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Social innovation drivers in social enterprises: Systematic review

Abstract

Purpose: Identify the drivers of Social Innovation (SI) that bring together the main management tools and approaches associated with the creation of SI in Social Enterprises (SEs).

Methodology: A systematic review was developed in the Web of Science, Scopus and EBSCO databases, using the keywords: social innovation, social enterprise and management. After analysis of quality and application of inclusion and exclusion criteria, 54 articles were selected for full analysis.

Findings: SI process was systemised into four steps: mapping and development, consolidation, scaling up and evaluation. The drivers of SI were mapped and classified into three main factors: contextual, organizational and managerial.

Practical implications: In organizational factors, business model was emphasized, as well as partnerships, participatory culture and intrapreneurship, adequate levels of bricolage and continuous learning. The management factors included the characteristics of the entrepreneur / innovator and managerial practices, where those that facilitate teamwork and the participation of all involved are best suited. In contextual factors, the highlight was the need for support from policy makers; community participation and demand for innovations that consider local context and usability.

Originality/value: This study connects previously scattered knowledge in a generic model of SI, highlighting routines and processes used, and provides a starting point for innovators and social entrepreneurs in the complex, uncertain and often unknown process of SI. Additionally, several research gaps were identified to be addressed by future research in the context of SI management.
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1. Introduction

Social innovation (SI) and social enterprise (SE) are topics that gained greater visibility in the last few decades as private companies, public organizations and community groups are mobilizing to develop more efficient solutions to social problems than the ones currently in place (Lettice and Parekh, 2010). In the United Kingdom, for example, there are over 100,000
SEs contributing £60bn to the UK economy and employing two million people (Hidden Revolution: Social Enterprise in 2018, 2018) and the European Union holds SI as one of their innovation policies.[1]

One of the most cited definitions of SI by Murray et al. (2010, p. 3) describes it as “new ideas (products, services and models) that simultaneously meet social needs and create new social relationships or collaborations” which can happen in all sectors: public, private and non-profit. SI is not limited to any type of organisation, nevertheless, this study aimed to study it in the context of SEs as there is a strong link between these two concepts, albeit their boundaries are unclear (Rao-Nicholson et al., 2017) and an intersection of areas of SI with social entrepreneurship has been observed (Farinha et al., 2020). Furthermore, SEs bring about the institutional conditions necessary for implementing SIs (Venugopal and Viswanathan, 2019). SI is an important competitive strategy for a SE, therefore its survival and capacity to generate social value is dependent on their ability to innovate (Ko et al., 2019).

A SE’s mission is to promote social impact through the trade of goods and services, using profits to reach social goals instead of financially rewarding its owners and shareholders (Biggeri et al., 2017). The SI is a process that begins with seeking an opportunity to deliver solutions for existing social problem to establish new social values (Mulyaningsih et al., 2016). Given how the objectives and principles are shared, the SEs are often seen as potential vectors for SI and even as a direct result of the process, considering that a number of SIs ended up creating a new SE (Biggeri et al., 2017; Selloni and Corubolo, 2017).

Researchers have suggested that SI – being dynamic and open-ended in nature – needs to be approached differently from products’ and technologies’ systems, which are more closed and predictable (Baek et al., 2019). In addition, encouraging SI in SEs involves the development and motivation of people’s tendency to innovate (Pasricha and Rao, 2018). However, there is a significant lack of research on the SI process and the barriers to innovation faced by social innovators (Lettice and Parekh, 2010; Phillips et al., 2015). Academics have called for studies that examine how SI can be encouraged in the SE and managed effectively (Bulut et al., 2013; Phillips et al., 2015; Slimane and Lamine, 2017).

A search in the main journal databases using both concepts, i.e. ‘social enterprise’ and ‘social innovation’, shows that few papers address the SI management in SE (54 articles were selected in our systematic review), most of them are case studies (Farinha et al., 2020) with SI models developed within particular contexts. Therefore, we sought to address this gap and set the main question in this review as: What are the models/ tools/management behaviours that are associated with the generation of SI in SEs? What is the SI process developed by the SEs?
To answer these research questions, this paper aims to identify the drives of SI that brings together the main management tools and approaches associated with the creation of SI in SEs. The main contribution of this study is in the connection of previously scattered knowledge in a generic model of SI, highlighting routines and processes used. Furthermore, the study has managerial implications as it provides a starting point for innovators and social entrepreneurs in the complex, uncertain and often unknown process of SI. We understand SI as a process, thus the establishment of a set of integrated routines helps the organization to make better decisions about the limited resources in order to minimise the high levels of uncertainty and maximize the ability to produce innovative goods and/or services.

The paper is outlined as follows: section 2 introduces the concept of SI and its process based on the literature review. Section 3 presents the systemic literature review methodology followed in this paper. In section 4 the results of the systemic review are presented, including a bibliometric analysis and the proposed integrated framework of SI management. Finally, section 5 and 6 discussed the findings and provide conclusions and future research.

2. Understanding Social Innovation

SI is commonly defined 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” (Phills et al., 2008, p. 36).

The SI differs from standard business or technological innovation as their main purpose is not the business profitability (Bhatt and Ahmad, 2017) and they are also different from other forms of solutions for social problems because they are sustainable in the long run, generating economic value but without accumulating money or profit (Slimane and Lamine, 2017).

When compiling the definitions presented by the analysed articles, it is believed that SI is a creative and collective process (Castro-Arce et al., 2019) that occurs essentially through partnerships started by individuals (users or non-users), social movements and organizations (Nicolopoulou et al., 2017; Senent-Bailach and Rey-Marti, 2017) motivated by the development of products, methodologies and/or services that address social issues and that, if institutionalised, can lead to system-wide changes (Castro-Arce et al., 2019; Solov’eva et al., 2018). In general, it is operated through different combinations of available resources to create solutions for social problems that are not effectively solved by existing organisations using traditional approaches (Kickul et al., 2018) and therefore are more desirable than the current options (Quandt et al., 2017). This way, “(...) SI is not limited to being associated with the social economy but also included in the private and public sectors, in new technologies,
research institutions and other actors and institutions of civil society” (Ludvig et al., 2018, p. 18). However, in this study we chose to better understand SI drivers in the context of SE because this type of innovation is the basis for accomplishing the SE’s mission (Mulyaningsih et al., 2014) and its competitive strategy (Ko et al., 2019). Furthermore, Borzaga and Bodini (2014) point out some reasons why the occurrence of SI is more likely in the SEs: reinvesting profits in the organization, which generates capital to invest in the development of innovations; and a multi-stakeholder governance structure that facilitates the alignment between the objectives from the organization and from the community.

