanted the new generation digital hearing aids having to pay privately in the region of

£2500 for each hearing aid. In 2000, RNID were allocated the task of modernisation in partnership with the DoH leading to the formation of the MHAS. It started with the dissemination of digital hearing aids to patients through 20 pilot sites and was subsequently extended across the country in 2003 at a cost of £125 million (House of Common, 2007). Currently, the main role of the MHAS is to work towards improving audiology services for patients with hearing problems with particular focus on finding ways to make the newer hearing aids technology available to the NHS patient.

In terms of social innovation, the MHAS was the first initiative where a voluntary organisation (RNID) was asked to co-manage a large scale project with a government department (Mulgan et al., 2007). A clear need was identified in addressing a specific health need of hearing-loss and the existing barriers to service provision to this patient group. The resultant improvements in providing the latest hearing aid technology on the NHS ensured better audiology services, as well as allowing those who were previously disabled, to be independent thus contributing to the overall interests of the wider community (House of Commons, 2007). It was innovative in its use of a private-public partnership (PPP) to provide a community service through a charitable organisation where the programme is run by the RND on behalf of the DoH. The RNID worked in partnership with the NHS Purchasing and Supply Agency (PASA), and through efficient procurement methods managed to reduce the cost of the digital hearing aids down to £100, which was a significant cost saving (NHS Confederation, 2006). This meant that digital hearing aids could be provided free of charge on the NHS and was a major achievement and a key economic and cost saving driver for social innovation. Over the first five years after its introduction, over 800,000 patients across the UK have benefited in the way of having digital hearing aids fitted (*ibid*). Since, the MHAS has continued to work towards finding ways to make the latest technology in hearing aids being made available to patients on the NHS (MHAS, 2014). In addition, investment has been made towards the education and training of the staff providing the service, so as to improve the quality of the audiology service as experienced by patients (House of Commons, 2007). This has resulted in improved quality of life to this specific population group as well as an investment in improving this aspect of the health service.

## **Evaluating the Public Value of Social Innovation**

The cases described in the paper show three diverse and established examples of social innovation taking place in the UK. While two of the programmes were initiated by the government, in all three, involvement of the community and third sector has made these initiatives highly successful. Against the backdrop of aging populations and limited state spending on public services as highlighted in the literature (Goodridge et al., 2012), there is an increasing need for innovative and alternative solutions to address these challenges. Initiatives such as MOW and Sure Start are key social innovation examples that have been necessary in overcoming these obstacles and providing much needed services to the community. Public value is generated in the MOW case by satisfying those individuals who are unable to purchase or prepare their own meals. Additionally, Sure Start ensures the creation of individual value for both the parents and their children by facilitating targeted development and learning. For parents, this initiative will create value that will positively affect their position in the community by: a) having access to learning through the development of their own skill-sets, and b) improving their skills on parenting. For example, parents can learn new skills and vocational training whilst their children engage in early

childhood development activities. For children this initiative will create value through achieving broad socially desired outcomes as a result of engaging in cognitive developmental activities. In contrast to the MOW and Sure Start cases, the MHAS case highlights the changes that are triggered through innovations in science the intervention of the state to exploit these innovations for the betterment of society. While having a major impact on society, the MHAS case also drives economic benefits in terms of cost savings for the public sector. This is being achieved through private public partnerships with the aim of improving services, particularly through the increasing involvement of users in the design and delivery of these services. Public value is created in MHAS by providing a service to a specific community that is disadvantaged in terms of health and wellbeing thereby ensuring social cohesion.

Table 2 below presents the key drivers of the social innovation for each of the three cases and the creation of public value for the respective communities in terms of service, outcome and trust.

