

CALL FOR PAPERS: DEADLINE 1st June 2014

6th International Social innovation Research Conference 2014

The University of Northampton 1-4th Sept 2014

Conference host: Tim Curtis, tim.curtis@northampton.ac.uk

The 6th International Social Innovation Research Conference (ISIRC) is an open conference that brings together scholars from around the globe to discuss the role of innovation in social businesses, social movements, not-for-profits, state actors, and the broader social economy.

To celebrate the designation of the University of Northampton as the UK's first AshokaU Changemaker Campus dedicated to large scale social innovation, this year's ISIRC is hosted in the county of squires and spires, the home of Princess Diana's family and the county with the most stately homes and ancient churches. In the midst of tradition, the University is breaking the mold and reconfiguring its entire way of 'being a University', based on social innovation.

In partnership with Ashoka UK, AshokaU, the Skoll Centre for Social Entrepreneurship at the University of Oxford (2013 host), University of York (2015 host).

KEYNOTE SPEAKERS:

Professor Alex Nicholls, University of Oxford

Marina Kim, co-founder AshokaU

Pre-registration available at <http://isirc14.eventbrite.co.uk>

CALL FOR PAPERS

Please select a stream to submit a paper or poster to and contact one of the team for details

Stream title	Stream team	
1. Health & Wellbeing	Michael Roy , Glasgow Caledonian University michael.roy@gcu.ac.uk Josephine Barraket , Queensland	Health inequalities in most 'advanced' economies have been progressively widening since the 1970s. More recently, groups within civil society have been encouraged to fill gaps in services caused by the retreat of the state in the context of austerity (viz. The Big Society).

	<p>University of Technology jo.barraket@qut.edu.au</p>	<p>Substantial reform of the health service in England has seen social enterprises being encouraged to enter quasi-markets for local healthcare provision.</p> <p>At the same time, social innovation has been championed as a potential means of addressing key social determinants of health, such as social exclusion.</p> <p>We welcome papers that explore innovative ‘upstream’ approaches to addressing health inequalities, and also innovative responses that acknowledge the limits of the state, and big business, to address specific health challenges.</p> <p>We also welcome papers that examine social innovation in healthcare, both in so called ‘developed’ and ‘developing’ economies.</p> <p>Theoretical and empirical papers that demonstrate the role of social innovation and social enterprise in generating health and well-being, addressing health inequalities and/or acting upon the social determinants of health are especially encouraged. We are particularly interested in papers that increase our understanding of the causal pathways and mechanisms of action involved.</p>
<p>2. Regional and geographical aspects</p>	<p>Sarah-Anne Munoz, University of the Highlands and island sarah-anne.munoz@uhi.ac.uk Micaela Mazzei, Durham University micaela.mazzei@durham.ac.uk</p>	<p>This session will explore the role of space and place in the development and practice of social innovation. We welcome papers that explore the contextual factors that influence social innovation – from the local to the global level. Presentations could explore, for example, how local community context influences the development of social innovation or the role of regional economies and support structures. We are interested in spatial variations, e.g. between regions or countries, and the drivers and impacts of these. Therefore, papers are welcomed that consider the geography of social innovation; the place-based nature of social innovation and the spatiality of its impact.</p>
<p>3. Growing and scaling</p>	<p>Fergus Lyon, Middlesex University f.lyon@mdx.ac.uk Georg Mildenberger, CSI, Heidelberg georg.mildenberger@csi.uni-heidelberg.de</p>	<p>While there are many examples of social innovations, a challenge remains finding ways of scaling their impact. This stream will examine the range of potential approaches to growth. But there is an open question. Does scaling a social innovation mean growth of the organisation that promotes it? In the latter case this may begin through internal changes aimed at maximising the social impact and finding ways of demonstrating this to others (Paton, 2003; Nicholls, 2009).</p> <p>But social innovations can also spread in other ways that are not fully understood either (Davies and Simon, 2013). Scaling can also come about through external developments beyond the confines of the organisation (Lyon and Fernandez, 2012). Sharir and Lerner (2005) examine the types of alliances needed to get resources and political support, others examine the potential of social franchising (Bradach, 2003; Dees et al., 2002, Johnson et al.,</p>

