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ABSTRACT

This research intends to gain deeper insight into the social innovation processes within public and private organizations. The purpose of the study will be to determine if public and private organizations are influenced more by internal organizational factors or external organizational factors. Using Roger’s diffusion theory, Mohr’s internal determinants and Berry and Berry’s unified theory as a foundation, this research will endeavor to prove hypotheses which suggest that private organizations are influenced more by internal organizational factors and public organizations are influenced more by external organizational factors although not exclusively.

The research method for this study will involve a mixed methods approach. A survey of innovation champions will be implemented online followed by a qualitative interview of a subset of those respondents. In addition to the research specific to internal and external organizational factors, this study will also seek to assess the importance of the use of innovation champions during the social innovation process. Social innovation is a new concept in the realm of innovation. This research will offer much needed insight into a process that is new and evolving.
Chapter 1: Introduction

In this new era of social responsibility, organizations are no longer being measured solely by traditional indicators of success such as profits, dividends and jobs created. Corporate scandals of the last few decades and the economic downturn have contributed to a trend where there is less public trust in corporations and large organizations (Ellis, 2011; Phillips, Deiglmeier & Miller, 2008). For these reasons, short-term shareholder value is no longer enough to satisfy the public’s needs and the rules of how to stay in business are changing. Success in the global economy is determined by a firms’ ability to provide answers to changing views, needs and structures (Autant-Bernard, 2010). Companies are responding to this challenge with attempts to redesign their business models in order to incorporate responsible and sustainable business actions (Boons, 2012; Westley, Banerjee, Galaz, der Leeuw, Folke, 2011). A diverse range of companies are now revitalizing their business models by putting innovation and sustainability at the core of their business thinking (Ellis, 2011).

There are now new measures of social worth that are equally as important and which include the organization’s relationships with its employees, its communities, its customers and the physical environment (Valentino, 2006). There is a strong belief that leading global organizations of the future will be those that provide goods and services and reach new customers in ways that address the world’s major challenges – including poverty, climate change, resource depletion, globalization, and demographic shifts (Ellis, 2011). Large scale changes that are durable enough to withstand the test of time must focus on new ways of thinking, new processes for action and decision making, new designs for behavior and new social programs for greater durability and impact (Datta, 2011; Westley et al., 2011). The key to the
development of successful sustainability initiatives is promoting policy and legal conditions that promote social innovations (Phills, et al., 2008; Westley et al., 2011).

The ultimate objective in social innovation is developing and attaining sustainable development goals which are initiatives that target an organization’s ability to address social needs without negatively impacting its environment today or in the future (Mulgan, 2006). This new way of thinking has led to an understanding that organizations not only have an obligation to be socially responsible; but, they also have an obligation to generate transformative new ideas in the realm of cultural and social well-being (Phills, et al., 2008). Social innovations can be defined as innovative solutions to immediate social problems that can mobilize ideas, capacities, resources and social arrangements required for sustainable social transformations (Alvord, Brown & Christine, 2004, Westley et al., 2011). Scientists concerned about the future of the planet have pointed to the urgent need for sustainability transitions (Clark, 2001). They recognize that these types of transitions may require shifts in patterns of social behavior, governance and management regimes in order to receive greater resilience and sustainability with regard to innovation (Westley et al., 2011). An example of creative social innovation is the Aravind Eye Hospital in India which provides eye services and cataract surgery for the poor at a fraction of the cost for these services in developed countries. The hospital’s socially innovative cost structure allows the organization to subsidize these services from fees given by full fee paying patients and other donations (Datta, 2011). Unlike corporate social responsibility, which has become a normalized phrase, corporate social innovation denotes a process that not is not merely reactive; but, instead is a fully active, strategic and an integral component of how the most socially responsible organizations conduct their business (Mulgan, 2006). These types of innovations essentially change the way business is conducted in a socially beneficial way. Once
these concepts are applied to other organizations or diffused into other sectors, a sustainable concept has been developed which has the potential to transform a particular sector of society (Boons, 2012).

Around the world there is increased awareness of the potential to harness the core competencies, assets and resources of organizations in hopes of finding new solutions to complex social and environmental problems (Hart, 1997). Some of the world’s leading organizations like, GE, Method, Starbucks, HP and Dell have created programs which have allowed them to advance in the social innovation arena. These companies have recognized that by conducting innovation for the public good (social innovation) they can manage risks, gain competitive advantage and enhance their reputation and stakeholder relationships all while helping to solve complex social and environmental problems (Boons, 2012; Nelson, 2006). In the social responsibility context, organizations are seeking to ensure that their businesses do not create or exacerbate social and environmental problems (Boons, 2012). From a social innovation perspective, other organizations are creating new value by developing products, services, and business models that meet social and environmental needs while generating a profit at the same time (Nelson, 2006). Effective and successful social innovation can lead to greater levels of sustainability, an ever important concept in our growing socially responsible society. Social innovation is the best construct for understanding and producing lasting social change (Mulgan, 2006; Phillips, et al., 2008).

In periods of economic distress and political change and uncertainty, where organizational budgets are tight and community and social needs are high, the general public looks to organizations to develop innovative products, services and processes that will ultimately serve to benefit communities and society at large (Phillips, et al., 2008). The success of
organizations is often measured by profit margins and the return to shareholders where applicable (Hart, 1997). However, this study will seek to examine an organization’s social innovation process and attempt to ascertain what organizational factors influence social innovation among organizations in the public and private sectors.

**Purpose**

The primary purpose of this research is to determine what factors influence social innovation processes within organizations. The study will also seek to find if there are differences in what these factors are between the public and private sectors. The main research question in this study seeks to determine if there is a difference in the types of organizational factors that influence public and private organizations during implementation of a social innovation process. The study will also ascertain how these help or hinder the social innovation processes. In the business context, the innovation literature has repeatedly identified factors that lead to successful innovation processes as well as elements that may dissuade or hamper successful innovation (Cook, 1998; Ford, 2000; Nutt, 1999a; Nutt, 2005b). These factors can be easily categorized as factors that are internal or external to an organization.

As previously mentioned, organizations are presently tasked with the need to do more with fewer resources. The ability to develop novel processes, services and products are important to the viability of organizations both public and private. However, innovation is often not easily attained. Research has revealed that there are numerous characteristics exhibited by organizations that are successful with innovative change processes. The specific types of management, organizational culture, finances and organizational structure are examples of elements that can promote or deter innovative change processes within an organization (Cook, 1998). In addition, execution constraints and bureaucracy can be hindrances to the innovation
process (Palgrave, 2009). The interactions among individuals, groups and organizations as a whole are complex; but, necessary for innovation to occur (Siau, 2003). According to several sources, in order for innovation to be successful an organization should have, at a minimum, the following: clear goals, effective leadership, sufficient resources, open communication channels and an accepting organizational climate (Ford, 2000; Nutt, 1999a; Nutt, 2005b; O’Sullivan, 2009).

Social innovation is innovation that affects the communities and society external to an organization (Alvord, Brown & Christine, 2004). Therefore, this study will enhance the literature by providing an understanding of how social innovation is influenced (Alvord, Brown & Christine, 2004). In short, this proposed research will help to determine if there are differences in which factors influence innovation in public and private organizations and whether those elements are internal or external to the organizations. Understanding the elements that influence innovation within organizations will inevitably lead to better social innovation design processes which will ultimately affect the sustainability of the social innovation (Mulgan, 2006).

**Importance of Study**

We are now living in an era where organizations both public and private are tasked with the need to “do more with less”. In these fiscally trying times; the ability to develop innovative policies, processes and products has proven to be increasingly more valuable. The fiscal crisis requires transformational change (governing.com, last accessed on December 9, 2013). Generally, private businesses seek innovation in hopes of affecting the bottom line and raising more cash. Innovative private firms are constantly in search of the next best product or process (Ellis, 2011). Successful companies are highly innovative and produce a steady flow of new products, Apple for example (Parker, 1982). Likewise, government organizations and non-governmental organizations seek innovative practices in order to improve their overall
effectiveness and efficiency. For example, in New York City and other localities, citizens and businesses can call a nonemergency 3-1-1 number, 24 hours a day, seven days a week to reach an automated services system or operator in order to request city services. These residents can ask for anything from pothole repair to information on burial financial assistance. In another display of innovation, various localities throughout the country have implemented on-line geographic information systems (GIS) to citizens and government employees. GIS is used to collect and organize data entered by public and private organizations regarding physical information associated with location attributes (Franzel, 2008). The aforementioned programs exemplify innovative services that have been implemented by local governments.

Innovation has the ability to bring productive change to the processes, policies, services and products of organizations. The ability to turn creative and unique ideas into novel solutions has never been more important to the success of organizations and society as a whole (Mulgan, 2006). There are numerous barriers that may combine to stifle or hamper innovation (Ford, 2000; Nutt, 1999a; Nutt, 2005b). Studies about innovation and the characteristics of the organizations and individuals that do it well are numerous. However, these studies often focus on one specific industry and on characteristics that are either internal or external to the organization (Heckert, 2007). A widely accepted premise asserts that innovation is best done in the private sector because it has less bureaucracy and more resources (Autant-Bernard, 2010; Mulgan, 2006). Nevertheless, as the economic environment has changed, government and not-for-profit agencies are increasingly engaged in innovation processes much like their private counterparts. Historically, humanity has put great faith in technological innovation to help transform societies and improve the quality of life (examples include the industrial revolution, the more recent Green Revolution and the Internet Revolution). (Westley et al, 2011). While
technological innovation is vital to growth of the economy, societal change requires innovation across multiple scales (Mulgan, 2006). Innovation is a double-edged sword. Much of the economic and population growth that has compromised ecosystem services has been driven by technological innovation. However, human capacity for innovation can equally be used as positive force for supporting transformations toward global sustainability (Boons, 2012; Westley et al., 2011).

**Sustainability.** Over the past 30 years, nonprofits, governments and businesses have developed a better appreciation of the complexity of global problems such as climate change and poverty (Phills et al, 2008). As a consequence, most have realized that these complex problems require sophisticated solutions (Alvord, Brown & Christine, 2004). In short, as previously mentioned, social innovation is a process by which organizations develop new products, processes or services that have a positive benefit to society at large. Sustainability is a concept which encompasses social responsibility and social innovation (Valentino, 2006). Sustainability is a business approach that creates long-term consumer and employee value of an organization by taking into consideration every dimension of how an organization operates in its social, economic and cultural environment. (en.wikipedia.org/corporate sustainability, last accessed October 10, 2013). Since companies are no longer being measured solely by traditional indicators of success such as profits, dividends and jobs created, one may assert that an organization’s contribution to the overall well-being of society is a direct measure of its ability to be a sustainable organization (Mulgan, 2006). An organization’s relationships with its employees, its communities, its customers and the physical environment; define its cultural and social well-being, which are the indicators of successful levels of sustainability. (Phills et al,
We have entered into a new era in the relationship between organizations and societies where organizations are expected to:

- Safeguard the environment,
- Adopt codes of ethics,
- Enter into partnerships with non-governmental organizations,
- Display openness and transparency with all stakeholders,
- Promote diversity in the workplace,
- Help communities and societies solve their social problems, and
- Consult with communities on business plans and strategies (Burke, 2006).

For many years community goals were philanthropic activities that were seen as separate from business goals (Burke, 2006; Mulgan, 2006). Since the development of social responsibility and social innovation, it has been recognized that competitive advantage and sustainability can result from weaving social and environmental considerations into business strategy (Mulgan, 2006). It is about building a civic character, not just a business character, which builds image, reputation, interest, respect and loyalty. This in turn creates sustainability (Valentino, 2006). Giving money to charity, staff volunteering, painting the community center—are all good things but they are peripheral to a business (Phills et al, 2008). Organizations need social innovation which leads to the creation of new products and services and differentiates their brand, engages people and achieves lasting and social environmental impact (Valentino, 2006). This is, in essence, sustainability.

A recent report by Ernst and Young identified several key trends regarding corporate sustainability. 1) Sustainability reporting is growing; while the tools are still developing; 2) the chief financial officer’s role in sustainability is on the rise; 3) awareness is on the rise regarding the scarcity of business resources; and 4) rankings and rating matter to company executives. (reyn.com, last accessed on October 10, 2013). The interpretation of sustainability suggests that
organizations should base their developments on the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (Boon, 2012; Samuelson, 2009). As the importance of sustainability increases and its definition becomes broader than its prior focus on environment, the role of social innovation processes will continue to develop and increase in value. (environmentalleader.com, last accessed on October 10, 2013). Furthermore, since the area of sustainability is currently in a growth stage, research regarding what makes an organization sustainable is currently expanding and changing. However, the literature has agreed on a few key concepts. For an organization to achieve sustainability it has to be willing to grow and change in a way that is reflective of the needs and desires of society-at-large (Mulgan, 2006; Valentino, 2006). In order to be responsive in a sustainable manner; there are key elements which an organization must acknowledge and embrace. Sustainable organizations must:

- Have a leader or leadership that is committed to sustainability and effectively communicates the organization’s sustainability goals on a consistent basis.
- The organization must have a mission statement that reinforces those goals.
- The organization must have a willingness to invest in the money, time, human resources and other resources needed to attain its sustainability goals.
- The organization must be willing to change by innovation, growth, expansion, reduction, etc. in order to position itself competitively in the sustainability category.
- Finally, the organization must have reporting and monitoring systems in place in order to accurately review and assess its sustainability progress and positions. (Epstein, 2010).

Organizations that are committed to sustainability invest in a significant commitment. As noted by the requirement to seek competitive advantage, one can discern that social innovation is just one tool that can be used to achieve this goal as it strives to reach levels of sustainability. Any successful organization needs to be simultaneously focused on existing
activities, emerging ones, and more radical possibilities that could be the mainstream activities of the future (Mulgan, 2006). In other words, successful organizations must not only focus on their core; but, they must also be looking towards the future and how they will actuate sustainable change (Valentino, 2006).