Case Study	Drivers of the Social Innovation	Public Value		
		Service	Outcome	Trust
Meals on Wheels (MOW)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ civil society need</li> <li>▪ commercial influence</li> <li>▪ public policy (on health and wellbeing)</li> </ul>	MOW adds value as a service to home-bound individuals by ensuring that they are healthy and safe within the confines of their own homes. Furthermore, individuals receiving this service often have no other point of personal contact and as such MOW allows for these people to have some social engagement, although brief, and thereby eliminating complete isolation.	The outcome value of MOW is the achievement of social and economic benefits in the long term. For example, MOW helps facilitate independence by allowing people to live in their own homes for an extended period than usual. This will not only reduce the burden on the social care system but in turn provide cost savings for the state.	The individual perception of trust in government is likely to increase as a result of the availability of this service during a phase of their life where such essential services are most needed.
Sure Start	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ political agenda and drivers (Early Years Foundation Public Policy)</li> <li>▪ wicked problems</li> <li>▪ social and citizen needs</li> </ul>	Sure Start generates value by providing a service that brings together professional, voluntary and private providers of social, education and health services to provide one combined service targeted specifically at a population subgroup of families with young children.	The outcome value of sure start is the long term improvement of employability and childhood educational development. For example, better early childhood development will ensure improved education outcomes resulting in lower levels of unemployment in the country. In addition, the interactive environment offered in Sure Start centres will help prevent issues such as post-natal depression in parents.	The initiative will create trust among parents as it offers a learning environment which combines care facilities and development for children with education, vocational skills and other useful advice for adults on child and family health, parenting, money, training and employment.
Modernisation of Hearing Aids Services (MHAS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ economic and cost saving</li> <li>▪ third sector influence</li> <li>▪ improvement in science and technology</li> <li>▪ need for modernisation</li> </ul>	MHAS creates service value through the resultant improvements in providing the latest hearing aid technology through the NHS. This ensures better audiology services as well as allowing those who were previously disabled to be independent, thus contributing to the overall interests of the wider community.	MHAS has resulted in major economic outcomes as it has managed to reduce the cost of the digital hearing aids down to £100, which is a significant cost saving for the NHS. Furthermore, it has major health outcomes as it improves the quality of life of this physically disadvantaged community.	MHAS generates trust among the targeted community as a result of the provision of latest hearing aid technology to a specific group of individuals who otherwise would have been isolated from society due to their physical disability.

**Table 2: Public Value of Social Innovation: Case Study Analysis**

The table highlights how public value is generated through three diverse examples of social innovation initiatives in the UK. However, it is important to note that technically measuring this value creation can be notoriously difficult and the failure of the social and public sectors to measure this value does not always stem from a paucity of acumen or good intention (Mulgan, 2010). Rather, according to Mulgan (2010) it is due to the unavoidable complexities that comes with measuring social value that often proves challenging. For example, the lack of strict laws and regularities in the social field, lack of agreement among people on the desired outcome of a service, etc. are some of these complexities. Nonetheless, it is important for social innovation initiatives in any sector to create public value if they are to be successful and sustainable among the society as outlined in our examples presented in this paper.

## **Conclusions**

From a theoretical perspective, this paper has contributed to the current understanding of social innovation by synthesising the normative literature on social innovation and analysing through a public value lens. By doing so, the paper has demonstrated how social innovation contributes to addressing civil society needs while at the same time contributing to the political and economic agendas of a country and the exploitation of science for the benefit of communities. The evaluation of social innovation cases from a public value lens allowed the authors to delineate the respective impacts of these initiatives in terms of service, outcome and trust value for the community.

In terms of practical contribution, this paper has illustrated how social innovation initiatives evolve to deliver public value through strong community and public sector collaboration. For policy makers the examples presented in the paper offer valuable insights into the drivers of social innovation and the role government in generating stakeholder involvement in evolving the process of social innovation. Furthermore, our findings highlight that the public sector can play a dual role in enabling and facilitating social innovation at both local and national levels. For example, the MOW case demonstrated how the community initiated the service and subsequently public sector involvement took place to sustain the service. On the other hand, the MHAS case illustrates a public private partnership to enhance both societal and economic outcomes for the community.

The findings and discussion presented in this study need to be interpreted with the limitation in mind that this paper relied on secondary analysis of cases to draw conclusions. In this respect, the evaluation of public value of the cases need further empirical grounding by consulting the various stakeholders involved in the social innovation process as well as the beneficiaries of the services.