		<p>2007; Tracey and Jarvis, 2007). Research has examined how scaling up requires different resources and capabilities (Bloom and Smith, 2010) that are drawn on at different times (Uvin et al. 2000; Weber, Kröger, and Lambrich, 2012). There is also a growing discussion concerning the types of institutional contexts that might provide fertile grounds for growth, and the institutional contexts that might be hampering development (Defourny and Nyssens, 2010)</p> <p>Since social ventures have the combined objectives of both social value and financial sustainability, the growth of turn-over may be only one element of growth (Vickers and Lyon, 2013). Increasingly social ventures are putting greater energy into measuring their social and environmental performance as well as the financial performance, although many consider the challenges of social reporting to be considerable (Mair and Marti, 2006).</p> <p>We welcome papers on any element of scaling and growing but particularly on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approaches to scaling and growing • Resources and capabilities required for growing • The sources of income and finance required for growth • The skills and staffing needed for growth • Balancing social and financial objectives in growing organisations • Measuring growth and scaling of social impact • Managing shrinking organisations • The institutional contexts that support growth and scaling • Balancing collaboration and competition
4. Social Investment	<p>Alex Nicholls, The University of Oxford, Marianosa Scarlata, University of Surrey, m.scarlata@surrey.ac.uk Rob Paton, the Open University, rob.paton@open.ac.uk</p>	<p>As with any organization, social enterprises need access to resources to start up, grow and scale their impact. Over the past 10 years a vibrant new ecosystem of finance has emerged to provide these resources –social impact investment. This new ‘market’ has attracted considerable political attention across the world - notably following the G8 Social Investment Forum in June of 2013 – and is growing fast. The market is estimated as having the potential to reach over \$1 trillion in assets under management globally. However, this new type of finance is yet to be fully institutionalized and many challenges and questions remain concerning its future. This stream invites research on any aspect of social impact investment ranging from innovations in philanthropy (for example, Venture Philanthropy or Mission Related Investment) and state spending (for example, Social Impact Bonds) to new market opportunities for established capital markets (such as micro-finance). Key questions include:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • what are the key differences between conventional finance and ‘social’ finance; who are the social investors and why do they invest; • how can the performance of social impact investment be calculated and modeled; what is the role of government policy and regulation in term of shaping this emergent market; • what instruments and models will best serve the future growth of social impact investment? <p>Papers may use any of several theoretical approaches, but contributions based on financial economics of the sociology of markets will be particularly welcome.</p>
5. Politics and Ethics	<p>Pascal Dey, the University of St Gallen, pascal.dey@unisg.ch Florentine Maier, Vienna University, florentine.maier@wu-wien.ac.at Simon Teasdale, Glasgow Caledonian University, simon.teasdale@gcu.ac.uk</p>	<p>Unlike the term ‘enterprise’ which since the industrial phase primarily meant a capitalist organization with economical finalities (Berardi, 2009), social entrepreneurship and social innovation have been introduced as something infinitely more emancipatory. What is critically at stake in these terms is nothing less than the imagination of an alternative to the capitalist economy (Shaw & de Bruin, 2013); an alternative that places democracy, solidarity and equality at the heart of the debate. And yet, social entrepreneurship and social innovation – due to their overly instrumental usages in social policies, academic research and popular culture at large – today are often nothing more than a cliché of their initial promise. To both challenge and move beyond this cliché, our stream seeks to animate contributions that reflect on social entrepreneurship and social innovation from the vantage point of politics and ethics. Although notable research on the politics (e.g. Goss et al., 2011) and ethics (e.g. Zahra et al., 2009) of social entrepreneurship and social innovation does exist, we are of the conviction that an intensification of such engagements – in qualitative as well as quantitative terms – has never been more needed than today.</p> <p>We thereby invite contributions which interpret politics and ethics in the broadest sense possible. Without trying to be conclusive with regard to possible topics and foci, we are interested in contributions which inquire about social entrepreneurship and social innovation with regard to their usage in formal politics (e.g. policies and government programs), where they are scripted in line with sectional interests and politically conditioned goals. We are also interested in studies on the political economy of social entrepreneurship and social innovation, which bring to light how social entrepreneurship and social innovation influence and constitute the production, distribution and consumption of ideas and resources, thus participating in the production and alteration of particular realities. Further,</p>