2. Social innovation process

To understand how SI happens in SEs, we chose the process approach. Despite criticism to the linear visualisation of innovation, such as attributing a static status and/or not exploring the interactive aspect of the process, this option facilitates understanding through the use of sequential phases. Nine articles were identified that described the SI process (Table 1).

Table 1

Overall, the process starts at a micro level, with an entrepreneur or a small group of people, and ends at a macro level, with changes in the social system and development of new laws, business models and structures. A common characteristic in half the models analysed is the intersection of the SI creation process and the SE (Bhatt and Ahmad, 2017; Mulyaningsih et al., 2016; Slimane and Lamine, 2017; Tanimoto, 2012), for example, they perceived the identification of a social need as an opportunity for the development of a SE.

Figure 1 integrates the findings from previous studies of the SI process in SEs and shows the process dynamics, the generation of knowledge and the required abilities necessary to create SI. There are four main stages where the social need is identified, the SI is developed and strengthened, and finally the new practice creates changes in the system, so the process is concluded. During the entire period, there is constant evaluation of the SI process and impact.

Figure 1

As seen on Figure 1, the stages are simply milestones in the process and the dotted lines, and the constant evaluation show the interactions and systemic view of the model.

3. Methodology
The study has undertaken a systematic review of the literature, providing an overview of the knowledgebase about SI process in SEs. This method suggests best evidence synthesis whereby reviewers consistently apply clearly stated inclusion criteria for studies to be reviewed (Al-Tabbaa et al., 2019). The systematic review was separated into three distinct phases: (i) planning the review, (ii) conducting a review and (iii) reporting and dissemination (Tranfield et al., 2003). We started the review by identifying our main question, that is: What are the models/ tools/management behaviours that are associated with the generation of SI in SEs?

Afterwards, we used two articles that conducted systematic reviews involving SI and SE to help us define the electronic databases and searching terms and combinations. Phillips et al. (2015) used the terms “social enterprise*AND social innovation*” to carry out their search on Scopus database, which was chosen due to their broad range. Eichler and Schwarz (2019) on the other hand, chose “Social Innovation” and “Social Innovat*” as keywords and the search was conducted on Web of Science, due to its coverage of high impact factor journals, and EBSCO, a database known for including articles from a wider range of sources. From this starting point, we defined the following search string combinations (made by combining keywords with the Boolean operators):

1. "Social Innovation" or "Social Innovat*" in the title AND "social enterprise*" or "social entrepreneur*" or "social business" in the abstract and keywords.
2. "Social Innovation" or "Social Innovat*" in the title AND "management" or "manager*" in the abstract and keywords.
3. "Social Innovation" or "Social Innovat*" in the title AND "social enterprise*" or "social entrepreneur*" or "social business" in the abstract and keywords AND "management" or "manager*" in the abstract and keywords.

The search string used in the third combination is the only one directly related to our objective, i.e., it contained the three keywords in our search: management of SI in SE. However, we adopted a comprehensive strategy to ensure that all the articles that discussed SI and SEs and/or SI and management were reviewed. The comprehensive search extended to the databases as we chose to use the three previously mentioned sources, also aiming at finding out not only about current knowledge but also about how this knowledge evolved over time. Therefore, the search did not include any time period limitation. The search took place in February of 2020. The step by step for extraction of data is described in Figure 2.

Figure 2
The exclusion and quality criteria adopted has the disadvantage of excluding grey literature and book chapters; nonetheless, all important contributions in a given research field would usually appear continuously in subsequent journal papers (Pittaway and Cope, 2007). Additionally, we were interested in models / tools / management behaviours, therefore the review of conceptual material was not that relevant.

To determine if the context of SI were SEs, we adopted the UK government definition that SEs are "businesses with primarily social objectives whose surpluses are primarily reinvested for that purpose in the business or community, rather than being driven by the need to maximizing profit for shareholders and owners" (Department for Business Innovation Skills - BIS, 2011). In this definition, the social mission is emphasised without restricting the business model and therefore proved to be more appropriate to classify studies on SEs located in different countries. Subsequently, the articles were evaluated according to the questions on Table 2. The process of exclusion resulted in 54 articles that were considered for full analysis. The oldest paper was published in 1970 and the newest was published in 2020.

### Table 2

#### 4. Results

##### 4.1 Bibliometrics Analysis

The year 2010 marked the increase in the number of publications on SI and also on the SI process. We used the approach proposed by Phillips et al. (2015) dividing the articles in four categories: 1) Theoretical: presents or questions an existing theory; 2) Conceptual: bibliographical study that presents the main concepts and variables studied and the potential relationship between them; 3) Qualitative: research that uses data that do not indicate ordinal value; and 4) Quantitative: study that uses mathematical approach and/or statistics to analyse data with the goal of explaining a phenomenon.

Overall there is a dominance of qualitative researches (Figure 3), especially case studies (27 articles). At an early stage of research development, an approach that aims to explain a phenomenon can be very useful, later, investigating relationships becomes a priority and, in this case, it is more useful to use quantitative methods such as cost-effectiveness analysis (Mays et al., 2005). Unsurprisingly, starting from 2017 a number of quantitative approaches began to analyse the SI phenomenon.

**Figure 3**
Considering first author only, most of the researchers are affiliated to institutions in the United Kingdom (9), followed by the United States (8) and Canada (5). When comparing these results with other systematic reviews (Eichler and Schwarz, 2019; Phillips et al., 2015), we see a dominance of English speaking countries and a growing interest from British researchers as they have surpassed the United States in number of publications. It is worth pointing out that one of the criterion of exclusion was articles not written in English, which could have biased the result. Eichler and Schwarz (2019) for example, when including two other languages in their search, identified Italy in the third position.

The results also suggest that international collaborations are not common in this field of knowledge since only ten studies involved authors with affiliation to institutes from different countries. However, this trend may change soon considering that collaborations have increased recently.

There was no single journal specialized or focused on SI process and the articles included in this study were published in 48 different journals, most of them in areas of management and social change journals (14) and Science, Technology and Innovation Management (13). Management Decision is the journal with the greatest number of articles (3) due to a Special Issue related to SI.

4.2 An integrated framework of social innovation management

This study sought to identify and compile the main models/tools/management behaviours that are associated with the generation of SI in SEs. Figure 4 presents the three main drivers: contextual, managerial and organisational and their sub-factors that together influence SI in SEs. Following the phases presented in Figure 1, each driver is associated with a different step of the SI process, whether it is important at ‘mapping’, ‘developing’, ‘consolidation’, ‘scaling’, ‘evaluating’ or throughout the process ‘continuous’.