The difference between social responsibility and social innovation. Social responsibility, also known as corporate responsibility, corporate citizenship, or responsible business, can be defined as a mechanism for entities to voluntarily integrate community and environmental concerns into their operations; thus, producing goods and services in a way that is not harmful to society or the environment (Mulgan, 2006). In recent years, the boundaries between organizational and social issues have undergone dramatic changes (Draimin, 2012). Organizations today are increasingly focused on social and environmental responsibility, including the impact of their activities on the global climate and communities throughout the world (Mulgan, 2006). An increased obligation to social responsibility has led to organizations that are not only invested in social responsibility; but, have taken their actions further with social innovation (Epstein, 2010; Valentino, 2006).

The answers to the world’s biggest social challenges will not be found by governments or non-governmental organizations alone. Increasingly, big corporations are engaging in social innovation by creating new business models, new products and services that deliver lasting financially viable solutions to the big problems facing society (Phills et al., 2008). As an example, Nokia recently won a social innovation award for its data gathering technology which allows organizations to collect information using mobile phones instead of paper forms or laptops (Chieppo, 2010). The city of Colorado Springs has opened its own office of Innovation and Sustainability in an effort to promote innovation in the realm of social and environmental
sustainability. The results of social innovation are all around us, self-help health groups and self-build housing, microcredit and consumer cooperatives, zero carbon housing schemes, charity shops and community courts are all examples of social innovation – ideas that work to meet pressing unmet needs and improve peoples’ lives (Mulgan, 2006).

As previously mentioned, social innovation goes a step beyond social responsibility (Datta, 2011; Valentino, 2006). It is innovation that drives systemic change with the overall well-being of society in general as a driver (Alvord, Brown & Christine, 2004). Organizations can make a social difference if they understand how their organization’s agenda can enhance social needs (Phills et al., 2008). Because it is truly an opportunity for organizational development, various organizations have recognized the value and importance of social innovation and therefore are making advancements in this area in greater numbers (Hart, 1997).

Although social innovation happens all around, many promising ideas are stillborn, blocked by vested interests or otherwise marginalized (Mulgan, 2006). Because, there are times when important innovative ideas never reach implementation due to various deterrents of the innovation process, there are many instances when some social problems remain unaddressed because they have answers or potential solutions that simply need a little more support (Phills et al., 2008).

Researchers agree that the identification of social innovation needs generally develops in resource constrained environments, for example, in inner city neighborhoods or villages in Brazil or India, for example (Datta, 2011). Social innovation is often hampered by the lack of financial capital (Datta, 2011; Mair, 2006). Social purpose innovation often does not offer clear financial return as these ventures cannot be evaluated in pure financial terms (Mair, 2006). In addition, identifying people who are interested in social innovation is often difficult. The concept of
social innovation is relatively new, and when engaging individuals whether in the public or private sector, it is often difficult to recruit or engage that right type of human capital (Datta, 2011). Social innovation is driven by the need to create social value (Valentino, 2006).

Social value is often times, a concept that is particularly difficult to measure although the needs are visibly obvious in most scenarios. Businesses, both public and private, with financial and people resources are needed to further promote social innovation (Datta, 2011; Epstein, 2010; Mulgan, 2006). Clearly, public and private organizations have realized the need for social innovation programs; however, exactly how their innovation processes are influenced requires some clarification. Given the multitude of barriers that exist for the social innovation process as a whole, this study will be important to innovative and socially responsible organizations because it will seek to identify and determine which organizational factors influence the social innovation process throughout organizations overall.

Business decision making and innovation has been researched and tested on various levels throughout history (Nutt, 1999a; Nutt, 2005b). Social innovation, while applicable to businesses and government organizations, has not been examined in an effort to thoroughly understand which factors influence the social innovation process. Based on an organization’s desire to remain viable in an economically distressed atmosphere, it is clear social innovation is needed and welcomed whether it comes from governments or businesses (Porter & Kramer, 2011). The growing trend is for an organization’s value to be measured by more than the products or services it produces. Sustainability, benefits and lack of harm to society is increasingly becoming a distinct measure of an organization’s worth (Mulgan, 2006; Valentino, 2006). Social innovation is seen as a key to creating and transforming markets towards sustainable development (Hart & Milstein, 1999; Lovins, Lovins & Hawken. 1999). There is a
wealth of business opportunities associated with social innovation and sustainable development as it could most certainly be a force for industrial renewal and progress (Hart & Milstein, 1999). The world needs more social innovation; regardless of the sector of society they come from, sustainable initiatives create long term social value (Phills et al., 2008). There have been remarkable achievements in organizational social value creation with the micro-financing initiated by Grameen Bank in India or Sekem Group, a multi-business organization that hosts diverse social ventures in Egypt (Boons, 2012). This study will provide results that will offer greater insight for those specifically involved in social innovation; thus, leading them to successful outcomes similar to those that have already been realized and potentially even greater social innovation results.

**Social Entrepreneurs and Innovation Champions.** As described, social innovation is one step beyond social responsibility and this research seeks to determine which factors influence the process. A conversation regarding the social innovation process cannot ignore the role of social entrepreneurs. They have been identified in many contexts as a component that can enhance the social innovation process. In fact, social innovations have been primarily investigated through the lens of social entrepreneurship (Boons, 2008; Nelson, 2006). This is because social innovations are often linked to the entrepreneurial activities of individuals who are motivated to affect social change (Datta, 2011). However, as this research plans to distinguish, they are one of only a few emerging components that can have a vital role to the social innovation process. Technology, public policy, social movements and community development have also been cited as areas that can help prompt and guide social innovation as they too become more fully developed (Mulgan, 2006; Phills et al., 2008). The Schwab Foundation for Social Entrepreneurship defines social entrepreneurs as people who identify
practical solutions to social problems by combining innovation, resourcefulness and opportunity (Nelson, 2006). Deeply committed to generating social value, these individuals identify new processes, services and products by driving pattern breaking approaches to seemingly insurmountable social issues (Nelson, 2006). Social entrepreneurs motivate private resources along with groups of people and communities to develop productive assets for society (Boons, 2008). Social entrepreneurs work with companies by mobilizing, money, people, products and premises to help support and strengthen communities (Boons, 2008). An organization’s partnerships with social entrepreneurs provide the following benefits:

- Eliminates the need for the organization to develop certain new competencies internally;
- Allows for the use of smaller scale, affordable technologies;
- Provides innovative financing mechanisms;
- Mobilizes core corporate competencies to allow for investment in strategic social programs (Nelson, 2006).

As with the Avarind Eye hospital, social entrepreneurs have been essential to other social innovation projects. The microcredit package from Grameen Bank in Bangladesh provides group loans for poor and marginalized people to develop income-generating activities. The Self-Employed Woman’s Association in India, was developed to support mobilization of self-employed women to campaign for policies to support work activities and to develop services adapted to their work and overall welfare needs (Boons, 2008). Finally, Plan Puebla in Mexico was developed in order to assist and promote innovation in corn production by subsistence farmers (Alvord, Brown & Christine, 2004). Based on these examples alone, one may discern that the opportunities for social innovation are many. Social entrepreneurs are often faced with constraints such as human resource and financial resource limitations (Nelson, 2006). In addition, the ambiguousness associated with social value can hamper one’s willingness to invest time and money in a social entrepreneur’s social innovation goal (Alvord, Brown & Christine,
Organizations that have access to these types of resources become more valuable to social innovation processes. Their access to people and money could lead to successful innovation processes that are more likely to transcend into transformative change and sustainable programs (Nelson, 2006). Clearly, social entrepreneurs have been important to social innovation thus far; however, given their obvious limitations examining the role of organizations is essential to understanding and expanding how social innovation takes place.

Clearly, social entrepreneurs are beneficial to organizations and their involvement in social innovation can certainly be a benefit to the social innovation process. To date, the social innovation literature, while limited, suggests that social challenges are too big to believe that one organization or an individual can successfully address the challenges on their own. Social entrepreneurs are a part of an exciting trend that includes an organization’s desire to aggressively address the social issues of the world today.

A concept similar to social entrepreneur is that of the innovation champion. With the current economic climate, the need to develop innovative policies, processes and products that are socially beneficial has proven to be extremely valuable (Ellis, 2011). For this reason, organizations both public and private have realized the benefit of utilizing individuals who promote innovation within and around the organization (Winistorfer, 1996). Recent research suggests that no innovation of significant magnitude can be introduced into a stable policy domain without “champions” who advocate its introduction and usage and who directly and indirectly motivate others to accept the innovation. (Hardy, Hipple, Michalski & Wilson, 2001)

Innovation champions may have formal innovation titles and roles or they may serve in other positions and have become innovation champions through other means (innovationlabs.com, last accessed on February 12, 2013). These individuals are easily identified
in organizations and the innovation process because they are the people tasked with making a significant contribution to an innovation’s progression through an organization by utilizing zeal and persuasiveness to encourage innovation (Howell, 2005). Innovation champions are able to successfully promote an innovation and its process using the following skills:

• Expertise – an innovation champion needs expertise on the innovation they are proposing and the process or outcome they are trying to achieve;

• Credibility – an innovation champion must have respect from co-workers and management;

• Planning skills – a champion will, in essence, be organizing and implementing a business plan; therefore, they must have superior planning skills;

• Networking skills - an innovation champion must have an extensive network of contact both internal and external to the organization;

• Sensitivity – an innovation champion must be sensitive to all stakeholders in the process, some of whom will be willing participants and others will go along grudgingly. (An effective innovation champion will know to craft conversation and actions in a way that does not alarm or distance stakeholders);

• Objectivity – an innovation champion must recognize their own biases in order to ensure that one is doing what is best for the organization;

• Tenacity, Assertiveness, Decisiveness and Confidence are personal characteristics that an innovation champion should exhibit in order to instill passion and positive thinking in the innovation process. (Buswick, 1990)

• Advocacy - Innovation champions typically act as advocates of a particular innovation and work to overcome organization resistance. Because new ideas often encounter sharp resistance, vigorous promotion is required; therefore, innovation champions play a vital role in innovation processes (Buswick, 1990; Kessler, 1996).

Based upon the innovation champion concept, this research will utilize innovation champions (while that may not be their formal title or role) to reach a better understanding of which factors deter and promote social innovation within organizations. Innovation champions
are responsible for creating and sustaining successful innovation adoptions within an organization; therefore, they will offer a unique perspective for the research regarding the tools and skills needed to manage innovation processes. Social innovation, being as complex as it is, is best understood from the point of view of the actors involved (Wolfe, 1994). Because innovation champions must interact with all stakeholders in an innovation process, they can also provide an educated opinion about which factors dissuade or promote innovation. In addition, they can easily discern whether elements internal or external to an organization have the greatest amount of influence. This study uses the feedback from the innovation champions to determine if there are distinct differences between how public and private firms pursue change. The innovation champions’ descriptions of the promoters and barriers to innovation include a comprehensive perspective that is unique to their role.

**Innovation Process.** Creativity is a vague concept which is often difficult to describe. Furthermore, the definition may vary depending upon the context in which it is used (Cook, 1998). A basic definition which attempts to target creativity in business settings is, “the starting point of a process which, when skillfully managed, brings an idea into innovation” (Lampikoski & Emden, 1996, p. 204). Innovation is a concept that is often defined as the introduction of some new product, process, idea, service or procedure which initiates change and creates new value for the organization and its related stakeholders (Woodman, 2008). In short, creativity may be defined as thinking new things while innovation can be defined as doing new things (Neff, 1993). While the practice of creativity and innovation can certainly be more complicated, the previous statements accurately describe these terms and their role in the innovation process. Based upon the definitions presented, it is obvious that the concepts of creativity and innovation are separate but intertwined. A model reflecting this relationship is exhibited in Figure 1.
Clearly, not all organizational change follows this process because, simply put, not all organizations harness and promote creativity and innovation (Ford, 2000). However, this process flow presents an ideal formula for understanding the relationship between creativity and innovation.

Development of an innovative idea, the actual implementation of creativity, is influenced by the following elements as depicted below:

- Organizational culture and structure – This characteristic addresses an organization’s environment. Is the structure rigid and hierarchical? Does the culture breed ingenuity and change or does it promote status quo?
- Technology and Communication – This element examines whether an organization embraces advancements in technology and uses that to enhance communication and further the organization’s mission.
- Resources – When assessing this attribute one must ascertain whether the organization is willing to sacrifice the human and financial resources needed to foster and implement creativity and innovation (Amidon, 1997).

The diagram depicted above showed the flow of the innovation process. The diagram below exhibits the flow of the actors within those processes.
Clearly, the innovation process involves complex relationships among individuals, groups and organizations and these interactions have a definite impact on the innovation process which, in turn, leads to creative outcomes within an organization (Woodman, 1993). Innovation is defined as something new, but in reality it is the culmination of imagination, determination, and the discipline to put all this together into a product or process that is truly new (Hunt, 2004).

There are numerous models in the innovation literature which attempt to depict, in more detail, the innovation process. Some models, like the one above, depict a process that is linear in nature with a sequential process and well-defined stages (Carter, 1957). Other models show a chain link process flow which provides for feedback loops at each stage of the innovation (Kline, 1986). Nevertheless, in the social innovation realm, the innovation process has proven to be a messier process which implicates a more complex progression of events (Van de Ven, 2008). According to Van de Ven, the social innovation process consists of three periods: initiation, development and scaling.

- **Initiation**
  - Identification of a social need problem, social opportunity
  - Development of a solution
- **Development Phase**
  - Resources mobilized
  - Testing and refining of the solution
- **Scaling Phase**
Implementation and application and use of the developed idea (Van der Ven, 2008). Evaluating whether a social innovation has created value is often the more difficult task and at this time is typically measured by assessing the viewpoints of the target beneficiaries (Van der Ven, 2008). The social innovation process has not been studied to the extent or level of typical organizational innovation processes; therefore, proving once again that an analysis of the process would help to develop an understanding of the overall social innovation process.