		<p>as social entrepreneurship and social innovation are often reflected in purely functionalist terms, we welcome approaches which remind us that these phenomena are not merely pragmatic, non-ideological means for solving today's pressing problems, but inherently political forces which – at times obliquely and in others more manifestly – provoke, disrupt and even destroy established values, practices, cognitive schemas and the status quo quite generally. As to ethics, we invite contributions that reflect about social entrepreneurship and social innovation from the vantage point of ethical virtues, teleologies, dilemmas and conundrums, as well as moral principles and ideals such as liberty, cosmopolitanism, emancipation or freedom. While interested quite generally in contributions that make productive use of the rich heritage of Greek and German ethical philosophies, we are particularly keen to receive contributions that grapple with newer (or still marginal) developments in ethics as typified by, for instance, Badiou's (2011) ethics of truth, Dussel's (2008) philosophy of liberation or Soja's (2010) theory of spatial justice, to name but a few.</p> <p>References</p> <p>Badiou, A. (2011). <i>Second manifesto for philosophy</i>. Malden, MA: Polity.</p> <p>Berardi, F. (2009). <i>The soul at work: From alienation to autonomy</i>. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).</p> <p>Dussel, E. (2010). <i>Politics of liberation: A critical global history</i>. Canterbury: SCM Press.</p> <p>Goss, D., Jones, R., Betta, M. & Latham, J. (2011). Power as practice: A Micro-sociological analysis of the dynamics of emancipatory entrepreneurship. <i>Organization Studies</i>, 32: 211-229.</p> <p>Jones, C. & Murtola, A-M. (2012). Entrepreneurship, crisis, critique. In D Hjorth (ed). <i>Handbook of organizational entrepreneurship</i>. Edward Elgar: Cheltenham, UK.</p> <p>Shaw, E. & de Bruin, A. (2013). Reconsidering capitalism: The promise of social innovation and social entrepreneurship? <i>International Small Business Journal</i>, 31, 737-746.</p> <p>Soja, E.W. (2010). <i>Seeking spatial justice</i>. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.</p> <p>Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Newbaum, D. O., & Shulman, J. M. (2009). A typology of social enterprise: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges. <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i>, 24, 519-532.</p>
<p>6. Hybridity, governance and organising SI</p>	<p>Bob Doherty, The University of York bob.doherty@york.ac.uk Roger Spear Sophie Bacq Northeastern</p>	<p>Doherty, Haugh and Lyon (2013) assessed the impact of hybridity on the management of the Social Enterprise mission, financial resource acquisition and human resource mobilization, and presented a new framework for understanding the tensions and trade-offs resulting from hybridity. By examining the influence of dual mission and conflicting institutional logics</p>