Figure 4

4.2.1 Organisational Factors

The organisational factors reflect the structure, learning process and culture of an organisation and are important because the innovation is an outcome from the organisation’s capabilities (Khosravi et al., 2019). The systemic literature review showed that there are four important organisational sub-factors influencing the SI processes in SEs: Business Model (BM), partnerships, knowledge management and culture.
Business model (BM). The BM is crucial to guarantee that the innovations achieve social impact and, at the same time, prove to be financially sustainable (Westley et al., 2014). This is formed by three pillars: (i) the proposition of value that is obtained when answering the following question ‘Who are our customers and what do we offer to them that they value?’, (ii) the creation of socio-environmental value, which is made from the offer of value to clients, involving the enterprise, its suppliers and partners and, lastly, (iii) the capture of value stemming from revenue obtained by supplying goods and services in a social profit equation, aiming at recovering total cost and capital, but not the maximization of economic profit (Bocken et al., 2014; Yunus et al., 2010).

An adequate BM is the one in which the proposal and the capture of value occur through a balance between (i) the SE’s strengths and internal knowledge and (ii) the opportunities to improve social well-being and external knowledge, such as the experience of members of the community. Hence, the most important driver for SI success is the balance between internal abilities and external demands (Biggeri et al., 2017; Mulyaningsih et al., 2014; Slimane and Lamine, 2017). Furthermore, the matching between supply and demand is crucial for the success of SI and SE (Westley and Antadze, 2010). This means it is necessary to have a holistic integration of users’ explicit needs (observable in their behaviours and attitudes) and their tacit and latent needs (Baek et al., 2019), and a profound knowledge of initiatives, organisations’ resources, existing community activities and potential funders to lower dependency on traditional sources, especially if users are unable to fund the innovation (Nandan et al., 2015; Westley and Antadze, 2010). Hence, seeking multiple forms of funding and resource inputs is a prerequisite for SI, especially public funding and private donations in early stages (Martins et al., 2020; Raynor, 2019; Zivojinovic et al., 2019).

BM should include the establishment of cooperation with multiple actors so that the social entrepreneur can access limited resources, ideas and managerial skills, as well as minimize the innovation’s risks by distributing responsibilities across organizations, which will enable the development of SI (Castro-Arce et al., 2019; Nicolopoulou et al., 2017; Phillips et al., 2017; Senent-Bailach and Rey-Marti, 2017; Slimane and Lamine, 2017; Svensson et al., 2019; Tanimoto, 2012). This can be facilitated by following an open social innovation approach, which is the application of both inbound and outbound open innovation strategies, as well as changes in the business model, to address social challenges (Chesbrough and Di Minin, 2014; Rayna and Striukova, 2019; Raynor, 2019; Selloni and Corubolo, 2017; Svensson et al., 2019).
Finally, in the scaling up phase, the BM should be adapted to the new scalability target environment to achieve inclusive and sustainable growth (adjustments in the structure and strategy) (Morais-da-Silva et al., 2016; Walker and Chen, 2019), developing local capabilities through work with local volunteers and organizations, resulting in the creation of SI’s ecosystems (Rao-Nicholson et al., 2017). Moreover, when the SI is outside of the mainstream way of thinking, it may also be necessary to reshape the preferences of a market or engage with a new ‘customer’ base (Lettice and Parekh, 2010; Martins et al., 2020).

**Partnerships.** SE are more effective when working in collaboration since the partners facilitate the identification of consumer needs (De Silva et al., 2019), access to resources, and can develop SIs based on the opportunities identified, but not developed, by the SE due to capacity or ability issues (Phillips et al., 2017; Svensson et al., 2019). Biggeri et al. (2017) for example, confirmed the hypothesis that the high level of social capital and trust between the different actors of the social ecosystem has a positive influence on the SE’s ability to create SI. The credibility of the partners is integral to SI growth, particularly in including actors not currently engaged with the SI or SE (Raynor, 2019). Some authors emphasise that the establishment of partnership specifically with private enterprises brings a greater return as they facilitate the access to market trends and new technologies, possibly generating social impact and financial returns to all parts involved (Ko et al., 2019; Solov’eva et al., 2018; Yun et al., 2017). Moreover, a structure with global networks of cooperation (institutional entrepreneurship) can create a connection to other contexts with new opportunities (demands from markets, policies and culture) (Westley and Antadze, 2010) and potentialize the diffusion of the SI (Bhatt and Ahmad, 2017; Chow et al., 2019).

The choice of partner is based on a motivation to solve a social problem (same interests) and on resources that different members will contribute (Castro-Arce et al., 2019; Nicolopoulou et al., 2017; Senent-Bailach and Rey-Marti, 2017; Slimane and Lamine, 2017; Tanimoto, 2012), so the mapping process should also be concerned about being aware of the unknown potential of partnerships (Raynor, 2019). To avoid problems generated by different organizational cultures, it is recommended a pre-determination of how the value created by the SI will be shared (Slimane and Lamine, 2017; Voltan and De Fuentes, 2016), a collectively definition of the “social” component of SI (what and how social needs will be met) (Dufays, 2019) and engagement with a long-term evaluation initiative to establish strong partnerships, with sense of shared property and a SI evaluation adapted to the needs of different groups as they became better understood (Szikarto et al., 2018).
Finally, specific networks of social entrepreneurs and innovation can offer better support to the creative process than the traditional networks (Zivojinovic et al., 2019), where the ideas of social innovators could be misunderstood or even ridiculed (Lettice and Parekh, 2010). In this regard, Svensson and Hambrick (2019) identified that through in loco visits (5 to 10 days) or virtual learning community, the leaders of social sports organizations, shared parts of curriculums, training methodology, impact measurement and tools among them, which promoted collective learning.

**Knowledge management.** Three themes regarding knowledge management must be highlighted: organisational learning, user learning and bricolage. The organizational learning is considered an important element in the successful cases of diffusion of the SI (Voltan and De Fuentes, 2016). It happens when the SE creates new knowledge based on the lessons learned from previous experiences, when it adjusts to environmental changes and offers training to promote internal development (Morais-da-Silva et al., 2016; Mulyaningsih et al., 2014). Another recommendation is the use of continuous participative evaluation methods and reflective sessions to create “neutral” places to build trust and comprehension through dialogue and critical thinking (Szijarto et al., 2018).

External experts may also be involved in the innovation process, combining conventional and unconventional knowledge, but this involves designing and creating mechanisms within the SE that prevent knowledge dissipation (Vezina et al., 2019) since this combination between internally generated knowledge and externally acquired knowledge is positively related with levels of SI in SEs (Urban and Gaffurini, 2017).