Geoff Mulgan’s (2006) social innovation research suggests that there are various social innovation typologies based on where the social innovation is occurring. For example, the social innovation process in businesses has distinct differences from social innovation in government. However, the framework for government and organizations with a social interest are substantially similar. The steps are as follows:

1. Generation of possibilities – Creativity, imagination, consultations, user inputs and adaptation of models from other sectors generate possibilities.
2. Prototypes, Piloting, Testing – Learning by doing, incubators, test and capture lessons

Little is known about social innovation when compared to the vast amount of research related to business and science. Unfortunately, there are no large overviews of the field, or major datasets or long-term analyses in this particular realm of study for innovation. Some of the insights gained from business are helpful when studying social innovation and will be used in this study to aid the development of the research. However, one could argue that the lack of knowledge may dissuade large scale research in this field (Mulgan, 2006). Therefore, using the basic premises that have been developed to date, this study will likely open further dialogue on how social innovation is pursued and how much various organizational factors enhance or deter the process.
As described, social innovation is a component of a complex phenomenon that involves other concepts such as social responsibility and sustainability. Successful companies are innovative and those that strive for sustainability often participate in social innovation processes (Valentino, 2006). This research is distinctly important because it will endeavor to understand how public and private sector organizations are influenced by certain internal and external organizational factors. Because social innovation is an emerging concept and is a process that has not been extensively researched, this study will offer insight into the overall process and how it is influenced in the public and private sectors. Understanding where strengths and weaknesses may lie in the public and private processes will allow innovation champions, and other leaders engaged in the social innovation process design better social innovation processes. The better design and implementation of social innovation processes may lead to more successful innovation processes and sustainable initiatives which will ultimately benefit communities and society as a whole.

**Theoretical Framework**

This research will utilize a theory first introduced by Frances Berry and William Berry, which combines two separate models of innovation. Everett Roger’s Diffusion Theory is a broad concept which attempts to describe patterns of innovation adoption, to explain the mechanism of innovation adoption and to assist in predicting whether and how a new innovation will be successful. This premise relies heavily on the assertion that factors that contribute to innovation diffuse across entities; thus, influencing the probability of innovation (Rogers, 2003). The internal determinants model suggests that the factors that contribute to whether and when an organization adopts an innovation are internal to an organization (Mohr, 1969). The Berry and Berry Unified Theory suggests that these two concepts do not operate independently. It instead
takes into account the influence organizations experience form the external environment as well as the internal determinants that may influence an organization’s innovation process. Using Unified Theory as the foundation this study will use a survey of innovation champions to determine the extent to which they are influenced by internal and external factors and how this influence varies across sectors.

**Diffusion theory.** Diffusion theory is a broad, social-psychological theory which attempts to describe the patterns of adoption, explain the mechanism and assist in predicting whether and how a new invention will be successful (Clarke, 1999; Rogers, 2003). Essentially, diffusion is the process by which an innovation is communicated through certain channels over time among the members of a social system (Rogers, 2003). Diffusion of Innovation sees change as being primarily about the evolution of products and behaviors so that they become better fits for the needs of individuals and groups. Diffusion of innovation offers three insights into the process of how innovation is adopted. They are as listed below:

1) What qualities make an innovation spread?
2) How important is the innovation to peer communities.
3) How well does the innovation address the various needs of different users (Robinson, 2009)?

Diffusion experts recognize five qualities that determine the success of an innovation.

1) Relative Advantage – is the degree to which an innovation is perceived as being better than the idea it supersedes.
2) Compatibility with existing values and practices – is the degree to which an innovation is perceived to be consistent with values, norms, practices, of potential adopters.
3) Simplicity and ease of use- is the degree to which an innovation is perceived as difficult to understand and use.
4) Trialability – is the degree to which the innovation can be experimented with on a limited basis.
5) Observable Results – is the degree to which an individual can see the results of an innovation (does the innovation have a positive effect on individuals and society that is palpable?) (Clarke; 1999; Rogers, 2003).

According to Everett Rogers (2003), if an innovation addresses each of these qualities in a positive manner, the likelihood of innovation acceptance and diffusion increases. Once a successful innovation occurs, reinvention, a component of diffusion theory, becomes a key component of the process, and is also important to this research. Essentially, reinvention suggests that the success of innovation depends on how well it evolves to meet the needs of more individuals in a particular social system (Robinson, 2009). Individuals tasked with promoting and implementing an innovation could likely scan the external environment to determine if there are already existing innovations in place, which they could modify, and conform to suit the needs of their organizations.

In a study of state governments published in 1999, Frances and William Berry reviewed the various types of diffusion models that have contributed to the policy literature throughout the years. Each model focuses on a different channel of communication. The national interaction model, described by Berry and Berry, assumes that there is a national communication network among state officials and these officials interact freely and emulate policies and programs from their peers in other states (Berry & Berry, 1999). Thus, it is predicted that the probability that a state will adopt a particular program is proportional to the number of interactions its officials have had with officials of already adopting states (Gray, 1973). The regional diffusion model suggests that states are primarily influenced by states that geographically are, in close proximity to them (Berry & Berry, 1999). Further, neighbor models suggest that states which share a
border have even more of an influence on its border states (Berry & Berry, 1990). The leader-laggard models assume that certain states are pioneers in the adoption of policy and; therefore, other states emulate these leaders (Walker, 1969). In this scenario the laggard states following the cues for the leader states in the policy adoption process. Finally, the vertical influence models see states as emulating the policies of the national government (Berry & Berry, 1990). Obviously, this model must take into account that the national government can mandate the adoption of certain policies. However, this model can be an effective tool when states have the ability to retain some level of discretion. The models used here to describe interaction and policy adoption across states can be used to describe the innovation process in localities as well. In addition, private firms have also been known to perform external scans for innovative products and ideas to enhance their own internal program (Pantiskoski & Asakawa, 2009).

**Internal determinants model.** The diffusion model suggests that factors that contribute to whether an organization adopts a new policy or practice are highly dependent upon external factors of influence (e.g. whether or not other states have adopted the innovation) (Rogers, 2003). The internal determinants model assumes that there are characteristics internal to an organization that determine when and if a specific innovation will be adopted by that particular organization (Mohr, 1969). For example, does the organization have a general proclivity to innovate or do they typically maintain the status quo? The internal determinants model basically suggests that organizations have various internal factors, political, economic and social characteristics internal to the organization, that provide insight into whether they are likely to innovate (Berry & Berry, 1999). The ability to innovate is a function of the motivation to innovate, the strength to overcome obstacles to innovation and the availability of resources to promote and overcome barriers to innovation (Mohr, 1969). The organization and management
literature suggest that private organizational innovativeness is regarded as primarily influenced by structural determinants such as size, functional layers, and specialization, culture, leadership style and attitudes toward risks; factors clearly internal to an organization (Damanpour 1991a; Damanpour, 1992b; Damanpour; 1996c; Van der Ven, 1999).

**Unified theory.** Taken separately, the diffusion of innovation theory and the internal determinants model both offer insight into an organization’s tendency to innovate. However, Berry and Berry suggest that the two combined can provide greater insight as they believe that the two are not mutually exclusive (Berry & Berry, 1990). In essence, an organization can be influenced externally by other innovators as well as by factors internal to the organization. The existence of internal factors that influence the probability of adoption of an innovation by an organization does not preclude the prospect that this probability is also affected by the actions of other organizations, and vice versa (Berry & Berry, 1999). Berry and Berry introduced unified theory of innovation, which takes into account the influence organizations have on others as well as the internal determinants that may influence the innovation process. Unified theory suggests that policymakers should deemphasize the lone global concept of innovativeness and instead combine the concept of community sharing with internal influence (Berry & Berry, 1990).

Resources and an organization’s desire to innovate are examples of factors that can have a direct correlation as to whether an organization actually commits to an innovation process (Ford, 2000; Nutt, 1999a). However, it is also important to note that external factors such as influence from stakeholders and consumers, experiences from other organizations and political pressure are examples of external pressures that can influence the innovation process. According to Berry and Berry, an organization’s innovation process can be simultaneously influenced by characteristics internal and external to the organization. Using Unified Theory as the foundation
this study will seek to determine the extent to which organizations are influenced by internal and external factors and how this influence varies across sectors.

**Research Questions**

- **Research Question 1:** Do internal organizational factors have more of an influence on social innovation processes of private sector organizations than external organizational factors?
- **Research Question 2:** Do external organizational factors have more of an influence on social innovation processes of public sector organizations than internal organizational factors?
- **Research Question 3:** Are public and private sector organizations’ motivation to implement social innovation influenced by both internal and external organizational factors?
- **Research Question 4:** Do organizations with a high motivation to implement social innovation processes believe innovation champions are important to the social innovation process?

**Methodology and Research Design**

This study will be conducted by executing a mixed methods approach targeting employees who have been hired to be, or have essentially become, innovation champions within an organization. Innovation network directories were used to select potential candidates that are working in the innovation area and who have the role of innovation champions. Upon identification of 75 to 100 public and private sector respondents, a survey was used to analyze the promoters and barriers to social innovation within the organizations of those respondents. A secondary element of the research was implemented in order to gather qualitative feedback from a subset of those respondents. A convenience sample will be able to provide the insight needed to have a better understanding of how organizations are influenced by internal and external
organizational factors and if the influence of those factors varies among the public and private sectors.

While an understanding of the process of innovation within business organizations has increased over recent years, the concept is still somewhat vague and almost non-existent in terms of social innovation and how public and private sector organizations are influenced. There is much to be learned about social innovation and how it is measured (Advisory Committee on Measuring Innovation, 2008). Therefore, to adequately understand the concept of innovation and the factors that promote or deter its success, it is important to examine how the respondents understand the concept (Considine, 2009). The survey and interviews will gather information on the following ideas:

- Their organization’s promotion of general innovative practices
- Individual’s perception of organization’s social innovation habits
- Internal factors that influence social innovation
- External factors that influence social innovation
- Factors that motivate the organization to participate in social innovation

Each individual’s interpretation of many of the aforementioned terms is subjective; therefore, the survey tool supplied basic definitions as a manner in which to level set the respondents’ answers when participating in the questionnaire component of the study. The researcher used the data in several statistical analyses such as independent sample t-tests, regression analyses and correlation analyses to determine whether there are significant differences between the different sector type employees and if the type of innovation and the use of innovation champions play a significant role in the social innovation process. As previously mentioned there have been numerous studies that have determined which factors are most likely to influence an innovation process. Internal influence factors are typically identified as:
1) Risk tolerance
2) Leadership support
3) Financial resources
4) Human resources
5) Clear objectives
6) Organizational structure
7) Availability of data

(Mohr, 1969; Buswick, 1990; Papadakis & Bourantas, 1998; Nutt, 1999; Nutt, 2005; Orcutt & AlKadri, 2009)

External factors are characterized as:
1) Legal environment
2) Network participation
3) Perceived benefits to the community
4) Incentives
5) Competition
6) Consumer/user opinion

(Ford, 1995; Locke, 1995; Mohr, 1969; Nutt, 1999a; Nutt, 2005b; Orcutt & AlKadri, 2009; Rogers, 2003; Young, 2011).

The survey tool was used to measure whether these elements play a role in the organization’s social innovation process, and if so, if they are a significant factor in the organization’s motivation to participate in social innovation. Also, the research ascertained which internal and external organizational factors have the most influence on the social innovation process. The researcher then used these assessments to understand if external or internal factors have the greatest influence on the social innovation processes and if there are significant differences between the public and private sectors with respect to those factors.

The innovation champions were asked to assess how much influence internal and external organizational factors have during a social innovation process. Research questions 1 and 2 were tested using independent sample t tests in order to provide a comparison for the mean influence
value associated with the internal organizational factors and the external organizational factors (Wetcher-Hendricks, 2011). Regression analysis will be used to answer research question 3 since it can be used to determine which variables are contributing to the explanation of the dependent variable (Nardi, 2006). Finally, research question 4 will utilize correlation analysis because it is a tool that indicates how well one variable predicts another (Cramer, 1994). A secondary component of the study, qualitative interviews, was conducted with a subset of the innovation champions. Using a semi-structured interview format, the researcher will use probing questions in this qualitative portion of the research to gain further insight into how the innovation champion views the organization’s social innovation process and its related barriers and promoters.

**Limitations**

As previously mentioned, this study on social innovation will help experts further understand the newly emerging social innovation process. Innovation literature is rich with analyses that focuses on the individual characteristics that help an organization innovate or deter its innovation processes. Because the methodology of this study suggests a convenience sample of those individuals in organizations that are involved in social innovation, the study will find that the results are not generalizable to organizations as a whole. Additionally, the use of innovation champions, as defined herein, may result in a survey of individuals who do not necessarily perform the same tasks as it relates to innovation. Therefore these individuals may not have the same conceptual understanding of innovation commonalities. Nevertheless, the insight they provide into the social innovation process will prove insightful despite how their role within the organization is fulfilled. This research is intended to provide novel insight into a new
area that has not been researched in-depth. Despite its restrictions the dialogue that is opened with this study will certainly be helpful to innovators across the board.

**Summary**

On September 21, 2009, President Obama released the Strategy for American Innovation. The goal of the strategy is to establish the foundation for sustainable growth and job recovery (Farrrell, 2010). President Obama believes that the federal government is responsible for three areas in this innovation effort.

1. The federal government should invest in the basics of innovation; research, human capital and infrastructure.

2. The government must create the right environment for private investment by reforming export controls and encouraging high growth entrepreneurship, for example.

3. And the government should serve as a catalyst for breakthroughs in national priorities such as clean energy and health care (Farell, 2010).

The President and his administration are committed to facilitating social innovation; therefore, it is clear that there is a mandate for policy to move in this direction. Further an understanding of how public and private organizations are influenced in this area is key to understanding how social innovation processes can be enhanced moving forward. This understanding can lead to the development of organization models that emphasize sustainability and benefit for society overall.
Definitions

- Creativity – the starting point of a process which brings an idea into innovation (Lampikoski & Emden, 1996).

- Innovation – Introduction of a new product, process, idea, service or procedure which initiates change and creates new value for an organization and its related stakeholders (Woodman, 2008).

- Innovation Champion – individuals tasked with advocating the introduction of an innovation and directly or indirectly motivate others to use it (Winistorfer, 1996).