	<p>University s.bacq@neu.edu Julia Battilana, Harvard Business School jbattilana@hbs.edu</p>	<p>on Social Enterprise management both this said paper and this conference stream calls for papers on:</p> <p>To what extent have different institutional frameworks and contexts supported or discouraged the establishment of hybrid organizations?</p> <p>How do hybrid organizations successfully pursue conflicting objectives and secure competitive advantage?</p> <p>How do board members, managers, employees and volunteers of hybrid organizations respond to the tensions inherent in the contrasting value systems of private, public and other non-profit distributing organizations?</p> <p>How are the resource requirements of hybrid organizations satisfied, and to what extent does hybridity influence innovative resource exploitation?</p>
<p>7. Science, Technology and Creativity</p>	<p>Bert-ola Bergstrand University of Gothenburg ola.bergstrand@handels.gu.se Gordon Shockley Arizona State University Gordon.Shockley@asu.edu</p>	<p>The Science, Technology, and Creativity stream bridges C.P. Snow’s “two cultures” of literary intellectuals and natural scientists with respect to social innovation. Snow writes in The Two Cultures (1959): “The clashing point of two subjects, two disciplines, two cultures—of two galaxies, so far as that goes—ought to produce creative chances” (Snow, 1959, p. 16). We invite papers that obviously or subtly find “creative chances” relating science, technology, or the arts and humanities to social innovation, social entrepreneurship, or social enterprise. For example, how does...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • science inform social innovation? • technology extend social enterprise? • the arts illuminate social entrepreneurship?
<p>8. Social innovation and sustainability</p>	<p>Rafael Ziegler, Getidos Rafael.Ziegler@web.de Ankur Sarin., Indian Institute of Management asarin@iimahd.ernet.in</p>	<p>This stream invites papers on social innovators, innovation and innovation processes in the global South and North, as well as conceptual papers around these themes. We are keen to encourage explorations seeking to understand these activities as socially located, in the pursuit of social justice and sustainable societies. The focus is on issues of equity, flourishing and marginalization around social innovation, especially but not limited to the use of natural resources in social innovation processes.</p> <p>The nature of questions that the stream seeks to interrogate include: How are we to conceptualize the dimension of sustainability in social innovation, and the socio-ecological dynamics that some social innovators seek to address in contexts of poverty (f. ex. “environmentalism of the poor”), of affluence (for ex. “new models of wealth”) as well as the interlinkages of poverty and affluence? How do processes that recognize and legitimize social innovations engender sustainable futures? Are the opportunities created by social</p>

		<p>innovation widely and equitably shared? In what manner do they enhance the sense of a shared future? Are there specific types or models of social innovation in relation to sustainability? What is the existing evidence (cases, surveys, literature reviews) around the world? What are the major questions for further research as well as for policy?</p>
<p>9. Social exclusion and employability</p>	<p>Simone Baglioni Glasgow Caledonian University simone.baglioni@gcu.ac.uk Thomas Montgomery Glasgow Caledonian University Thomas.Montgomery@gcu.ac.uk</p>	<p>Among the policy areas where social innovation is called upon to intervene are social exclusion and employment. Previous and existing policy responses (e.g. integration or inclusion policies as well as activation policies) do not seem capable of providing viable social inclusion and employment opportunities to meet the effects of the economic crisis in European labour markets and their impact on more general social inclusion dynamics. Innovative solutions, and in particular social innovations, are considered to have further untapped potential in, on the one hand, job creation, and on the other hand, in keeping potentially excluded groups such as the young unemployed, migrants or disabled people embedded within society. This panel invites papers investigating how far social innovation is capable of providing solutions to social exclusion and employment issues. In particular, we would be interested in papers discussing how social innovation is likely to (a) provide further opportunities for employment, (b) rebalance employee/employer relations, (c) contribute to reducing inequality in job access amongst poorly qualified or unskilled workers, migrants and disabled people and as such, how (d) social innovation is capable of contrasting current forms and dynamics of social exclusion.</p>
<p>10. Social innovation, pedagogy and education</p>	<p>Bethany Alden Rivers, The University of Northampton, Bethany.Alden@northampton.ac.uk Bart Rienties, The Open University Bart.Rienties@open.ac.uk Daisy Mwanza-Simwami, The Open University Daisy.Mwanza-Simwami@open.ac.uk</p>	<p>Education, at any level of learning, plays a fundamental role in social development. Arguably, the rich discourse around social innovation, social enterprise, and more generally—making a positive social impact—is inextricably woven into a wider discussion of the role of education in society. Recognising this connection between social innovation and education raises several important questions as we purposefully evolve towards a more enlightened society.</p> <p>Exactly how do education providers develop students’ capacities for social innovation? How can education providers become catalysts for making a positive social impact in their local and global communities? What responsibility do educators have towards this aim? What role do other stakeholders play in promoting students’ skills and orientations to social innovation (students, parents, carers)?</p> <p>This conference stream welcomes proposals for papers and posters that broadly address the following aspects of social innovation, pedagogy and education.</p>