SI process involves not only expert work, but also user empowerment, i.e. a mutual knowledge transfer between experts and users (Baek et al., 2019). Siddike and Kohda (2016) show that e-learning can be used for both the training for potential users of the SI in the cases where they need to understand the importance of the social benefit before receiving the SI, and as a channel to obtain feedback on acceptance, satisfaction and adaptation needs. Therefore, the access to information and communication technologies (ICT) contributed to the success of SIs (Zivojinovic et al., 2019).

One of the greatest benefits suggested by the reviewed articles when addressing the construction of joint knowledge is the development of solutions to social problems by the use of bricolage - combination of existing resources for new purposes (Baker and Nelson, 2005). Farmer et al. (2018), for example, observed that all the innovations developed in the six case studies that they analysed were adaptations of current existing ideas and were generated based on participants’ experience and knowledge of local context. However, it is worth pointing out
the findings from Kickul et al. (2018) who showed that a high level of bricolage could hamper the development of innovations that attract non-traditional resources and that can be scaled to currently neglected markets. That is to say, the SE should use bricolage to produce SI, but should not be limited to it and should encourage radical SI (Kickul et al., 2018).

**Culture.** A proper environment for the creation of SI involves a process of co-building and sharing knowledge between all involved (internal and external) (Vezina et al., 2019), a willingness to improve social well-being that is greater than the fear of failure, strong levels of intrapreneurship and less dependence on a leader that only encourages innovation inwards (Berzin and Pitt-Catsouphes, 2015; Biggeri et al., 2017; Martins et al., 2020; Morais-da-Silva et al., 2016; Pasricha and Rao, 2018; Quandt et al., 2017). For example, when analysing the SI process in a large SE, Altuna et al., (2015) found that the ability to shape societal demand into a new product / service involves a decentralized process of product definition by the business unit responsible for innovation maintaining an ongoing dialogue with the corporate level.

The involvement of employees can increase their engagement and sense of belonging to the organization, promoting a culture that is open to new opportunities and innovations (Urban and Gaffurini, 2017). Similarly, the entrepreneurial passion motivates the collaborators to spend more energy in creative processes to solve social problems (Ko et al., 2019). By collaborating together, the knowledge created endogenously by employees contributes to the development of new knowledge which, in turn, allows social entrepreneurs to identify and explore new opportunities (Krejci and Sebestova, 2018; Mulyaningsih et al., 2016). Hence, Biggeri et al. (2017) recommend the establishment of physical and virtual spaces that promote dialogue and innovation. This participative culture should be maintained in the SI consolidation, focusing on improving flexibility, since a rigid organizational culture and centralized control are negatively associated with diffusion of SI (Voltan and De Fuentes, 2016).

Finally, according to Dufays (2019), team members seem further motivated to simultaneously embrace both the social and the commercial dimensions needed for implementation of SI when they have both a mutual interest at stake and a general interest (superimposition of the producer/investor role with the beneficiary role).

### 4.2.2 Managerial factors
Studies such as Chen et al. (2015) suggest that managerial ability is an essential component of corporate innovative success. Ruiz-Jiménez and Fuentes-Fuentes (2016) confirmed that management capabilities affect both product and process innovation positively. Based on findings of this systematic review we consolidate the managerial sub-factors into two categories: manager/innovator characteristics and management practices.

**Manager/innovator characteristics.** Studies suggested certain characteristics that are important for SI. For instance, it is argued that the social innovator should have social entrepreneurial passion (Ambati, 2019), social conscience with empathy and follow interdisciplinary approach for he/she to diagnose adequately the social needs and their potential solutions (Biggeri et al., 2017; Lettice and Parekh, 2010; Mulyaningsih et al., 2016; Slimane and Lamine, 2017). Another competence is technological knowledge for creating solutions (Ambati, 2019) or understanding that would help him/her to not only visualise the potential for innovative means to promote social well-being but also to manage its specificities (Chavez et al., 2017). Finally, it is expected that the social innovator acts as an ethical leader who promotes and motivates ethics in the organization, serving as a role model and transmitting standards and ethical values to the employees (Pasricha and Rao, 2018).

**Management practices.** Most of the studies reviewed proposed management practices that facilitate collaborative work. These practices provided multiple platforms for deliberation to create fertile ground for the recognition of a social opportunity (Vezina et al., 2019) and identification of users' latent needs, which are connected to cultural values and are harder to access (Baek et al., 2019). Some of these practices included: a) design thinking helps in supporting, accelerating and democratizing the innovations involving users and other actors in the conception and development of SI (Selloni and Corubolo, 2017); b) focus group contributes to ensure equality in the perception of the social problem and the choice of the solution to be developed (Mulyaningsih et al., 2014); c) agile method aids the division of the process into small cycles (iterations) where the next steps are defined based on current results, lessons learned and new ideas in a cooperative work between users involved and stakeholders (Castro-Spila et al., 2018); d) techniques that enable peripheral vision (Lettice and Parekh, 2010) and larger teams with higher cognitive heterogeneity (more interpretations of courses of action) (Dufays, 2019) to help identify opportunities from unexpected sources; e) risk management helps to identify the optimal level of risk versus type of innovation (Urban and Gaffurini, 2017); and f) SI evaluation considers the impact throughout the entire chain in order to guarantee that the proposed solution does not generate negative externalities ex ante / ex post the SE’s actions (Castro-Spila et al., 2018).
4.2.3 Contextual Factors

The contextual factors are crucial for SI as organisations are dynamical systems that import vitality and dynamism from their environments, that is, environmental changes drive organisational changes and innovation (Khosravi et al., 2019). This context includes the market dynamics; political support, as proposed by Damanpour and Schneider (2006); and the community where the SE is embedded. This was added because the SI is a creative and collective process (Castro-Arce et al., 2019) and its management requires iterative negotiations to “re-evaluate resolutions and outcomes for fit with the community and the continuous inclusion of shared knowledge, evolving perspectives and interactive experiences” (Dawson and Daniel, 2010, p. 17).

Market dynamics. The following drivers not only facilitate consolidation of the SI but are also valued by its users: a SI that is easy to use and maintain where the users can replicate it (Ahmed et al., 2018), the quality of goods and services being offered (Morais-da-Silva et al., 2016), the established reputation of the SE and the existence of knowledge platform in which experiences, ideas and products are shared (Ahmed et al., 2018; Westley et al., 2014). Additionally, adapting the innovation to the local context (preferences and standards) is frequently necessary to replicate SI in other regions (Morais-da-Silva et al., 2016; Rao-Nicholson et al., 2017) and the local community plays an instrumental role in how programs and services are adapted to fit local needs providing access to specialized expertise from outside the boundaries of the organization (Svensson et al., 2019).

Another recommendation, mainly in the scaling phase, is to encourage people or organizations to seek solutions to their private interests that, at the same time, serve the public’s well-being (Zainol et al., 2019). Some examples are the valuing of small producers due to growing demand for organic products (healthy lifestyles) (Zivojinovic et al., 2019), and addressing social challenges in the bottom of the community pyramid through the response to altruistic needs of customers at the top (De Silva et al., 2019).