- Social Innovation – solutions to immediate social problems that can mobilize ideas, capacities, resources and social arrangements required for sustainable social transformations (Alvord, Brown & Christine, 2004).

- Social entrepreneurs - people who identify practical solutions to social problems by combining innovation, resourcefulness and opportunity (Nelson, 2006).

- Social Responsibility - The obligation of an organization towards the welfare and interests of the society in which it operates (Mulgan, 2006).

- Sustainability - a business approach that creates long-term consumer and employee value of an organization by taking into consideration every dimension of how an organization operates in its social, economic and cultural environment (Valentino, 2006).
A focus on environmental responsibility has been growing stronger for the past four decades (Ellis, 2011; Phills et al., 2008; Porter & Kramer, 2011). Prior to the 1970’s corporations were in a state of denial in terms of their impact on the environment (Phills et al, 2008). Then a series of highly visible ecological problems gained visibility and garnered support for strict environmental governmental policy and regulation. In the United Sates, Lake Erie was dead. In Europe the Rhine was on fire. In Japan, people were dying of mercury poisoning (Hart, 1997). These types of visible environmental imbalances made it more difficult for companies to sustain business as usual when there was resource scarcity and natural disaster issues to address (Ellis, 2011). The term, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has been in wide use since the 1960’s. However, it wasn’t until the 1980’s when companies like the Body Shop, Ben & Jerry’s and Patagonia touted an active vision of CSR, that other businesses began to view it as a means to improve society and to make money at the same time (Phills et al., 2008). Companies began to largely accept the notion of CSR and are now beginning to embrace a larger concept known as sustainability. Over the past 30 years, nonprofits, governments and businesses have developed a better appreciation of the complexity of global problems such as climate change and poverty (Phills et al., 2008). With this understanding, organizations have also come to terms with the fact that these complex problems require complex solutions; thus, the introduction of social innovation (Ellis, 2011).

For years, organizations operated in distinct environments in the social realm. Each sector managed its own ideas and did not attempt to partner with or collaborate with organizations from a different sector. However, in recent years, with the growth of complex societal problems, these once distinct lines have started to blur. Government and nonprofit
leaders are learning management and revenue generation lessons from private businesses while business are learning about societal issues from those sectors (Phills et al., 2008). Each of these sectors combined are learning that public policy can be shaped in a manner which promotes social responsibility; thus, potentially leading to successful social innovation. Organizations both public and private are faced with the task of developing a sustainable global economy: an economy that the planet is capable of supporting indefinitely (Hart, 1997). Sustainability goes beyond the environment and pollution. If all companies were to reach zero emissions within the next couple of years; the earth would still be stressed beyond what biologists refer to as its carrying capacity (Hart, 1997). Therefore, social innovation that leads to sustainable outcomes is a requirement. Organizations within the public and private sectors have recognized their ability to make a tremendous impact and move towards sustainable practices globally (Ellis, 2011).

Private businesses are poised to take the lead in these sustainability efforts (Porter & Kramer, 2011). Each sector of society recognizes the fact that sophisticated business models and adequate financial human and people resources provide a better framework for social innovation platforms (Hart, 1997). However, it is obvious that no company is self contained. The success of every private business is affected by the other private businesses and infrastructure in the community surrounding it (Porter & Kramer, 2011). Porter and Kramer (2011) suggest that this interaction creates a type of shared value where each stakeholder has a role in solving the societal issues it faces on a day to day basis. Governments are tasked with developing creative innovative policy, processes and services. Private organizations must focus on preventing pollution, and minimizing negative product or service impacts associated with the full life cycle of their output all while maintaining a vision focused on sustainability (Ellis, 2011) Given these daunting tasks, it is clear that innovation does not rest solely on one sector in particular (Hart,
Government organizations are creating and implementing social innovative practices in much the same way that private industry addresses these issues (Ellis, 2011). Therefore, this research takes on the task of determining if the organizational factors that influence social innovation processes differ across sectors. The results will provide insight to social innovation stakeholders as social innovation becomes more important to the sustainability goals of organizations throughout the world.

It is clear that private businesses and government organizations have a need to initiate and manage social innovation processes. This chapter will review the literature which focuses on the organizational factors that influence innovation processes in organizations generally and how those factors may influence the social innovation processes in public and private organizations. An explanation of the theoretical frameworks that supports analysis regarding internal and external organizational factors will open the discussion. These theories, Roger’s diffusion theory, Mohr’s determinants model and Berry and Berry’s unified theory will offer insight into how organizational factors can be analyzed separately and together in an effort to explain the social innovation process within organizations. This section will be followed by an examination of literature which includes; research studies and innovation examples related to innovation in both sectors. In addition, an examination of the research will offer insight into the vitality of innovation champions and their role in innovations processes both public and private.

**Research Questions**

This research endeavors to find out if the research related to innovation promoters and barriers generally is applicable to social innovation. In addition, this study seeks to determine if there are differences in the barriers and promoters to social innovation in the public versus private sectors. Additionally, the question of whether those barriers and promoters change based
on the level of innovation the organization is engaged in, is also a component of the research.

Finally, this research will seek to determine if innovation champions are viewed as important component of the social innovation process.

- Research Question 1: Do internal organizational factors have more of an influence on social innovation processes of private sector organizations than external organizational factors?

- Research Question 2: Do external organizational factors have more of an influence on social innovation processes of public sector organizations than internal organizational factors?

- Research Question 3: Are public and private sector organizations’ motivation to implement social innovation influenced by both internal and external organizational factors?

- Research Question 4: Do organizations with a high motivation to implement social innovation processes believe innovation champions are important to the social innovation process?

**Theoretical Framework**

**Diffusion theory.** Diffusion is the process by which an innovation is communicated through certain channels over a period of time (Rogers, 2003). An important characteristic of diffusion theory is that for most members of a particular social system, innovation decisions depend heavily upon the innovation decisions of similar members of that social system (Berry & Berry 1990). This phenomenon is clearly exhibited by research that has consistently shown that innovation adoption follows an s-shaped curve. This curve consists of members who adopt an innovation concept early, followed by a relatively large adoption pattern by other members of the system and finally a period in which the laggards eventually adopt the innovation. (Rogers,
The figure below depicts the general innovation adoption process by members of a particular system.
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The decision to adopt an innovation is made through in-depth analysis of costs and benefits of the innovation where elements of risk are strongly avoided (Berry & Berry, 1990; Rogers, 2003).

A study published in 2011 by Zdenka Zenko and Matjaz Mulej, involved an intensive review of the innovation diffusion process. The researchers sought to understand the diffusion process and reviewed it using the ISO 26000 standard on social responsibility as its foundation. According to Zenko and Mulej, Roger’s diffusion model consists of four stages to the diffusion process; innovation, communication channels, time and social system (Rogers, 2003). According to Zenko and Mulej, Roger’s model can be used when addressing the innovation necessary when attempting to respond to the ISO 26000 standard (2011). In order to develop a culture of innovativeness, organizations should be willing to move from an era of good intentions to good practices by actively participating in a member system that reviews and adopts social innovations (Zenko & Mulej, 2011).
The core of diffusion as a social process includes interpersonal relationships, communication and networking. (Berry & Berry, 1990; Rogers, 2003) A study by Paul Nutt in 2005 revealed that government organizations are likely to have less access to data and information related to a specific innovation; therefore, they are likely to utilize tools such as bargaining and networking to facilitate and effectuate their decision making processes prior to and during innovation (Nutt, 2005b). Organizations that are innovators have higher risk tolerances, can accept a certain level of uncertainty, and have large amounts of financial resources and higher social mobility (Zenko & Mulej, 2011). These factors are generally not applicable to public organizations; however, an assessment of organizational factors such as these by public and private innovation champions will offer insight into the social innovation process in both types of organizations. Because these attributes are not inherently applicable to public organizations one can assert that public organizations would need to rely on external networks to initiate and manage innovation processes and ultimately realize the full benefits of an innovation process (Kemp & Volpi, 2007). Based on the premise asserted by diffusion theory, external organizational factors have a significant influence on innovation processes; this research will use this framework as a mechanism for understanding how important these organizational factors are to both public and private organizations.

**Internal determinants.** In 1969 Lawrence Mohr published research which attempted to identify the determinants of innovation in public agencies by conducting interviews with public health officers of 94 local public health departments in Illinois, Michigan, New York, Ohio and Ontario. While this study was focused on public agencies the author stated that the results and conclusions reported appeared to be applicable to organizations in general (Mohr, 1969). Nearly four decades later, one could argue that the conclusions reached by Mohr are indeed applicable
to both public and private organizations. (Berry & Berry, 1990) Mohr’s premise asserts that innovation is suggested to be the function of an interaction among the motivation to innovate, the strength of obstacles against innovation, and the availability of resources for overcoming such obstacles (Mohr, 1969). Paul Nutt (1999) conducted a study that measured the difference in decision making processes between the public and private sectors. That research revealed that private sector organizations had easier decision making processes because their internal factors were more conducive to effective decision making (Nutt, 1999).

The internal determinants that Paul Nutt identified in his study are vastly similar to the factors described by Mohr in his public health agency research. Essentially, according to Mohr, innovation was more likely to occur in organizations that had the following positive internal attributes:

- Sufficient financial resources
- Innovation ideology (Risk Tolerant)
- Knowledge, competence (Available Data)
- Decentralized structure (Flexible Organization)
- Strong leadership (Mohr, 1969)

The combination of these factors builds the framework for an organization that has the motivation to innovate and the strength and resources available to overcome obstacles. Because private organizations are generally in a better position in terms of Mohr’s internal determinants factors, society generally looks to the private sector for innovation (Porter & Kramer, 2011). Using Mohr’s internal determinants model as a foundation this research will seek to determine how organizations; both public and private are influenced by factors such as those identified above.

**Unified theory.** Pollution prevention, product stewardship, clean technology and social awareness all move a company toward sustainability (Hart, 1997). However, in order to make
true progress toward sustainability, social responsibility must incorporate social innovation (Datta, 2011; Ellis, 2011; Hart, 1997). Social innovation is a concept that has value for private and public organizations alike. A diverse range of companies are revitalizing their business models to incorporate social innovation and sustainability at the core of their operations (Ellis, 2011; Hart, 1997). Government agencies are actively exploring the benefits of innovation and their processes and ultimate product and service deliveries. (innovationinsights.net, last accessed February 1, 2013). Social innovation is an emerging concept and one that innately involves the society at large. For this reason, this study utilizes the Unified Theory framework presented by Frances and William Berry to support the hypothesis which states that organizational factors both internal and external to an organization have the ability to influence the social innovation process.

Berry and Berry’s 1990 study attempted to explain the adoption of state lotteries by combining Mohr’s internal organizational determinants model and Roger’s diffusion theory. Berry and Berry used a model which assumed that the probability that a state without a lottery would adopt one is dependent upon the state’s internal characteristics and the previous pattern of adoption by nearby states (Berry & Berry, 1990). Using event history analysis Berry and Berry were able to conclude that a unified theory approach which incorporated factors internal and external to the state would provide the most complete picture for a decision to innovate (1990). Operating separately, neither Mohr’s internal determinants model nor Roger’s diffusion theory could offer a full explanation for why a state chose to implement a lottery for the first time (Berry & Berry, 1990). However, the failure to incorporate both components would also not provide an accurate description of the innovation process (Berry & Berry, 1990). In fact, Berry and Berry go so far as to suggest that the two components are dependent upon each other (1990).
For example, monitoring the lottery adoption process for one state allows another state to
observe the process and plan for certain risks or costs that they would not have known about had
they be an early adopter (Berry & Berry, 1990). This process of diffusion essentially provides
data and information while lessening the risk associated with the venture (Rogers, 2003) In
short, by monitoring the external environment an organization can effectively increase or
decrease an organizations’ motivation to innovate (Mohr, 1969). The external factors argument is
further strengthened by Peyton Young’s study which emphasized the requirements for social
innovation. According to Young, social innovation adoption is dependent upon three factors 1)
the interaction among actors in a particular network, 2) the perceived risk associated with the
innovation (based on experiences of others who have implemented similar social innovation and
3) the level of success other organizations have experienced relative to the social innovation
process (Young, 2011). Young’s examination and assessment of diffusion of social innovations
within networks provides an additional understanding related to the factors that have an external
influence on social innovation. In short, Rogers and Young stress the importance of like
organizations within a network while Mohr’s premise suggests that internal characteristics
ultimately determine whether an organization will implement an innovation process. Berry and
Berry’s 1990 study recognized that both internal and external organizational factors play a role in
the innovation process and ultimately complement each other during the decision to innovate
phase (Berry & Berry, 1990).
Private Sector and Organizational Factors that Influence Innovation

**Organizational Characteristics.** Structures in creative organizations tend to be flexible, with few rules and regulations, loose job descriptions and high autonomy (Locke & Kirkpatrick, 1995). Open communication is key and leaders within the organization must stress the importance of creative breakthroughs, constant improvements and the discovery of creative ways to achieve the organization's goals. Creativity in organizations is best achieved by the following means:

- The leader should formulate a vision that emphasizes the importance of creativity and must make sure that vision is communicated continuously to all employees.

- A creative culture must be developed using the steps identified below:
  - The organization should contain people who are intelligent, knowledgeable in their domain and who use creative thinking processes.
  - There should be continual training to update knowledge and teach creative thinking skills.
  - The leaders in the organization should set specific, quantitative and time based goals for creative products.
  - Frequent communication should be encouraged among all employees.
  - The organizational structure should be flexible and provide high levels of discretion and responsibility at every rank.
  - Creative achievement should be recognized and not punished for any failures (Locke & Kirkpatrick, 1995).

In sum, creative organizations have more fluid boundaries (Nutt, 1999; Nutt, 2005). Creative organizations defy the dualities that are customarily seen when analyzing the facilitators and the inhibitors of creativity in organizations. Obviously, organizations that foster creativity and support its use will likely have more innovative environments. Understanding, the internal characteristics that may foster or enhance a creative environment will provide lessons
related to how social innovation processes can be enhanced by developing an internal environment that is conducive to the innovation process.