		<p>1. Pedagogy for social innovation</p> <p>Developing one’s capacity for engaging in social innovation involves the development of a multitude of skills, behaviours and attributes. What are these skills and how are learning opportunities designed to specifically develop these abilities? Importantly, how are the values, conceptions and dispositions of learners (and teachers) addressed within the learning design, as these surely influence individual orientations towards the subject of social innovation (<i>cf.</i> Svensson, 1977)?</p> <p>Learning outcomes, assessment and feedback are the building blocks of learning design. How are these used to contribute to the student experience? What existing pedagogical models can be used to help us? Probst et al.’s (2013) pedagogy for intrapreneurship, Jones and Iredale’s (2010) pedagogy for enterprise education and Heriot et al.’s (2008) approach to an active learning pedagogy are all examples of such models. The open question is whether we need a new pedagogical model for social innovation. What would such a model look like? Who are the stakeholders involved in facilitating such a model?</p> <p>2. Education providers as catalysts for positive social impact</p> <p>School, colleges and higher education institutions are important social organisations. The strength of these communities to extend their reach into the local and global communities raises the question of how can these organisations be catalysts for social change. The obvious answer is: they already are. How can we highlight and share this work? What can we learn from these outreach experiences? What models can we use for reflexive organisational learning so that the bridges between educational institutions and community partners are continually developed? How are other members of this community—students, parents, carers, SMEs influential in nurturing this link?</p> <p>3. Responsibilities of educators towards social innovation</p> <p>A critical view of the link between education and social innovation begs the question of whether it is truly a responsibility of educators to work towards this aim. And, if so, where does that responsibility begin and end? How does technology mediate</p>
--	--	--

learning in socio-cultural contexts in line with expansive learning theories around adult learning (cf. Vygotsky, 1978; Leont'ev (1978) and Engeström (1978)? Ethically speaking, are educators responsible for measuring the social impact of their efforts? How can educators safeguard learners from the practical perils of trying to make a positive social impact? What examples do we have to learn and grow from?

References

Engeström, Y. (1987). Learning by expanding: An activity theoretical approach to developmental research. Helsinki, Finland: Orienta Konsultit.

Heriot, K. C., Cook, R., Jones, R. C., Simpson, L. (2008). The use of student consulting projects as an active learning pedagogy: a case study in a production/operations management course. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*. 6(2), 463-481.

Jones, B. and Iredale, N. (2010). Enterprise education as pedagogy. *Education and Training*. 52(1), 7-19.

Leontiev, A. N. (1978). Activity, consciousness, and personality. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. (Original work published 1975)

Probst, H., Eddy, A., Eddy, D. and Cummings, J. (2013). 2 INSPIRE: increasing intrapreneurial skills through pedagogy. *HSCE* 2(1).

Svensson, L. (1977). On qualitative differences in learning: III. Study skill and learning. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. 47, 233-43.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). Mind and society: The development of higher mental processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

EMAIL [Bethany Alden Rivers](mailto:Bethany.Alden.Rivers) to submit your paper or proposal for poster by 1 June 2014.

Presentations/Abstract Types

Your presentation should describe the purpose, methods, and conclusions of your research. No one may submit or take part in more than one presentation. Presenters may give one of the following presentations:

Paper Presentation

Each presenter is allowed 20 minutes to present and discuss a paper.

Illustrated Paper

A short, three- to five-minute, oral summary of problem, data, method, and findings presented in poster format, followed by a one-on-one or small group discussion at the poster

Poster Presentation

Sessions consist of posters displayed for informal browsing with opportunities for individual discussion with authors. This format is best suited for material that can easily be communicated visually.