Political support. The institutionalisation is a crucial factor on the likelihood of success of SI (Judit et al., 2016) since SI needs support from managers and/or policymakers to be implemented in a large scale (Farmer et al., 2018). Thus, it is more effective to connect the benefits of SI to the government platform to sustain changes promoted by SI (Farmer et al., 2018; Svensson et al., 2019). Hence, the ability to build strategic relationships with public policy makers is fundamental (Westley et al., 2014).

Community. The process of SI is based on working with the community, thinking of ‘others’, as well as collaboration (Maclean et al., 2013; Nicolopoulou et al., 2017). Bhatt and
Ahmad (2017), Castro-Spila et al. (2018), Farmer et al. (2018) and Vezina et al. (2019) suggest that the diagnostic phase of a SI process should be done jointly with the community (bottom-up and consultative process) to: develop innovations for low cost good and services that are technically feasible (Farmer et al., 2018); access financial resources, greater trust and cooperation (Bhatt and Ahmad, 2017) and legitimise the SI through its use and dissemination (Bhatt and Ahmad, 2017; Farmer et al., 2018; Rao-Nicholson et al., 2017). Note that trust and cooperation occurs after some time, based on SI’s results (Zivojinovic et al., 2019), and that legitimacy becomes increasingly difficult if there are irreconcilable differences in priorities (set of beliefs) between the community and the SE. Hence a prior alignment of interests and expectations is needed (Venugopal and Viswanathan, 2019). Venugopal and Viswanathan (2019) recommended that SEs identify and work with local leading communities because they are proactive gatekeepers who could allow or prevent entry of SE into their community.

Implementing SI requires institutional change in addition to strategic actions by social innovators. SE can facilitate political dialogue and make material, social, and cognitive resources available, but the direction, energy and pace of change have to be determined by the community because new values will coexist alongside existing ones and harmonizing them can be extremely difficult (Venugopal and Viswanathan, 2019). Thus in the scaling up phase and system change, the development of local abilities, empowerment of the participating actors, meeting the interests of all key-actors, and changing the socio-political arrangements, are useful strategies to change values, laws and BMs (Castro-Arce et al., 2019; Maclean et al., 2013). Mongelli and Rullani (2017) show that empowerment of actors outside the SE’s boundaries can promote the expected systematic change at the last stage of the SI process, spurring new economic activity in marginalised areas and generating virtuous circles between the economic and social parts of a SE.

4.3 Frequency of the different drivers of social innovation in social enterprises

‘Partnerships’ was proposed by 37% of papers as a key theme in generation of SI (Table 3). Some of the topics discussed included resource and capabilities mobilization, management of the partnerships in terms of differing cultures, approaches, importance of social capital, and types of partners.

| Table 3 |

Two other categories related to the organizational factor stand out: culture and knowledge management, were each were discussed in 18% of the studies analysed. This highlights the
importance of internal organisational antecedents to SI as well as the relevance of studies aimed at enhancing the SE's ability to innovate socially, gap already discussed by Phillips et al. (2015).

On the other hand, detailed technical aspects of SI management linked to managerial practices and decision-making in SE contexts were rarely addressed by the reviewed articles, where ‘Evaluation’ and ‘Risk Management’ were each discussed by only 3.7% of papers. Evaluation is a fertile field of study as it requires the development of innovative, flexible and creative approaches in order to help social innovators meet the challenges they face (Szijarto et al., 2018). Geobey et al. (2012) point out that although SI funding agents demand methodologies that balance the social risk and uncertainty in ways to attract capital allocation by different stakeholders, research in this field is still incipient.

5. Discussion and future research

Both concepts, SI and SE, are intertwined as many times parts of the SI process are often mixed up with the development of a SE. For example, when discussing mapping opportunities and business plan. As a result, SE is the place where SI happens, but can also be the result of a SI process.

Despite different names, there is a consensus around the phases of the SI process. Only a handful of articles discuss the system change stage and the current literature has not answered questions related to drivers that are vital in this phase. Future research should focus on the later stages of SI, which can demonstrate the challenges of diffusing SE.

Certain factors were identified in our study that influence the SI process in SEs. For instance, the role of the entrepreneur is essential in the first stage, as he/she is generally the initiator of the innovation process by expending efforts with the community (Dawson and Daniel, 2010; Slimane and Lamine, 2017; Tanimoto, 2012). Additionally, partnerships are extremely important for the development and scaling of SI, given that different types of partners are demanded throughout the process and there is no consensus in the literature about the ideal partner, but it is very important that they share the same values and motivation. In order for the SI to generate value beyond the niche where it was developed and is supported, it is necessary to have the support from managers and/or policymakers to be implemented on a large scale and be replicated (Farmer et al., 2018; Raynor, 2019). Thus the institutionalisation is a crucial factor on the likelihood of success of SI (Judit et al., 2016), more specifically on the later stages of SI, where the government plays a prominent role (Raynor, 2019).
Nevertheless, compared to the role of the entrepreneur and the partnerships, there is a lack of research on this subject calling for more research discussing institutional support to SI.

Overall, the paper provides an important contribution by proposing a taxonomy of the factors that influence the SI process in SEs. We categorize SI drivers into three categories (Figure 4): contextual, organizational and managerial. In organizational factors we emphasize the importance of: (i) establishing a BM that balances social demands, the core assets of the SE and the possibilities of income generation; (ii) partnerships with different types of partners and with prior negotiation of the potential values to be generated by the SI; (iii) adoption of adequate levels of bricolage and continuous learning; and (iv) participatory culture with intrapreneurship levels.

The management factors were divided into two sub-factors: (i) the characteristics of the entrepreneur / innovator, emphasizing nonconformity, peripheral vision and ethical leadership, and (ii) managerial practices, where those that facilitate collaboration, teamwork and the participation of all involved are best suited. We highlight the lack of approaches that support decision making, such as risk management, as minimising risks is also important to any organisation and, for the SE with extremely limited funds, it is essential. Due to the closer alignment between SI and technological innovation, the support from a more mature field with established theoretical tools can provide further insight into the processes of SI (Chalmers and Balan-Vnuk, 2013; Shaw and de Bruin, 2013).

Three main drivers were mapped in contextual factors: (i) the importance of community participation in all phases of the SI process, being a source of new ideas and knowledge and a channel for the dissemination of SI; (ii) the demand for innovations that consider local context and usability and (iii) the need for support from policy makers.