A general review of the literature shows that innovative organizations have effective leadership, individual discretion, effective communication, a tolerance for risk and change, reward and incentive systems and adequate resources (Ford, 1995; Locke & Kirkpatrick, 1995). These important internal characteristics are developed, managed and controlled by the organizations themselves when referencing private sector businesses.

A review of the innovation literature reveals the fact that social innovation is only implemented within organizations that foster an environment of creativity (Ford, 2005; Nutt, 1999a). Creative individuals and thoughts lead to the creative ideas that will ultimately transform into innovation. The competitive innovation atmosphere requires organizations to develop new products, services and processes and these demands prompt frequent calls to pursue creativity (Nutt, 1999; Ford, 2000). There are different types of organizations that are more successful at pursuing innovation than others. Organizations constitute a distinctive context within which creativity might be fostered or stifled. The organizational context needs to be recognized as an important factor associated with a creative endeavor (Ford, 1995). Some believe that there is an innate creativity-organization conflict. Creative processes cannot flourish in bureaucratic organizations; therefore, creative individuals avoid narrow, structured, rigid jobs (Ford, 1995). Most empirical work on creativity in organizational settings has focused mainly on identifying individual differences that distinguish highly creative individuals and their characteristics (Ford, 2000). Since, historical research has focused mainly on creativity within individuals, there hasn't been much attention paid to the fact that there are potentially several influences that hinder or promote creativity among organizations (Nutt, 1999). There are numerous other
characteristics that promote the ability to be creative within organizations at both the individual and collective group levels (Ford, 2000; Locke & Kirkpatrick). An in-depth analysis of how creativity is influenced within people and organizations will allow the research to provide insight regarding the difference in innovation levels between public and private organizations.

Organizational contexts impose a special set of conditions on creativity. Some of the obvious components may be; interaction patterns among employees, the degree of trust among organization members, the design of incentives, appraisal and reward systems, the availability of resources, the culture of the organization, identification of goals and means versus ends orientations (Ford, 1995; Nutt, 1999a; Nutt, 2005b). The modern world can now be viewed as a world of organizations in some contexts, perhaps more than as a world of individuals (Ford, 1995, Hart, 1997). As a consequence, the character of human achievement is now often seen in the light of organizational sponsorship rather than individual accomplishment (Ford, 1995).

Public and private organizations are well-versed in the strategic decision making process in all areas (Eisenhardt, 1997). Therefore, it is safe to assume that traditional processes have been tried on numerous occasions in these areas. For well-structured problems such as scheduling, inventory and facility design routine readymade solutions are already well known and practiced (Lynn & Lynn, 1992; Spillane & Regnier, 1998). Other problems that have less information available about them and are more ill-structured in nature require a different type of thinking (Nutt, 2005b). In these cases there is ambiguity about the nature of the problem or how to transform the current state into a desired state. To solve these problems divergent thinking is required. This means that the organizations need to think of many different potential solutions (Elsayed-Elkhouly, 2002). In these types of situations, creative
thinking environments are needed in order to develop the array of thoughts that will eventually lead to an innovative and successful outcome.

There are several factors that exist within an organization that may ultimately serve to enhance or inhibit the innovation process (Damanpour, 1995). In addition, to the creative thought strategies which should be instilled in the decision makers (although research regarding creativity training and its success is sparse at best) a champion for creative decision making must also pay special attention to the extrinsic factors that may influence the ability of the organization to promote and achieve innovative outputs (Elsayed-Elkhouly, 2002).

Primarily, effective leadership is often viewed as an important component of the strategic decision making process. Effective leadership is, in itself, a broad notion; however, leaders who aid in creative acts do things such as set clear expectations about what is to be accomplished (Locke & Kirkpatrick, 1995). The provision of clear direction gives the employees the guidance they need to utilize divergent thinking when addressing the issue at hand. In addition, effective leaders in a creative environment provide an atmosphere that is supportive and unobtrusive (Locke & Kirkpatrick, 1995; Nutt, 1999b). This allows the organization members to operate in a manner that is conducive to free, unconventional thinking. Finally, the leaders must be able to focus the decision makers on the outcomes (Locke & Kirkpatrick, 1995; Nutt, 1999a; Nutt, 2005b). As mentioned, setting clear goals and focusing on the ultimate end provides the much needed direction that decision makers should take into account during the innovation process.

Next, another organizational opportunity that encourages the occurrence of creative acts, and ultimately innovation, involves discretion (Ford, 1995; Nutt; 1999b). Essentially, discretionary work environments allow individuals a choice regarding their work methods
Individuals that can choose among their assignments or start assignments on their own are more likely to utilize innovative techniques to achieve their goals. This type of work atmosphere requires a great deal of trust among the employees and management. Managers must trust their employee's competence and motives and employees must trust the same aspects of their management (Locke & Kirkpatrick, 1995). If these components of trust do not exist discretionary environments fail to develop (Locke & Kirkpatrick, 1995). In untrusting environments people tend to simply comply with immediate, expected components of their jobs and do not stray beyond the boundaries of their positions (Locke & Kirkpatrick, 1995; Nutt, 1999a).

Successful innovation has also been associated with frequent and productive communication. This communication is not restricted to colleagues within the same domain but can extend to other networks as well (Ford, 1995; Mohr, 1969; Nutt, 1999a). Given the fact that technology has revolutionized how communication occurs throughout the world, one can assume that the ability to communicate across numerous domains has certainly been enhanced. The skill to communicate helps promote innovation as it is essential to broadening the knowledge base of decision makers throughout an organization (Nutt, 1999a; Nutt, 2005b).

Change-oriented management is an important component of innovation because creative thought processes cannot occur if management is not receptive to creativity and the potential for change (Nutt, 1999a; Nutt, 2005b). A nurturing organizational culture helps creativity because it reduces the extent to which people feel threatened when they air new ideas (Locke & Kirkpatrick, 1995). Organizations that nurture creative ideas from employees will implement more innovative processes because they will have more creative ideas from which to choose (Damanpour, 1995; Locke & Kirkpatrick, 1995).
A strategic reward system is also important to the promotion of creative thoughts and innovation (Nutt, 2005b). As mentioned earlier, creativity is motivated by interests and challenges. Contrary to popular belief, extrinsic factors such as evaluations and monetary rewards place pressure on the creative thought process and are therefore debilitating to creativity (Locke & Kirkpatrick, 1995; Nutt, 2005b). Essentially, if an employee feels that they are working on an issue because they have to in order to be recognized; the ability to think creatively is quickly stifled. Overall, creativity results from acts of free will in supportive environments. Rewards therefore should be equitable and outcome oriented (Ford, 1995; Locke & Kirkpatrick, 1995).

Naturally, employees should have resources available that allow them to act in a creative and innovative manner. This includes items such as money, facilities and time (Bozeman, 1987). The information gathering component alone requires a vast amount of resources in order to ensure that it is done properly. Creative thought processes are indeed complex and are certainly expensive in some cases; therefore, the provision of adequate resources can prove to be quite a difficult task (Ford, 1995).

Clearly, the organizational factors that enhance or deter the creative decision making process are numerous. It is important that researchers in this area recognize the interplay between characteristics of creative individuals and creative organizations. These creative characteristics are important components of organizations, both public and private, and will help advance the minimal areas of understanding and research regarding their innovative capabilities and tendencies.

Virtually every creative act involves a novel way of defining the problem and the selection of information that is relevant to reaching the goal (Halpern, 1989). There are some organizations that have characteristics which impede this process (Mohr, 1969). The previous
section identified numerous functions that work to enhance the ability for organizations to act in a favorable manner. However, there are few characteristics that are innate to organizations that could potentially deter any efforts towards creative thought processes (Nutt, 1999a). As previously mentioned, a carefully constructed rewards structure is important to creativity and innovation (Nutt, 1999a). Organizations that methodically and routinely evaluate and implement surveillance structures for their employees do not have a great amount of creative innovation (Nutt, 1999a; Nutt, 2005b). When employees can work with the freedom to handle their positions with some level of discretion they are more apt to think and act in a creative manner (Nutt, 1999a; Nutt, 2005b). Highly critical management and organizational culture also experience low levels of creativity and innovation (Locke & Kirkpatrick, 1995). If an employee is constantly berated with negative feedback, whether it involves new ideas or not, then they are less likely to suggest innovative thoughts and processes (Locke & Kirkpatrick, 1995). Also, organizations that do not have a drive for ingenuity and are comfortable with the status quo do not prompt the development of innovative thought (Ford, 1995). Finally, organizations that have employees that are overworked and overwhelmed with their workload will find that their institutions do not typically excel with creative decisions during strategic decision making processes. Organizations must have a desire for new processes and imaginative outcomes in order to make the true commitment to innovation (Nutt & Backoff, 1993).

**Internal Organizational Factors – Related Studies.** Much of the research and literature on innovation within organizations is pretty clear that innovation is a complex interaction between behavioral, cultural, structural and environmental conditions (Newman, 2001). A review of several research studies in this section depicts how various organizational characteristics influence an organization’s ability to innovate. Individual actors and
organizational culture are among the organizational attributes that may shape the nature of how innovation occurs within an organization (Damanpour, 1991). In 1991 Damanpour identified and tested 13 innovation factors including structure, processes and resources. His research showed that various internal organizational characteristics had a positive correlation to innovation within an organization. The implementation of innovation is based upon the organization’s ability to execute. Internal organizational characteristics that foster innovation may be; adequate resources, the ability and willingness to take on risk, the desire to share accountability, the development of proper timelines and the creation of proper assessment tools (www.ibm.com, last accessed February 26, 2013). The following section will examine previous research that has evaluated the promoters and barriers to innovation processes in general.

In 2001, Amnon Frenkel developed an empirical study of innovative practices among industrial firms in Israel. Because innovation has a direct effect on the economic growth of the regions, he sought to identify the most significant barriers to the development of innovation by comparing the high-tech sector to the more traditional industrial firms (Frenkel, 2002). Frenkel conducted personal interviews with the senior managers of 211 industrial firms in the northern region of Israel. In this interview, the managers were asked to assess the likelihood, that certain factors were a hindrance to innovation. The 17 factors in the list were scored on the basis of a 1–5 scale indicating the relative importance that were ascribed to them as hindering the realization of innovation in their firm: (1) not significant; (2) slightly significant; (3) moderately significant; (4) very significant; (5) crucial. The importance placed by the firms’ managers on each of the barrier factors was examined by calculating the sum and the mean score, thus, ranking the 17 factors according to the relative final score (Frenkel, 2002). Generally, Frenkel discovered that
the high-tech industries were more knowledgeable about the innovation process because they were engaged in that role more often. However, overall the results suggest that the most significant limitation was related to the high risk involved with the engagement of innovation (Frenkel, 2002). In addition, the lack of resources and high cost (thus affecting the time needed for return on investment) were all significant barriers to innovative practices within both types of industrial firms (Frenkel, 2002).

In 2002, Lynne Millwood and Helen Freeman conducted a study that attempted to measure innovative tendencies based on gender (2002). The researchers hypothesized that respondents would trend towards innovative solutions for problems presented in a theoretical format, if they were role playing as male managers as opposed to role playing as female managers (Millward & Freeman, 2002). The researchers developed a hypothetical management scenario and presented a corresponding survey and conducted personal interviews. Based upon the results, the researchers were able to conclude that innovative solutions were more often attributed to a male than a female manager (Millward & Freeman, 2002). In addition, adaptive or incremental solutions were attributed more often to a female rather than a male. This research revealed that there may be other, not as prominent or well known, internal barriers to innovation such as gender bias (Millward & Freeman, 2002).

In 2009, a study of Apple, Nokia and Nintendo revealed that there are various barriers to innovation within private organizations. The researchers hypothesized, that there may be instances where the company campaigns for creativity and innovation; however, the institutional characteristics do not actively support these types of contributions to the organization (Pontiskoski & Asakawa, 2009). The researchers used secondary data to assess how innovation occurred with the organizations. During the study the researchers discovered that Apple took
pride in the fact that they did not perform much external consumer research; however, they still made products that were satisfying to the consumer. Ultimately, Apple had to draw in customer feedback in order to successfully construct the iPhone (Pontiskoski & Asakawa, 2009). Nokia experienced an issue with the “not invented here syndrome”. Essentially, the organization was not receptive to technology that was not developed within the company. Nokia underwent an organizational change and was forced to begin to understand the benefits of strategic outsourcing (Pontiskoski & Asakawa, 2009). Finally, Nintendo was faced with trying to find a way to break into the market by placing a focus on society and culture itself. Nintendo used in-depth customer feedback and research to develop the Wii console. During the study the researchers identified three levels of barriers: cognitive, behavioral and institutional; all of which were barriers internal to the Nintendo organization (Pontiskoski & Asakawa, 2009). The types of obstacles faced during these three innovation projects demonstrate how an organization’s internal culture can limit the ability to innovate.

Pateli and Giaglis published a study related to technology innovation which revealed that a private organizations’ business model and that business model’s flexibility has a direct effect on its ability to create and implement advancements in technological innovation (Giaglis & Pateli, 2003). The researchers used case studies to understand an organization’s current business model. They then identified the influence of the current technology in place and later proposed a future business model that would create a scenario in which the technology could advance and develop further in an innovative way (Giaglis & Pateli, 2003). The researchers were able to develop a roadmap for leading business model change in an effort to facilitate more advanced technology solutions. This effort to support and promote innovation is yet another example of
how the internal environment and its related processes have a direct impact on the potential success of innovation.

In the realm of corporate social responsibility, it is very apparent that both public and private organizations are expected to address larger societal concerns in an effort to advance sustainability initiatives worldwide (Samuelson, 2009). Mahon and Watrick’s (2012) study on corporate social performance reveals that corporations exercise autonomous decision-making authority with respect to its actions related to employees/human resources, environment/operations, marketing and investor relations. The ability to address and administer actions in an independent manner allows the organization to react to the social environment and consumers in a manner that is not heavily influenced by other stakeholders or external factors (Nutt, 2005b). In a similar study, Boon and Ludeke –Freund (2012) determined, using a review of the literature that a business model that integrated social, environmental and business activities could effectively lead to an environment where social innovation becomes an integral part of the organization.