## References

- Alford, J. and J. O'Flynn. 2009. 'Making Sense of Public Value: Concepts, Critiques and Emergent Meanings', *International Journal of Public Administration*, 32, 3–4, 71–91.
- Bacon, N., Faizullah, N., Mulgan, G. and Woodcraft, S. (2008). *Transformers: how local areas innovate to address changing social needs*. London: NESTA.
- Bekkers, V.J.J.M., Tummers, L.G., Voorberg, W.H. (2013). *From public innovation to social innovation in the public sector: A literature review of relevant drivers and barriers*. Rotterdam: Erasmus University Rotterdam
- Benington, j., and Moore, M.H. (2011) *Public Value Theory and Practice*, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bessant, J. and Tidd, J. (2007). *Innovation and Entrepreneurship*. John Wiley and Sons Ltd, Chichester.
- Cajaiba-Santana, G. (2013). *Social innovation: Moving the field forward. A conceptual framework. Technological Forecasting and Social Change*. Forthcoming.
- Caulier-Grice, J. (2008) 'Sure Start | Social Innovation Exchange' *Socialinnovationexchange.org*. [online] Available at: <http://www.socialinnovationexchange.org/ideas-and-inspiration/education-and-youth/case-study/sure-start> [Accessed: 12 Feb 2014].
- Clements, M.D.J. and Sense, A.J. (2010) Socially shaping supply chain integration through learning, *International Journal of Technology Management*, 51(1), 92–105.
- Conger, S. (2003). *A List of Social Inventions*. Download from: *The Innovation Journal* (<http://www.innovation.cc/books/conger-book-table.htm>, 01/12/2009).
- Cresson, E. and Bangemann, M. (1995) *Green Paper on Innovation*, *European Commission*.
- Crozier, M. and Friedberg, E. (1993). *Die Zwänge kollektiven Handelns – Über Macht und Organisation*. Frankfurt (Main): Hain.
- Dawson, P. and Daniel, L. (2010). Understanding social innovation: a provisional framework. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 51(1), 9-21.
- Franz, H.-W., Hochgerner, J. and Howaldt, J. (eds.) (2012). *Challenge Social Innovation. Potentials for Business, Social Entrepreneurship, Welfare and Civil Society*. Berlin-Heidelberg: Springer.
- Gerber, P. (2006). *Der lange Weg der sozialen Innovation – Wie Stiftungen zum sozialen Wandel im Feld der Bildungs- und Sozialpolitik beitragen können. Eine Fallstudie zur Innovationskraft der Freudenberg Stiftung*. Weinheim
- Glass, N. (1999) 'Sure Start: the development of an early intervention programme for young children in the United Kingdom' *Children and Society*, 13 (4), pp. 257--264.

Goodridge, P., Haskel, J. and Wallis, G. (2012). UK Innovation Index: Productivity and Growth in UK Industries. London: NESTA.

Gov.uk. (2014) 'Find a Sure Start Children's Centre - GOV.UK' [online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/find-sure-start-childrens-centre#before-you-start> [Accessed: 12 Feb 2014].

Greenhalgh, T., Robert, G., Macfarlane, F., Bate, P. and Kyriakidou, O. (2004). Diffusion of innovations in Service Organizations: Systematic Review and Recommendations. In: *The Milbank Quarterly*, 82(4), 1-37. Download from: Milbank (<http://www.milbank.org/quarterly/8204feat.html>, 27/11/2009).

Grimsley, M. and A. Meehan. 2007. 'E-Government Information Systems: Evaluation-led Design for Public Value and Client Trust', *European Journal of Information Systems*, 16, 134–48.

Hébert, R.F. and Link, A.N. (2006). The entrepreneur as innovator. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 31, 589–597.

Hellström, T. (2004). Innovation as social action. *Organization*, 11, 631–649.

Hochgerner, J. (2011), *The Analysis of Social Innovations as Social Practice*, available at:

Hoffmann-Riem, W. (2008). Soziale Innovationen. Eine Herausforderung auch für die Rechtswissenschaft. In: *Der Staat*, 47(4), 588-605.

Horizon 2020 (2013), *Horizon 2020 Work Programme, Secure societies – Protecting freedom and security of Europe and its citizens*, European Commission, December 2013

House of Commons. (2007) *Audiology Services*. [report] London: House of Commons.

Howaldt, J., and Schwarz, M. (2010). SI: Concepts, research fields and international trends. Report of ESF, EU, and Aachen University. Dortmund, May 2010.

Johnson, S. (2011) *Impact of Social Science On Policy: Sure Start Case Study*. Hull: Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC).

Kearns, I. (2004). Public value and e-government, Institute for Public Policy Research.

Kelly, K., G. Mulgan and S. Muers. 2002. *Creating Public Value. An Analytical Framework for Public Service Reform*. London: CabinetOffice.

Klein, J-L., Tremblay, D-G. and Bussieres, D.R. (2010) Social economy-based local initiatives and social innovation: a Montreal case study, *International Journal of Technology Management*, 51(1), 121–138.

Lettice, F. and Parekh, M. (2010). The social innovation process: themes, challenges and implications for practice. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 51(1), 139–158.