This taxonomy offers a good starting point for future empirical research. For instance, a quantitative study, using the model proposed here as a guide for developing hypothesis, can measure to what extent each driver influences SEs’ ability to innovate socially. The practices described here are situated in specific contexts, but a quantitative analysis could determine which drivers can be used in general settings and should be prioritised during the planning of public policies supporting and encouraging SI and training of entrepreneurs/social innovators, helping to define BM in SEs.

Delphi method is another pathway to empirically test the proposed framework. The potential for each driver to maximise SI can be analysed through a panel of experts, the collective experience of academics, social entrepreneurs, incubators, accelerators’ mentors and
similar organisations. Likewise, the quality of the framework can be improved based on expert consensus-based evidence.

5.1 Theoretical contributions

Research on SI has been criticized for being fragmented and non-cumulative (van der Have and Rubalcaba, 2016). To encourage better integration of knowledge and accumulation, and improve researchers’ ability to identify and formulate adequate conceptual building blocks, this study provides a systemic view of the management of SI, analysing several drivers and integrating them to a more widely accepted representation of the SI process. So far, in the literature, the drivers had been discussed individually, but according to Mongelli and Rullani (2017), the BM innovation is a multidimensional process and therefore it requires a more holistic approach.

Our paper provides a more stimulating contribution by identifying certain drivers that are unique to the SI practice, such as, a BM that balances social demands, the core assets of the SE and the possibilities of income generation; an innovator that has strong ethical and social values; and a unique context where political support and embeddedness in the local community are essential. Consequently, innovating in the context of SI is different in other types of organisation (non-profit organisations or profit-driven companies). Social innovators draw upon their various “diverse resources” in the process of innovation, as suggested by (Bridgstock et al., 2010), where networking and funding diversity, along with the capacity to conciliate different interests, were highlighted as characteristics that maximise innovative capacity.

5.2 Implications for practice

By gathering and organizing dispersed knowledge about the SI process in SEs, our framework can help the social entrepreneurs, policy makers and supporting organisations of SEs to direct their attention to appropriate drivers that can enhance the SE's ability to innovate socially. A systemic view of the management of SI is fundamental for organisations that aim to evaluate their strengths, weaknesses and opportunities in order to develop an effective strategy for innovation, increasing their ability to generate social value. For example, the ability to develop new solutions to social problems through high levels of intra-entrepreneurship and community participation may not lead to innovation unless there is also institutional entrepreneurship in
the consolidation stage. Likewise, cooperation and learning from accumulated knowledge from various partners may not lead to innovation if the SE is not prepared to adapt the SI and the BM to the new scalability contexts and consumer base in the stage of consolidation.

By proposing a visualisation model where the drivers are logically structured into a visual problem space, the framework shows the dynamic of the process, and how the role of practitioners change, according to the SI’s process stage. The enterprise and social entrepreneur start off as protagonists (Martins et al., 2020), giving room to institutional entrepreneurship in the following stages.

Furthermore, it is important for SI managers to develop the skills of: (i) mapping social needs and exploring possibilities for SI by considering different perspectives (approaches, sponsors or partners) in order to develop sustainable solution and options; (ii) connect previously unconnected parts of the market (Lettice and Parekh, 2010) and leverage SE’s ability to innovate socially through partners; and (iii) mobilize public policy makers and institutional partners to diffuse innovation in other contexts.

Finally, the SE must be structured to explore the various interactions with partners and the community, and internally, to awaken entrepreneurial passion (Ko et al., 2019), leveraging the lessons learned. The participatory management tools have a significant role to play in supporting SI. The framework presented here shows the role of the users/community; government; private companies; national and international partners; leader/manager and other SE collaborators, helping the social entrepreneur to determine which sources to look for, through the network, for an effective innovation process.

6. Conclusion and Limitations of the study

This study answers calls by Bulut et al. (2013); Phillips et al. (2015) and Slimane and Lamine, (2017) for studies that examine how SI can be encouraged and managed effectively in the SE. By investigating the drivers of SI in the context of SE, we structure dispersed knowledge into three main factors and a four-stage process.

Our review demonstrated that research regarding the relationship between those drivers of SI is scant and mostly based on case studies. The main contribution of the article was to improve understanding of how SI is created in the context of SEs, as only 17% of the reviewed articles have any mention of the SI process.
SI happens within a system of SI (community, institutions and government) in which SE plays a fundamental role initiating the process, articulating the various actors involved, and balancing social value generation and financial sustainability. To this end, it uses participatory management tools, organizational learning, partnership networks, adaptation of SI to the local context, and support from community and the government. However, search results are limited to data from 54 previous studies, so our references’ limitations may also apply to this study. The criteria for exclusion in the systematic review, the search for articles restricted to three databases (Web of Science, Scopus and EBSCO) and the exclusion of grey literature are all limiting factors of this study. Regarding grey literature, although this material can address the process of social innovation, we chose not to include them due to several challenges such as lack of consistent title and indexing information, potential variability among literature and unavailable abstracts documents and links after the initial search has taken place (Paez, 2017). Finally, despite the adoption of a rigid script for inclusion of articles, the final sample may contain some selection bias.
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Figure 1: Social innovation process

Phase 1
Mapping and development
- Step 1 – Social need diagnostics*
- Step 2 – development of a social innovation business model**
- Step 3 – Implementation in niche markets

Phase 2
Consolidation
- Expansion beyond local dimensions ***
  - New products, markets and business models
- Support from partners and policy makers

Phase 3
Scaling up
- Change in the social system

* Ability of Exploration => external knowledge X internal knowledge
** Experimentation and Connection ability => tacit knowledge for tacit
*** Ability of Expansion => internalization of knowledge - explicit to tacit

Source: Authors based on systematic literature review
**Figure 2:** Diagram for data extraction process

**Scopus**
(Total= 493)

- Restriction by exclusion criteria and quality criterion:
  1. Not written in English
  2. Not published in a peer-reviewed journal
  3. Is written as a book, book chapter or working paper
  (Total= 273)

**Web of Science**
(Total= 314)

- Restriction by exclusion criteria and quality criterion:
  1. Not written in English
  2. Not published in a peer-reviewed journal
  3. Is written as a book, book chapter or working paper
  (Total= 225)

**EBSCO**
(Total= 310)

- Restriction by exclusion criteria and quality criterion:
  1. Not written in English
  2. Not published in a peer-reviewed journal
  3. Is written as a book, book chapter or working paper
  (Total= 167)

- Removal of Duplicates
  (Total= 271)

- Evaluation of titles and abstracts (and the introduction in a few cases) according to inclusion criteria:
  Studies the process of social innovation (Explores method, model, tool or management approaches)
  (Total= 107)

- Evaluation of titles and abstracts (and the introduction in a few cases) according to inclusion criteria:
  Studies the context of social innovation in social enterprises
  (Total= 65)