An agenda that aligns business practice with social needs may lead to sustainable development practices (Boon & Ludeke-Freund, 2009). A sustainable social innovation requires an approach that changes things at the company level so that barriers imposed during the innovation process may be overcome due to the nature of the organization’s business model (Boon & Ludeke-Freund, 2009). The premise is to develop self-sustaining instead of profit maximizing businesses, giving space to entrepreneurs and managers to focus their business models on social issues (Boon & Ludeke-Freund, 2009). This concept may seem quite novel and potentially unreachable for the United States today; however, this is just another example of how
the internal design of an organization has the ability to have wider impacts on the social innovation environment overall.

Finally, an IBM Global Business Services report from 2006 suggests that the biggest barriers to innovation for corporations is inadequate funding, risk avoidance, time constraints, inaccurate data and the inability to have flexible boundaries. (ibm.com/bcs, last accessed February 26, 2013). All of which are internal characteristics that can be directly controlled by the corporation itself (Nutt, 2005b). Private businesses are certainly influenced by their consumers and the overall market; however, the proficient management of internal factors promotes successful and effective creativity and decision making as a direct response to those consumer needs (Nutt, 2005b). Organizations who are effectively managing the promoters and barriers to innovation are now tasked with using their innovative capacity to change the current unsustainable trajectories and support social innovation that will move the world’s population towards global sustainability (Westley et. al., 2011).

Based on the research and using Mohr’s internal determinants model as a foundation, one can hypothesize that private sector organizations are influenced more by factors that are internal to the organization.

Hypothesis 1 – The social innovation processes of private sector organizations are influenced more by internal organizational factors than external organizational factors.

**Public sector and organizational factors that influence innovation**

**Organizational Characteristics.** Public agencies have been keenly aware of the importance of innovation for years (Ellis, 2011). While the private sector has been implementing and expanding corporate social responsibility programs for years, the public sector has been slowly initiating its global social compliance efforts (Porter & Kramer, 2011). The social
responsibility mindset of some government organizations can be witnessed in the various types of programs that have been implemented to address environmental and social concerns.

Surprise, Arizona is committed to growing a community that is sensitive to the environment, from improving air quality to conserving the desert's most precious resource—water. At the newly-launched Green Surprise Web, citizens can learn about all of the green ordinances that have been implemented in order to advance the environmentally friendly acts within Surprise. (transformgov.org/en/Article/11486/Green_Surprise_Web_Site_Debuts last accessed on January 31, 2013).

The city of Yuma, Arizona has implemented a new practice for drunk driving offenders that involves the use of alcohol sensing bracelets. The technology, called the Secure Continuous Remote Alcohol Monitor (SCRAM) includes an ankle bracelet that offenders wear at all times to detect the presence of alcohol. This technology, which is now being used in 43 states, offers a continuous level of accountability for offenders. It is interesting to note that this technology is the product of a public-private partnership with Alcohol Monitoring Systems based in Denver, Colorado. (transformgov.org/govnews_details.asp?newsid=1328, Last accessed on January 31, 2013). Beyond the scope of social responsibility there have been instances of actual innovation within government organizations.

In a step beyond social responsibility and towards social innovation, a new concept has arisen that could be a game changer for education nationwide. In his recent state of the union address, President Obama called for universal preschool (Chieppo, 2013). AppleTree, a high quality early education program for three and four year olds from high risk backgrounds, has demonstrated that it can significantly improve the standardized testing scores of its students. It is a research based full day curriculum which identifies students’ weaknesses and intervenes
without using overtly academic techniques (Chieppo, 2013). Another benefit is that successful programs of this nature save money on special education needs in the future for this population of children. Programs such as AppleTree implemented nationwide could change the educational landscape and positively affect issues such as crime and poverty (Chieppo, 2013).

According to Paul Nutt (2005b), government agencies have often been plagued with a lack of data. In a significant effort towards innovation, the District of Columbia has embarked upon an effort to provide services better and faster by establishing a website that will improve the collection of citizen data. Grade.DC.Gov is an ambitious initiative that seeks to create platforms to drive enhancements to both customer satisfaction and resource allocation in D.C. (Goldsmith, 2013). With this system the citizens of D.C. are making a determination as to whether various departments receive a passing or failing grade. This highly visual accountability tool did not initially garner favorable results for the D.C. departments; however, after a few months grades began to rise (Goldsmith, 2013). Surely, this tool can serve to make the D.C. government more responsive. As witnessed, by the passing of just a few months, there were quantifiable improvements in how D.C. personnel were interacting with its customers (Goldsmith, 2013).

Based on the examples of social responsibility and social innovation exhibited here, there are a few items that are quite relevant and should be pointed out: Government agencies are highly influenced by the policies and regulations promulgated by elected officials (Nutt, 2005b). Take for example the Yuma, Arizona example and President Obama’s call for universal preschool. Elected officials create policy or suggest an initiative and agencies must work to fulfill the obligations of those requests and requirements. In addition, the ultimate end users, the citizenry, offer a vast market that is mandated the mere fact that the agencies offer a
public good (Nutt, 2005b). Public organizations do not have to advertise for consumers, they are already in place based on the nature of the services. As such, government agencies are accountable to and influenced by those consumers. The Grade.DC.gov initiative is an example of how the end users can have a direct influence on what and how the services are provided in a public atmosphere.

Public organizations ultimately have a goal of finding ways to do things better, faster and cheaper; however, the requirements to be socially responsible are pervasively evident and government agencies and institutions across the nation are trying to find ways to be socially responsible and innovative all while being better, faster and cheaper. (governing.com/blogs/bfc?cat=Innovation_by_Design, last accessed January 31, 2013).

**External Organizational Factors – Related Studies.** In a case study published by Punita Datta in 2011, Datta sought to understand the social innovation process from inception to its scaling phase (Datta, 2011). Datta conducted semi-structured interviews with the various factors involved in a social innovation process. They included the social entrepreneurs, employees, partners and beneficiaries for the MySME News. The interview responses were supplemented with observations made during site visits. This research focused on MySME News, a service developed to provide customized business related information services for microentrepreneurs in Kolkata’s slum areas. The news was disseminated through a four page newsletter initially; but, was also moving toward a mobile medium as well. The research traced the social innovation process as it related to MySME and was able to develop several conclusions.

- Social entrepreneurs (in this case external to the organization) were key to the process.
- Adequate resources must be identified and secured in the earliest (creativity) stage of the project.
Leadership needed to be in place to support and scale the innovation during its final phases.
(Datta, 2011)

However, the access to financial resources, human resources and social capital all played a role in the success of this social innovation. For social innovation that requires grassroots development, external resources are vital to the process (Datta, 2011). The organizations involved in these types of social innovation processes, look to the external environment for many of the resources it requires to be implemented. The social entrepreneurs themselves often come from within the community and outside of the organization (Datta, 2011).

Keng Siau, studied public tendencies towards innovation by analyzing the roll out of an enterprise resource planning system at a public university (Siau, 2003). Siau used an innovation strategy model as a foundation for a survey which was administered to university personnel on four campuses of a large mid-western university. The survey sought to understand how the personnel felt about the roll out of an SAP system which essentially united various processes across the organization. The researchers determined that the university’s respondents felt that innovation was moderately included in everyday business. It went further in order to provide conclusions as to how innovation was enhanced or hindered by the then current business practices. The research also suggested that innovation involves personnel at all levels of the organization and various external stakeholders and it became a complex system of interdependencies amongst those groups and individuals (Siau, 2003). Siau concluded that further research is needed to prove which characteristics of an organization are essential to innovation in government (Siau, 2003). Innovation in the public sector is an area that has not seen a tremendous amount of research as most research has been centered on private business;
however, Siau’s study provided another example of how public agencies rely on and are influenced by external stakeholders.

In an article focused on innovation champions in government agencies, Steve Winistorfer (1996) identified the various barriers that government agencies face during an innovation process. Often times these barriers are external to the government agency as a whole and therefore; innately more difficult to address.

1. Customers – In the private sector, corporations often decide which particular segment of society to serve. For government agencies the focus is often not selected by the agency; but is instead a mandate. Often times, agencies are faced with conflict by the mere fact that a decision they make in favor of one group could automatically be to the detriment of another group. (Nutt, 2005b; Winistorfer, 1996).

2. Executive influence – whether it be elected officials or the top bureaucrats who are appointed for temporary time periods. It is often hard to secure effective leadership that will support social innovation efforts when those with power typically seek to emphasize his or her own agenda and political biases (Nutt, 1999a; Nutt, 2005b; Winistorfer, 1996).

3. Employee support – whether it be middle management or general employee support, at times it becomes difficult to garner creativity or innovative ideas because government employees have for so long been told what to do. Career bureaucrats often do not have the knowledge needed to incite innovation and it has become difficult to bring this type of new talent into government agencies (Winistorfer, 1996).

Winistorfer’s research, while somewhat dated, provides additional insight into the external components that have a direct impact on the social innovation abilities of government agencies.

Innovation in government agencies is a relatively new and evolving concept here in the United States. The economic downturn of the 1930’s put new pressures on the government for economic relief of U.S. citizens through programs like the New Deal. The Reagan administration promoted the transfer of some of those obligations to the private sector (Phills et
al., 2008). We are now living in an era where both public and private organizations have realized their role in the social innovation and sustainability context. Private organizations and established government agencies can produce significant social change if the factors that influence their innovation processes are recognized and addressed at the initiation stage of the projects (Phills et al., 2008). Based on the research and studies identified in this section, it is suggested that government institutions must address external factors on a much larger scale than private organizations.

The diffusion theory discussed earlier in the chapter effectively supports the second hypothesis which states that government agencies are influenced more by external factors during the innovation process. By the very nature of their construct, government agencies must interact with elected officials, oversight bodies, similarly situated government agencies and the public. For this reason, external influences and ultimately diffusion practices are an unavoidable element of their innovation processes.

Hypothesis 2 –The social innovation processes of public sector organizations are influenced more by external organizational factors than internal organizational factors.

**Internal and external organizational factors that influence innovation.**

**Organizational Characteristics.** Strategic decision making is much like the innovation process because it involves gathering intelligence, setting directions, discovering alternatives, assessing the alternatives and implementing a plan (Harrison & Phillips, 1991). For this reason, the unique demand placed upon organizations during these types of processes makes decision making and innovation comparable processes. In 2005, Paul Nutt published a study which focused on differences between the public and private sectors during the decision making process. Nutt’s premise was that public and private sector organizations have notably different
roles in society and these differences in roles suggest different contexts which will dramatically influence the way in which decision making processes are conducted (2005). Using a simulation of strategic decision making processes among mid-level managers in the public and private sectors, Nutt was able to conclude that private (for profit) organizations have easier decision making processes while public organizations experience more turbulence, interruptions and conflicts (Nutt & Backoff, 1993; Perry & Rainey, 1988). This conclusion was based on the fact that various factors influence the decision making process and those factors present more obstacles to the public organizations then they do for private business. Studies and historical analysis on the topic of strategic decision making have identified organizational characteristics that either impede or enhance the process (Perry & Rainey, 1988). Other studies have identified important variances between public sector and private sector organizations in the decision making process (Rodriguez & Hickson, 1995; Schwenk, 1990). When consolidating this information, researchers can readily identify the explanations for why there may be differences in how decision making occurs in the public and private sectors. Next, below is a chart that identifies a few organizational characteristics, the differences between the public and private organizations and whether or not those characteristics enhance the strategic decision making process.
Table 1.
*Organizational Characteristics.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Influence on Decision Making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Influence</td>
<td>Public Consumers</td>
<td>Oversight Functions</td>
<td>Public sector organizations have to weigh opinions and seek approvals from oversight bodies during decision making processes. Private sector organizations may or may not take consumer opinion into consideration; may exercise discretion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Relationships</td>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Public Sector organizations must collaborate with other organizations; therefore, making decision processes much more complex. Private organizations generally compete with organizations in their industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrutiny</td>
<td>Confidential Processes</td>
<td>Open Processes</td>
<td>Public organizations are subject to laws and oversight functions that require disclosure of vast amounts of information. Private organizations generally maintain confidentiality of their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td>Law, Internal Constraints</td>
<td>Mandates, Oversight Function</td>
<td>Public organizations must make decisions in line with their directives and the approval from the oversight bodies. Private industry must comply with laws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Emphasis on research and analysis</td>
<td>Lack of emphasis on research and analysis</td>
<td>Strategic decision making requires in-depth analytical processes; public organizations often do not have the time or resources to commit to that process. Private organizations generally have ample research and data available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Clear goals</td>
<td>No goals, complex goals</td>
<td>Public organizations often have unclear, complex or missing goals due to the fact that collaboration with other organizations is required. Private organizations develop their own goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Nutt, 1999a; Nutt, 2005b)

Table 1 does not include all organizational characteristics that have the potential to influence social innovation. However, it does demonstrate how Nutt’s organizational behavior studies provide a framework upon which to understand how organizational factors differ in the public and private sectors.

Environmental factors arise external to an organization. They include markets, competition and political influences (Nutt, 2005b). In private organizations the buying behavior of people defines the market while in public organizations the oversight bodies that
govern the organization and the general public make up the market. Since public organizations rely on appropriations from oversight bodies for financial backing; they are obligated to seek the perspective of these entities during the strategic decision making process. Obviously, the need to depend on oversight functions and tax dollars can be limiting to the decision making process (Nutt, 1999b). Private organizations, on the other hand, can choose to acknowledge or ignore their consumers.

Competition for customers can be problematic for public organizations. In fact, public organizations are often expected to collaborate with other organizations that offer similar services and not compete for customers (Ford, 1995; Nutt, 1999a). Conversely, private organizations compete freely in the market. Since, at times, public organizations are prone to collaborate rather than compete; they are required to allow members from other organizations play key roles in their decision making processes. A process that requires input from members of other organizations is clearly an impediment to the decision making process (Nutt, 2005b).