- Mason, I. (2014) 'Meals on wheels changes hard to swallow' *Richmond and Twickenham Times*. [online] Available at: [http://www.richmondandtwickenhamtimes.co.uk/news/2403082.meals\\_on\\_wheels\\_changes\\_hard\\_to\\_swallow/](http://www.richmondandtwickenhamtimes.co.uk/news/2403082.meals_on_wheels_changes_hard_to_swallow/) [Accessed: 12 Feb 2014].
- Mergel, I. (2012). The social media innovation challenge in the public sector. *Information Polity*, 17(3-4), 281-292.
- MHAS. (2014) 'Modernising Hearing Aid Services' [online] Available at: <http://www.mhas.info/> [Accessed: 12 Feb 2014].
- Moulaert, F., Martinelli, F., Swyngedouw, E. and Gonzalez, S. (2005). Towards Alternative Model(s) of Local Innovation. In: *Urban Studies*, 42(11), 1669-1990.
- MOWAA. (2014) 'Our History - Meals On Wheels Association of America' [online] Available at: <http://www.mowaa.org/Page.aspx?pid=225> [Accessed: 12 Feb 2014].
- Moore, M. (1995). *Creating public value*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mulgan, G. (2010) 'Measuring Social Value (SSIR)' *Ssireview.org*. [online] Available at: [http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/measuring\\_social\\_value](http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/measuring_social_value) [Accessed: 20 Feb 2014].
- Mulgan, G. (2006). The process of social innovation, *Innovations*. 1, 145–162.
- Mulgan, G. (2007) *Ready or Not? Taking Innovation in the Public Sector Seriously*. NESTA Provocation 03. London: NESTA.
- Mulgan, G., Ali, R., Halkett, R. and Sanders, B. (2007) *In and out of sync: The challenge of growing social innovations*. [report] UK: NESTA.
- Mulgan, G., Tucker, S., Ali, R. and Sanders, B. (2007). *Social Innovation: What it is, Why it Matters, How it can be Accelerated*.
- Murray, R., Caulier-Grice, J., and Mulgan, G. (2010). *The open book of social innovation*. London: NESTA.
- NESTA. (2008). *Social Innovation: New approaches to transforming public services*. London: NESTA.
- NHS Confederation. (2006) *Independent providers...making a difference in the NHS*. London: NHS Confederation Distribution.
- OECD (2011). *Fostering Innovation to Address Social Challenges. Workshop Proceedings*.
- Okruch, S. (1999). *Innovation und Diffusion von Normen: Grundlagen und Elemente einer evolutorischen Theorie des Institutionenwandels*. Berlin: Duncker and Humblot.

Ormerod, P. (2012). *Positive Linking: How Networks and Incentives Can Revolutionise the World*. London: Faber and Faber.

Parsons, T. (1971). *The System of Modern Societies*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Pol, E. and Ville, S. (2009). Social innovation: Buzz word or enduring term?. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 38(6), 878-885.

Poole, M. and Van De Ven, A. (Eds.) (2004) *Handbook of Organizational Change and Innovation*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Pot, F. and Vaas, Fietje. (2008). Social innovation, the new challenge for Europe. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 57(6), 468-473.

Rogers, E. (1962). *Diffusion of Innovations*. New York: The Free Press.

Rüede, D. and Lurtz, K. (2012). Mapping the various meanings of social innovation: towards a differentiated understanding of an emerging concept. EBS Business School Research Paper Series 12-03.

Schroder, A. (2012). Universities as Regional Centres for Lifelong Learning and Innovation. *EIRP Proceedings*, vol. 7.

Schumpeter, J. A. (1964). *Theorie der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung*. Berlin: Duncker and Humblot (6. Auflage).

Short, J.C., Moss, T.W. and G.T. Lumpkin. (2009). Research in social entrepreneurship: past contributions and future opportunities. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 3(2), 161–194.

Simms, J.R. (2006). Technical and social innovation determinants of behaviour. *System Research and Behavioral Science*, 23(3), 383–393.

Skinner, M. W. and Joseph, A. E. (2011) 'Placing voluntarism within evolving spaces of care in ageing rural communities' *GeoJournal*, 76 (2), pp. 151-162.

Stoddart, H., Whitley, E., Harvey, I. and Sharp, D. (2002) 'What determines the use of home care services by elderly people?' *Health and social care in the community*, 10 (5), pp. 348-360.

Stone, D. (2004). Transfer Agents and Global Networks in the 'Transnationalisation' of Policy. *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 11 (3), 545-566.

Tarde, G. (1903). *The laws of imitation* (E., Parsons, Trans.; French ed., 1880). New York: Henry Holt.

Try, D. 2008. "Mind the Gap, Please": Using Public Value Theory to Examine Executive Take-up of Results-based Management', *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 57, 1, 22–36.

Try, D. and Z. Radnor. 2007. 'Developing and Understanding of Results-based Management through Public Value Theory' *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 20, 7, 655–73.

Van der Hof, S. and Groothuis, M. M. (2011) *Innovating Government: Normative, Policy and Technological Dimensions of Modern Government*, T.M.C. Asser Press.

Walsham, G. (1993) *Interpreting Information Systems in Organisations*, Wiley, Chichester

Walsham, G. (1995) Interpretive Case Studies in IS Research: Nature and Method, *European Journal of Information Systems*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 74-81.

Winterton, R., Warburton, J. and Oppenheimer, M. (2013) 'The future for Meals on Wheels? Reviewing innovative approaches to meal provision for ageing populations' *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 22 (2), pp. 141--151.