- Additional analysis and exclusion due to:
  - Not available to the researchers (4)
  - Not peer-reviewed (incorrectly filtered) (6)
  - Incorrectly labelled as written in English when in fact it was Spanish (1)
  (Total= 54)
**Figure 3:** Frequency of the publications per year and type of article

![Bar Chart]

- Green: Conceptual
- Light Blue: Quantitative
- Yellow: Quali-quantitative
- Purple: Theorical
- Dark Blue: Qualitative
**Figure 4:** Drivers of Social Innovation in Social Enterprise emerging from the literature review

### Contextual factors
- **Market dynamics**
  - M. People or organizations pursuing private interests while serving the public good
  - D. Technology for easy use and maintenance
  - C. Quality of products or services
  - S. SI's success and established reputation of SE and partners
  - T. Tailor social innovation to the local context

- **Communities**
  - M. Local community context and members' experiences
  - D. Community participation (determining the direction and pace of change)
  - S. Empowerment of participating actors

- **Political support**
  - C. Support from managers and/or policy makers
  - S. Changes in socio-political arrangements
  - T. Resources, support and legitimation from the State

### Managerial factors
- **Manager / Innovator characteristics**
  - M. Nonconformity, critical thinking and empathy
  - D. Multi-disciplinary perspective
  - S. Previous experience with the business or the SI
  - C. High degree of managerial capabilities and competence in technology
  - B. Ethical leadership

- **Practices**
  - M. Focus Group Discussion
  - D. Peripheral vision
  - S. Risk management
  - C. Multiple sources of information and funding
  - B. Design thinking
  - A. Agile prototyping process
  - E. Participatory impact chain evaluation ex ante/ex post
  - L. Long-term evaluation with reflective and participatory methods

### Organizational factors
- **Business model**
  - M. Identifying, connecting and managing stakeholder relationships
  - D. Equilibrium between the triangle: Experience and strategic assets of the core firm, regional vulnerabilities and adequate demand for SI and knowledge about potential ST funders
  - S. Cooperation with multiple actors and open innovation
  - C. Multiple forms of funding
  - B. Reshaping the pattern preferences or engage a new ‘customer’ base
  - A. Adaptable to the new scalability target and systems
  - E. Development of local capabilities and working with local volunteers and organizations (social innovation eco-systems)

- **Partnerships**
  - M. Collaboration with multiple actors (volunteers, for profit or non-profit organizations and public agencies) that share the same motivation
  - D. Social capital (access resources)
  - S. Partnerships with private companies
  - C. Support of network or community of innovators
  - B. Collectively definition of the “social” component of SI and ex ante decision on how SI’s value will be shared
  - A. Institutional entrepreneurship
  - E. Foreign partners
  - D. Sense of shared property

- **Knowledge Management**
  - M. In-depth knowledge of the field
  - D. Combination of internal and external knowledge
  - S. Appropriate level of bricolage
  - C. E-learning access to ICT
  - B. Organizational learning, detachment from the outdated knowledge and creating new knowledge from lessons learned