Public organizations are often times discouraged or prohibited from diverting funds from service delivery to collect performance and intelligence data. Private sector organizations often times collect vast amounts of research and data and regard it as a resource (Nutt, 1999a; Nutt, 2005b). When it is time to make strategic decisions, private organizations have an advantage because of the vast amount of information that is available and at their disposal. Strategic decisions in public organizations are often made with little data support and this limits knowledge about useful alternatives (Nutt, 1999a; Nutt, 2005b).

Public organizations are severely limited by the fact that mandates, obligations and oversight from external factors restrict the level of autonomy exhibited by any
one organization (Perry & Rainey, 1988). The external environment is also populated with political considerations. The view of opinion leaders, legislators and interest groups weigh heavily in the decision making process of the organizations (Nutt, 1999b). Public administrators must utilize the art of bargaining and networking in order to make decisions that will satisfy the desires of most stakeholders or reach a consensus. Private organizations innately have more autonomy and flexibility and since they are only constrained by the law and the need for internal consensus, they have more flexibility during the strategic decision making process (Nutt, 2005a).

A strategic decision making process requires that the decision makers gather vast amounts of information and examine various alternatives before deciding to implement one in particular (Nutt, 1999a). Private organizations have the ability to do this type of analysis in a confidential manner. Frequently, due to sunrise laws and oversight requirements, public organizations are required to disclose vast amounts of information. This high level of scrutiny leads to an influx of opinion from voters, interest groups and legislators (Nutt, 2005b). Therefore, public organizations once again have to address the concerns of numerous parties during their decision making processes (Nutt, 1999a).

Strategic decision making processes require that there are clear goals communicated to all involved in the decision making process (Locke & Kirkpatrick; 1995; Nutt, 1999a). Public organizations often have goals that are vague, complex and sometimes conflicting while private organizations have clear goals and the desire to make money is the key overarching principle (Nutt & Backoff, 1995). Goal ambiguity makes vital performance outcomes unclear for public organizations (Nutt, 2005b).
Private organizations have clear authority figures (Hart, 1997; Nutt, 1999a). Shareholders' interests are clearly reflected in the financial results of the business. In addition, all of the key decision makers for the organization are within the business. Public organizations are sometimes not clear regarding who owns the issues they face (Nutt, 1999a). This area can be vague since there are varied stakeholders. Citizens and legislators impose their viewpoints on the public organization and there is very rarely an overwhelming consensus among these groups (Nutt, 1999a). In addition, in public organizations most authority figures extend beyond the directors of the agencies. Members of the oversight bodies can exert an overwhelming amount of influence on the organization (Levine, Backoff, Cahoon & Siffin, 1976). Once more this is another component that makes decision making a more complex process for public entities (Nutt, 2005b).

The characteristics identified in the public and private structures all have an impact on the way decisions are made within these organizations. Combined, these elements develop the organizational culture that ultimately decides the approach that an organization will use to make strategic decisions. The pressures for involvement and the need for negotiation push public organizations toward a consultative or networking-like decision culture in which bargaining and negotiation are stressed (Nutt, 2005b). A private organization is not subject to as much scrutiny as a public organization; therefore, these decision makers can promote flexible, innovative and analytical atmospheres. Clearly, public organizations are constrained in ways that limit what they can do when making strategic choices (Nutt, 2005b). Because of the unique demands faced by public and private organizations, how they approach the decision-making process will vary. Using this same thought method one may predict how an innovation process can experience many of the same influences. Nutt’s observations provide
a foundation for understanding how the different types of influences on an organization can create promoters or barriers to a social innovation process.

**Internal and external organizational factors – related studies.** In 2009 Lawrence Orcutt and Mohamed AlKadri published a study of 109 transportation professionals. Sixty-three percent of who considered themselves to be innovation champions. The study was developed in an effort to understand the common barriers and enablers of innovation within their transportation focused organizations (Orcutt & AlKadri, 2009). Slightly more than 70% of the respondents were transportation employees for the state of California; the remaining were department of transportation executives from other states. Using a ten question survey instrument, the researchers were able to conclude that, among other factors, clear direction, enhanced communication and executive sponsorship were vital to the innovation process (Orcutt & AlKadri, 2009). In addition, service recipient awareness and participation influenced the effectiveness of the overall innovation process. The lack of political support is noted a serious impediment to innovation in this study of public organizations. This external factor has a clear impact on how innovation processes are developed and implemented. This study, while focused on transportation employees, offers an insightful framework for a survey of innovation champions and their perceptions of barriers and enablers to the innovation process which are both internal and external.

In another survey of innovation champions several researchers gathered to assess their views of the innovation process and how it can be improved in private sector organizations. A questionnaire was developed and proposed to members of the Association for Managers of Innovation. The researchers asked the innovation champions about organizational structure, what was perceived to be their biggest barriers during their innovation experiences, what types of timelines were incorporated and if they had adequate resource (Hardy et al., 2011).
The innovation champions from these materials and chemicals companies divulged that they felt that it was extremely important to have an innovation center or innovation champions in place if innovation is a key focus of the organization. In addition, leadership support, well thought out timelines, sufficient resources and a clear understanding of the market were vital to successful innovation processes (Hardy et al., 2001). Once again, in effort to understand how innovation is promoted or blocked within an organization, innovation champions have provided quantitative data that suggest that a multitude of factors may play a role in the innovation process and these factors could be internal and external to the organization.

The types of factors that influence an organization can vary based on the type of organization contemplating the innovation or the type of innovation in question (Westley et al., 2011). When considering the greater complexity of social innovation designed to address broad system concerns such as sustainability, there are similarities and differences with the various corporate innovation models (Berry & Berry, 1999; Westley et al., 2011).

Recognizing that there is shared value in having both public and private organizations participate in the social innovation process, it is important to build upon the research that has begun which attempts to understand the differences between the public and private sectors (Porter & Kramer, 2011). Charles Edquist’s examination of activities in innovation systems revealed that it is necessary to identify problems to be solved before designing a policy (2011). Therefore, to the extent innovation process weaknesses can be identified within an organization prior to the commencement of implementation, the identification and resolution of those problems could lead to a more successful innovation process.

Based on the studies presented by Paul Nutt it is evident that there a variety of factors that influence the decision making process within organizations. Nutt concluded that these decision processes are more difficult for public organizations due to issues such as lack
of resources, high levels of external oversight, political influence and lack of data (2005b). For private sector organizations they experience the opposite scenario in most of these cases (Nutt, 2005b). Various studies in the innovation literature have examined innovation processes and the various characteristics that influence the innovation, as identified above. Types of business models, as proposed by Schaltegger and Wagner, suggest that an organizations’ social responsibility orientation has a direct effect on its ability to be a social innovator (2010). According to Sartore and Walker (2011), after an examination of NASCAR’s consumer outreach program, Drive for Diversity, it was revealed that social innovation tendencies can be a direct reflection of consumer perception of an organization, an external factor. This premise was the same conclusion reached by Adrian Smith (2010) when his study of socio-technical transitions revealed that social innovation processes are influenced by an organization’s core business strategies, an internal factor. Its environmental and social goals can enhance or deter social innovation efforts. However, no matter the outcome it is clear that public and private organizations must address internal and external factors that may promote or deter the social innovation process. As noted with the studies just described, private and public organizations are forging a new path by shaping policy and driving change in consumer behavior. The strategies they implement to address the sustainability needs must incorporate influences that are both internal and external to the organization.

Based on the finding presented in the literature and by utilizing Berry and Berry’s unified theory and combining it with Young’s conclusions related to social innovation, it is clear that there are factors both internal and external to an organization that may influence the social innovation process.
Hypothesis 3 – The motivation to implement social innovation processes in public and private sector organizations is influenced by both internal and external organizational factors.

The Role of Innovation Champions in Innovation Processes

The importance of utilizing an innovation champion in order to have successful innovation is well documented and widely accepted (Bobrow, 1991; Frey 1991; Wilder, 1985). As noted in the Introduction to this research, innovation champions are individuals who make a significant contribution to an innovation’s implementation and progression (Winistorfer, 1996). Champion behaviors focus on what champions do to promote innovation in organizations with persistence and energy (Howell, 2012). Research has not only revealed the importance of innovation champions to the process; but, they have also used innovation champions as tools during the research process.

A study by Vassalis Papadakis and Dimitris Bourantas suggested that while determining factors of innovation tend to be organizational or environmental; another significant component of the process which cannot be ignored is the role of the innovation champion (1998). Using structured interviews and questionnaires, the researchers examined the technological innovation processes of 97 Greek manufacturing enterprises. In this study the researchers targeted the executives’ characteristics to determine if they acted as champions during the technological innovation process. Their conclusions suggested that CEO’s that acted as champions had a significant positive impact on the technological innovation process (Papadakis & Bourantas, 1998). Essentially, a CEO’s risk attitude, goal orientation, power and desire to succeed had significant positive impact on the innovation process if the CEO exhibited positive attitudes in these areas (Papadakis & Bourantas, 1998). Furthermore, for new product introductions the
CEO’s characteristics as a champion outweighed internal and environmental organizational factors (Papadakis & Bourantas, 1998).

Innovation champions are not only recognized for the ability to promote the innovation process; however, there is research that attests to the fact that having an innovation champion will increase the speed at which the innovation occurs (Kessler, 1996). In Kessler’s work a champion presence is noted as an organizational capability that in combination with leadership strength can enhance the timeline for innovation (1996). Their ability to overcome resistance, get resources, “sell” the idea, coordinate activity, facilitate communication and motivate key participants allow innovation champions to support an innovation in such a way that speed and success are ultimately promoted (Hardy et al., 2001).

Several surveys of note use innovation champions to ascertain the promoters and barriers to innovation (Hardy et al, 2001; InnovationLabs.com, 2007; Orcutt & AlKadri, 2009). Their insight into the innovation process of organizations both public and private provides expert detail on the hindrances and enablers of the innovation process. Their unique perspective allows researchers to reach conclusions regarding how organizations should properly execute an innovation process. The Hardy, Hopple Michalski and Wilson study focused on the need for innovation champions for future processes. The conclusion reached suggested that not only were champions required; but, in highly creative, innovative organizations there should be an Innovation Center where innovation champions are centered and available to support the organization in all of its innovation efforts.

As described in Chapter 1, an innovation champion is not just anyone in the organization. There are certain traits and abilities that must be exhibited by these individuals in order for them to successfully support an innovation process. Jane Howell studied 72 innovations in 38
companies and was able to identify the traits that distinguished an effective innovation champion from an ineffective one (2005). Howell asserts that their personal characteristics and behaviors have a direct influence on how they promote innovation within an organization (2005). Howell’s evaluation of these innovations revealed that effective innovation champions use their personality traits to work with their internal and external networks to persuade stakeholders to support the innovation process (Howell, 2005). Coming up with new ideas is not as difficult as selecting and converting them to development projects and an innovation champion’s role is to do just that (Juruzelski, Holdman & Loehr, 2013). The key to innovation success for organizations is to have the right people in place to manage the process using experience and judgment to make the required decisions (Juruzelski et al., 2013). Based on the literature, it appears that innovation champions are considered to be essential components of the innovation process. This leads to the fourth hypothesis:

Hypothesis 4 – Organizations that have a high motivation to implement social innovation processes believe that the use of innovation champions is important.

Summary

The research reveals that there are numerous factors that contribute to an innovation process. These elements could be internal or external to an organization. Given the complexity of social innovation, with its innately business and social characteristics, Unified Theory provides an effective framework for understanding how internal determinants and external influences both play a role in the innovation process. As several researchers have indicated, given the different contexts of public and private organizations; generalizing across sectors is impracticable (Nutt, 2005; Papadakis & Barwise, 1998). Therefore, this research will further
expand the innovation literature by offering concrete conclusions regarding the major influences on public and private organizations and their social innovation processes.
Chapter 3: Methodology

This chapter describes the methodology and research design utilized in this study. Specifically, it will address the respondent population, the data collection method, research questions, hypotheses, null hypotheses, independent and dependent variables and the types of statistical analyses used in order to develop the study’s conclusions. A growing trend in social science research is the use of mixed method approaches. According to Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998), debate regarding superiority of quantitative versus qualitative research methods has been ongoing for several decades with the thought that quantitative based research is superior. These methodological debates have culminated with the evolution of the mixed methods approach which is based on the premise that qualitative and quantitative methods are compatible (Howe, 1988). This study combined quantitative and qualitative approaches in order to take advantage of the known benefits of a mixed methods process touted by Tashakkori and Teddlie (2009), which is that mixed methods approaches may allow a researcher to simultaneously address confirmatory and exploratory questions with both quantitative and qualitative methods. Because social innovation is such a novel concept in the social research literature, an effort to explore the phenomenon with diverse tools could only prove to augment the research process and ultimately, its conclusions.

The mixed methods research tradition is not as well-known as either the qualitative and quantitative concepts because it has only emerged in the last 20 to 25 years (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2009). However, there are clear understandings related to the various approaches one may utilize when pursuing a mixed methods methodology. This study utilized the sequential mixed methods approach, in which the qualitative portion of the research will follow the quantitative exercise. By using this arrangement, emphasis is placed on the quantitative piece of
the methodology. The qualitative components will follow to further enhance and offer support to the conclusions reached during the quantitative segment of the study (Bryman, 2012). The diagram below illustrates the mixed method approach that will be used in this study.

![Mixed Methods Diagram](image)

*Figure 4.* Mixed Methods Diagram. Creswell, 2003.