- **Culture**
  - Co. Strong entrepreneurship level and entrepreneurial passion in the workplace
  - D. Participatory, that values improvement and collaboration
  - S. Physical and virtual spaces for dialogue and innovation
  - C. Flexibility organizational culture and less centralized control
**Table 1:** Comparison of previous studies of SI process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Empirical evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vezina et al. (2019)</td>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td>Translate social demand into a product/service that is compatible with its</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seizing</td>
<td>knowhow. New knowledge should be integrated with the organisation’s mission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconfiguring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer et al. (2018)</td>
<td>Growing ideas</td>
<td>Adaptations of existing ideas; Partnerships; SI aligned with political points</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>of view.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castro-Spila et al. (2018)</td>
<td>Exploration skills</td>
<td>SI: ability to deal with a threat (socioeconomic vulnerability); Performance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimentation</td>
<td>indicators: reduction in threat and ability to transfer SI to other vulnerable groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exploitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slimane and Lamine (2017)</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>SI motivation through the marketplace</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Understanding causes of social problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Model (BM)</td>
<td>BM (social needs/viability balance)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating an alliance strategy</td>
<td>Cross-sector partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senent-Bailach and Rey-Marti (2017)</td>
<td>Understanding problems/Proposal Development Prototyping Implementation Diffusion Systemic change</td>
<td>Proposal selection based on consensus and resources available; Prototype to implement improvements; SI dissemination through training.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhatt and Ahmad (2017)</td>
<td>Emergence of social idea Development</td>
<td>Social needs as opportunities to create a SE; Economic and social values generation; Social capital as source of resources.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scaling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morais-da-Silva et al. (2016)</td>
<td>Diagnostic</td>
<td>Leadership ability, experience in SE and political skill, less dependence on the leader; SE’s credibility and reputation, participatory culture; Governmental support, partnerships and community involvement.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulyaningsih et al. (2014)</td>
<td>Finding social problem</td>
<td>Combination of external knowledge and organisational knowledge lessons learned become source for future SIs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative idea generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feasibility/adjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutionalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanimoto (2012)</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Social need as an opportunity; Collaborative relationship; Complementary innovations to extend the reach of core innovation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in the system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Inclusion criteria for selection of articles that addressed social innovation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>The innovations described / analysed in the article / are “new ideas (products, services and models) that simultaneously meet social needs and create new social relationships or collaborations” (Murray et al., 2010, p. 3)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Is the focus of paper the process of development of social innovation and how is shaped by external and contextual factors (see structuralist perspective in (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014)?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Presents information about business model, management practices (tools), organizational culture, leadership and other management behaviours related to SI?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 3: Key management practices and frequency of papers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>No. of articles</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
<th>Representative Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisational (O), Managerial (M), Contextual (C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(O) Partnerships</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Previous negotiation about sharing future SI’s benefits; Private companies and foreign partners; Open innovation; Social capital.</td>
<td>(Bhatt and Ahmad, 2017; Biggeri et al., 2017; Ko et al., 2019; Phillips et al., 2017; Svensson and Hambrick, 2019; Voltan and De Fuentes, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(O) Culture</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Strong entrepreneur and intrapreneurship levels; Participatory culture; Entrepreneurial passion.</td>
<td>(Berzin and Pitt-Catsouphes, 2015; Biggeri et al., 2017; Mulyaningish et al., 2016; Pasricha and Rao, 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(O) Knowledge Management</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>External and organizational knowledge combination; E-learning; Bricolage; Organizational learning.</td>
<td>(Kickul et al., 2018; Mulyaningish et al., 2016; Szijarto et al., 2018; Voltan and De Fuentes, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Local problems/community participation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Members’ experiences and context; In-depth knowledge of the field; Development of local capabilities.</td>
<td>(Bhatt and Ahmad, 2017; Farmer et al., 2018; Venugopal and Viswanathan, 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(O) Business model</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Strategic assets of the core firm; SI’s and SE’s reputation; Diversity of funding; Adaptation to the new scalability.</td>
<td>(Morais-da-Silva et al., 2016; Slimane and Lamine, 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M) Characteristics of innovator and Leader’s skills</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Openness and peripheral vision; Multi-disciplinary perspective; Nonconformity and critical thinking; Previous experience.</td>
<td>(Chavez et al., 2017; Lettice and Parekh, 2010; Pasricha and Rao, 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Market dynamics (SI usability - characteristics)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Quality of products; easy use and maintenance; SI’s tailoring.</td>
<td>(Ahmed et al., 2018; Morais-da-Silva et al., 2016; Rao-Nicholson et al., 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M) Evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Impact analysis; participatory methods of evaluation.</td>
<td>(Castro-Spila et al., 2018; Szijarto et al., 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M) Risk Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Effective supply and demand; Risk taking versus innovativeness.</td>
<td>(Svensson and Hambrick, 2019; Urban and Gaffurini, 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Theme</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting references</td>
<td>(R1) Include: Rey-García, M., Calvo, N., &amp; Mato-Santiso, V. (2019). Collective social enterprises for social innovation: Understanding the potential and limitations of cross-sector partnerships in the field of work integration. Management Decision, 57(6), 1415–1440. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-01-2017-0091">https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-01-2017-0091</a></td>
<td>Rey-Garcia et al. (2019) is on the initial list of mapped articles but did not meet the Q2 and Q3 inclusion criteria presented on table 2. Having reviewed Mongelli and Rullani (2017), we acknowledge the potential contribution of the paper to help us understand further the findings of our review. For this reason, we have included this paper in the review and further reference to it is provided on pages 14 and 17.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mongelli, L., &amp; Rullani, F. (2017). Inequality and marginalisation: social innovation, social entrepreneurship and business model innovation. Industry &amp; Innovation, 24(5), 446–467. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/13662716.2017.1295365">https://doi.org/10.1080/13662716.2017.1295365</a></td>
<td>A supporting reference was included as a note according to citation instructions (roman numeral within square brackets within text followed by the full URL address at the end of the paper).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(R2) on page 2, we suggest the addition of some references for the written sentence “the European Union holds SI as one of their innovation policies” (Source??)</td>
<td>A supporting reference was included on page 11 (Kickul et al., 2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(R2) on page 11, we suggest the addition of some reference to the written sentence “That is to say, the SE should use bricolage to produce SI, but should not be limited to it and should encourage radical SI.”</td>
<td>A supporting reference was included on page 11 (Kickul et al., 2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>(R1) I would request the authors to do one more round of thorough literature search to ensure that they have not excluded some relevant articles published in leading journals.</td>
<td>A new search was conducted using the search strategy presented in the paper and only 6 papers were identified for a total of 54 articles in the review. These were included as supporting references in the paper on pages 2,8-14 and 18. As a result of this change, Figures 2,3 and 4, and Table 3 were modified, and the text changed accordingly. The date for the search was changed accordingly in page 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(R1) The quality of the paper will definitely improve if some kind of meta-analyses are conducted to arrive at some conclusive findings. However it depends upon whether the authors have expertise in conducting such analyses and also the availability of relevant data in the papers included in the systematic literature.</td>
<td>We acknowledge the potential insights that can be obtained with a meta-analysis, however, the papers included in the systemic review are heterogenous. Thus, we decided to summarise the data narratively rather than attempt a statistical summary (meta-analysis), as suggested by Reviewer 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework / contribution</td>
<td>(R1) I would request the authors to explain how the framework they have developed based on their literature review (Figure 4) could be tested empirically. The contribution of this study is this framework.</td>
<td>Further information on how the framework can be tested empirically is included on pages 16 and 17 (quantitative approach and Delphi method).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(R1) The authors should explain how this framework makes an effective contribution to the literature and how this helps in further theory development. I would also request the authors to discuss the implications for practice in a more detailed manner.</td>
<td>A subsection was created on page 17 named: ‘theoretical contributions’, which presents explicitly the two main theoretical contributions of our paper and the framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(R2) We suggest the addition of other theoretical and practical implications. The efforts on this systematic review should be translated into more explicit implications. Section 5.1 (Managerial implications), was changed to ‘Implications for practice’ on page 17 and updated to include further implications for practice from the paper.

(R1) The authors have not provided the figure numbers and titles for Figure 1 presented in page 23 and for Figure 4 presented in page 26. Figure 3 contains a table and a bar chart. The table and the chart should be presented separately with different identifiers. The quality of presentation of the tables should be improved. For example Table 1, which would easily fit into one page, has been presented in two pages.

Figure 1 and Figure 4 were edited to fit in one page and a title was added. The table (Figure 3) was prepared with the sole purpose of presenting the information that helped to create Figure 3. We consider that this information is redundant and decided to delete it from the revised version of the paper.

(R2) on page 1, please delete “literature review” after the abstract.
- Add a title to figure 1, on page 23.
- please check for the other tables and figures.
- on page 26, the figure is with unclear title.

This was corrected and highlighted in the text. Title of figure on page 26 was changed to “Figure 3: Frequency of the publications per year and type of article”

(R2) There is a table on page 25 without title and number.

This table was prepared with the sole purpose of presenting the information that helped to create Figure 3. We consider that this information is redundant and decided to delete it from the revised version of the paper.

References format

(R2) (47 articles were selected in our systematic review): can the authors identify them in the proposed references’ list by adding a star symbol behind them?

An asterisk was added to the references in the reference list that were included in the systemic review

(R2) Missing references cited in the text but not in the references’ List: on page 3: Phillips et al., 2008, p. 36; Borzaga and Bodini (2014); Vezina et al., 2019; Cajaiba-Santana, (2014).


All the references were revised. Yun et al., (2017) was cited in the text on page 10.

(R2) on page 6, line 5, edit “datas” to “data”; line 33, edit “(Murray et al., 2010)” to “Murray et al. (2010).”

This was corrected on page 6.

(R2) Remarks regarding the norms used in the references’ list: the authors seem not to respect the instructions for the authors for the JSBED when writing the references (APA; many capital letters....)

All the references were revised and corrected to follow the JSBED reference format

(R2) several references inserted in the references’ list were duplicated: Ko et al., (2019); Mulyaningsih, H.D., Yudoko, G., Rudito, B., 2014; Nandan, M., London, M., Bent-Goodey, T., 2015; Slimane & Lamine, 2017;

All the references were revised and corrected