Other approaches for mixed method processes place an emphasis on the qualitative portion of the research and still others may have equal emphasis on the qualitative and quantitative portions (Bryman, 2012). For this study the mixed methods approach provides the following advantages: As previously mentioned, the mixed methods approach allowed the opportunity for exploratory and confirmatory questions. It provided the ability to make better and stronger inferences; and it allowed for a greater assortment of divergent views (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2009).
As indicated by the capitalization in the diagram, the quantitative portion took precedence and occurred before the qualitative segment of the research for this study. This mixed methods approach will endeavor to answer the following questions:

- **Research Question 1**: Do internal organizational factors have more of an influence on social innovation processes of private sector organizations than external organizational factors?
- **Research Question 2**: Do external organizational factors have more of an influence on social innovation processes of public sector organizations than internal organizational factors?
- **Research Question 3**: Are public and private sector organizations’ motivation to implement social innovation influenced by both internal and external organizational factors?
- **Research Question 4**: Do organizations with a high motivation to implement social innovation processes believe innovation champions are important to the social innovation process?

**Quantitative Research**

Quantitative methods are important analytical tools because they give researchers the ability to count and provide statistics related to a specific occurrence (Nardi, 2006). The quantitative portion of this study was implemented using a survey of innovation champions that work in public and private organizations. While each individual may not have the official title of innovation champion; the study used respondents who are responsible for managing innovation processes within their organizations. As defined, the respondents will exemplify a convenience sample, or one in which the respondents are selected by virtue of their mere availability (Bryman, 2012). Convenience sampling is a type of non-probability sampling that will be used in this research due to the fact that individuals with the knowledge of innovation champions is not a characteristic that can be applied to society at large. The limitations of convenience
sampling are discussed in Chapter 1 and while the results will not be generalizable to society at large; the insight this research will provide will allow for a greater understanding of social innovation differences in the public versus private sectors. The survey will be administered using an online survey tool, RedCap, for ease of administration. The questionnaire design was substantially based on previously executed surveys; specifically as detailed in chapter 4. According to Floyd Fowler (1993), the use of questions that have been used in the past is advantageous because the measures have essentially been tested. The survey will consist of close ended questions whose aim is to determine if there are innate differences in the types of influence that public and private sector organizations experience during the social innovation process.

**Population.** This study focused on innovation champions as participants. The literature on social innovation stresses the importance of leadership. The literature also shows that individuals, who drive innovation as innovation champions, are important leaders during the social innovation process (Howell, 2012; Winistorfer, 1996). They are important because they proactively try to solve problems before they become crises, they take opposition seriously and deal with it forthrightly through persuasion or accommodation, and they develop a clear vision of innovation and stay focused (Borins, 2000). According to Mary Siegfried, creating an innovative culture requires multiple steps and having champions for innovation is a key component because they promote, encourage, support and drive the innovation. Organizations that are serious about social innovation have individuals that play this role (2011). This study recognized the importance of innovation champions and therefore targeted them specifically to be participants in this study. The respondents for this research were obtained using contact information available from conference attendee lists for the Association for Managers of Innovation, the Stage Gate
Summit conference, the New Jersey Sustainability Conference and the Harvard Innovators Insights network for Government Innovation. There were a total of 356 invitations sent by email. Two hundred eighty invitations were emailed to valid email addresses and 148 respondents submitted fully completed surveys. Seventy-six provided no response at all since they were invalid email addresses or were out of office. The initial invitation to participate in the survey was sent during the 2013 government shutdown. Approximately 120 out of office responses were received related to the shut down; however, additional invitations were sent once the shutdown ended to those respondents. Responses rates were initially low and the timing of the survey was extended by two weeks and two additional requests for participation were mailed during the open survey period.

**Quantitative data collection.** This research collected data using a survey tool and followed up with a semi-structured interview with a subset of the respondents. The beginning of the survey provided respondents with an explanation of the purpose of the study. In addition, a definition of social innovation was provided with current examples of a social innovation. The survey tool, attached as Appendix 1, gathered information related to the innovation champion, the type of organization they represent, and the types of social innovation processes that occur within their organizations; Questions 1, 2 and 4. Survey questions 9-11 prompted the respondent to make an assessment regarding their organization’s last social innovation process and the number of barriers encountered during that process. Also, the respondents were asked to provide information related to whether their organization has a formal social responsibility program; question 3. In addition, the survey asked the respondents to identify the level of influence various organizational factors have on the social innovation process; Questions 12-24. Finally, the
survey asked the innovation champions to assess the importance of the use of innovation champions during the social innovation process; Question 25.

**Key variables.** The review of the literature revealed that there are numerous factors that influence innovation processes generally (Berry & Berry, 1990; Mohr, 1969; Nutt, 1999a; Nutt, 2005b; Rogers, 2003). These organizational factors can be internal or external to the organization (Berry & Berry, 1990). In order to understand how innovation champions view the influence of these factors on their organizations a question related to each of internal and external factors is reflected in the survey instrument. The variables are identified in Table 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Factors</th>
<th>Internal/External Influence</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Risk Tolerance</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>The importance of the organization’s willingness to accept any level of risk (Orcutt &amp; AlKadri, 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leadership Support</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Leadership and other management support of social innovation concepts (Buswick, 1990; Papadakis and Bourantas, 1998).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Human Resources</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Availability of individuals to work on the social innovation (Mohr, 1969).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Clear Objectives</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Goals and objectives communicated clearly throughout the social innovation process (Nutt, 2005b; Orcutt &amp; AlKadri, 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organizational Structure</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Organization’s ability to maintain flexibility and accept change as required (Mohr, 1969).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Availability of Data</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Research and information available to make informed decisions. (Nutt, 1999a; Nutt; 2005b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Legal Environment</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Legal requirements and laws (Nutt, 1999a; Nutt; 2005b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Network Participation</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Organization’s ability to interact with stakeholders within its network (Young, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Perceived Benefits</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Organization’s perception that the social innovation may produce benefits for the organization. (Mohr, 1969; Orcutt &amp; AlKadri, 2009; Rogers, 2003).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Incentives</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Incentives from government to implement social innovation. (Orcutt &amp; AlKadri, 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Competition</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>An organization’s desire to implement a social innovation before a competitor has the chance to engage in a particular social innovation (Nutt, 1999a; Nutt, 2005b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Consumer/user opinion</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>The importance of consumer and user opinion of the organization’s social innovation actions (Ford, 1995; Locke, 1995; Orcutt &amp; AlKadri, 2009).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using these organizational factors the survey (Questions 12-24) asked the innovation champions to rate, using a 5 point Likert scale (very unimportant to very important), the importance of the above mentioned organizational factors on their organization’s social innovation processes. These independent variables were used to test the hypotheses for research questions 1-3. The data analysis allowed the research to conclude whether factors internal or external to the organization were more influential in the private versus public sectors.

Research questions 3 and 5 utilized a variable that identifies an organization’s motivation to innovate. Mohr (1969) describes the factors that influence an organization as one of the strongest predictors of innovation in the sense of readiness to adopt new patterns of behavior. When relating this concept to today’s practice of social innovation, a researcher must examine the general social responsibility literature as social innovation, is a somewhat new concept. Corporate Social Performance, (CSP) is a theory that has been has been gaining considerable interest by corporations, groups and governments (Ruf, Muralidhar & Paul, 1998). Since the development of social responsibility programs, there has been an effort to understand how best to measure the actions of organizations managing social responsibility programs. A multitude of the literature suggests that the only effective way to measure corporate social performance is to measure outcomes (Wood, 1991). There are several examples in the literature which have attempted to provide a framework for the measurement of socially responsible actions. Some attempts at measurement have used reputational surveys of consumers or the general public to assess an organization’s performance (Belkaoui & Karpik, 1989). Other attempts at measurement involved reviewing an organization’s corporate responsibility literature, financial reports and websites to determine how they performed (Freedman & Jaggi, 1982). However, this content analysis has its limitations since the only information reviewed was the information that
the organizations wanted the public to believe they were doing (Kedia & Kuntz, 1981). Other attempts at measurement focused on environmental impact and reviewed governmental pollution indices. (Freedman & Jaggi, 1982). Finally, some research has attempted to measure research and development spending in hopes of attaining a sense of measurement of innovation (Autant-Bernard, 2010). The literature presents solid reasoning for why measurement of social performance should be based on outcomes. Given that reasoning, this research used the performance based approach to equate motivation to innovate with the number of social innovations instituted by an organization in the last 3 years. In addition, the motivation to be socially innovative can also be expressed through an organizations’ implementation of a formal social responsibility program. The term motivation is used in this research and is premised on Mohr’s model which suggests that readiness to innovate is reflective of an ability to overcome obstacles (Mohr, 1969). In this study, motivation equates to the actual engagement in social innovation processes. Organizations that are engaged are indeed motivated, and this study sought to understand the perspective of organizations that are actively involved in social innovation processes. Organizations that have formal social responsibility programs have acknowledged the importance of their organization’s role in supporting and enhancing society as a whole (Porter & Kramer, 2011). Wetcher-Hendricks explains that combining data points that pertain to the same variable to create a new indicator results in a collective variable that ultimately creates a stronger indicator for the variable being tested (2011). Essentially, the more social innovations an organization has developed coupled with an affirmative development of a social responsibility program are values that can be combined to indicate that an organization is motivated to implement social innovation. The motivation/engagement score is not unlike the numerous innovation scorecards used by organizations today to assess their progress in
becoming more innovative in various areas. These scorecards measure numerous components of an organization’s innovation programs and practices. A recent report by Enrico Giovannini recognized that measurement of social innovation is difficult and hardly defined; therefore, measuring what is tangible in the form of an organization’s actual performance will provide the most detail possible in an effort to fully understand the work that is being done (Giovannini, 2012).

**Research Questions, Hypotheses, Variables and Data Analysis Techniques**

This section identifies each of the research questions contained in this study as well as the hypotheses, independent and dependent variables. Research questions 1 and 2 attempted to determine if internal organizational factors have more of an influence on private sector organizations and if external organizational factors have more of an influence on public sector organizations. The literature suggested that private sector organizations would base their social innovation decisions on internal factors and public sector organizations would commit to social innovation processes based upon influences from external factors. In order to test these hypotheses the survey tool (See Appendix 1, questions 12-24) asked that respondents rate the level of influence of specific organizational factors on social innovation processes within their organizations. The variables associated with this question involve a categorical independent variable, which is the sector the respondent is employed in, and a continuous dependent variable, which is the influence of the organizational factor (Cramer, 1994; Wetcher-Hendricks, 2011). The distinction between internal and external factors is one that this research ultimately developed based on previous literature and studies and can therefore be further described as researcher-developed categorical variables (Wetcher-Hendricks, 2011). The variable table depicted earlier in this chapter is the coding scheme used during the data analysis. The dependent variable in research questions 1 and 2 will be the result of responses set forth on a 5
point Likert scale in questions 12-24 of the survey instrument. Unlike categorical variables, continuous variables identify response answers according to positions along a sliding scale of values (Cramer, 1994; Nardi, 2006). Categorical variables sort subjects according to common characteristics and can either be very straightforward such as right or left-handedness to more complex such as distinguishing those in different tax brackets (Nardi, 2006; Wetcher-Hendricks, 2011). In this case it is the basic distinction between public and private sectors. Data analysis, when applied to these values can be used to identify concrete relationships (Nardi, 2006). Based on the types of variables involved in research questions 1 and 2, an independent samples t test was used for the data analysis. Using this form of t test the research was able to provide a comparison for the mean influence value associated with organizational factors for the public sector versus the mean influence value associated with organizational factors for the private sector.

Research question 3 sought to determine if an organization’s motivation to implement social innovation was influenced by both internal and external organizational factors. This study predicted that an organization’s motivation to implement social innovation processes is influenced by both internal and external organizational factors. Research question 3 was the first of two research questions that used a variable specifically designed to assess whether an organization had a higher or lower level of participation in social innovation. In order to construct this variable, the researcher combined the values of two variables:

- Question #3 of the survey instrument asked the respondent to indicate whether their organization had a formal social responsibility program.
- Question #5 of the survey instrument asked the respondent to indicate how many social innovations their organization has undertaken during the last 3 years.
The researcher’s assumption was that the presence of a social responsibility program coupled with the actual enactment of social innovation processes would identify those organizations that are actively involved in social innovation practices and therefore exhibit a propensity to participate in and continue to implement social innovation. There is certainly a possibility that an organization could have a sense of motivation to participate in social innovation processes; however, could not affirmatively answer Question #3 or #5 of the survey. According to Mohr’s internal determinants model, when the motivation is present, the likelihood of pursuing innovation increases (Mohr, 1969). Those organizations that are motivated will likely have taken steps to participate in the social innovation process. Therefore, using a performance based approach the combined values of these two variables became a new variable entitled motivation/engagement score. This multiple indicators variable was used in two linear regression analyses in order to determine which independent variable, organizational factors, had an influence on the multiple indicators value, motivation/engagement score. Uncovering which independent variables are contributing more or less to the explanations of the dependent variable is accomplished by a regression analysis (Nardi, 2006). Using linear regression analysis the data results will be able to provide information regarding which organizational factors are best able to explain the dependent variable; which was motivation/engagement score, in the public and private sectors. Even further, this research will be able to provide supplemental information related to whether or not internal or external organizational factors have little to no effect on an organizations’ motivation/engagement score for social innovation.

Finally, research question 4 used the final question in the survey tool, question 25, to determine if the respondents believed that the use of innovation champions were important to social innovation processes. The literature suggests that innovation champions are becoming
increasingly important to innovation processes; therefore, this study wanted to determine if respondents that were part of organizations with a high motivation/engagement score believed that the use of innovation champions is important. In order to make this determination, the data analysis required a correlation between motivation/engagement score; which is a combination of variables from survey questions 3 and 5, and the assessment of the importance of the use of innovation champions, an answer provided in survey question 25. The motivation/engagement score is divided into two subsets, high and low coded as 1 and 2. The independent variable is the organization’s motivation/engagement score. The dependent variable is the organization’s belief that the use of innovation champions is important. Both a correlation and crosstab analysis was done to determine if organizations involved in social innovation, differed in how they viewed the use of innovation champions. The correlation data analysis tool was run against the high and low motivation/engagement score categories to determine if the belief in the importance in the use of innovation champions is more applicable to the high motivation/engagement score category versus the low motivation/engagement score subset. In an effort to pursue further analysis, crosstabs were used to assess the differences between respondents who were members of organizations with no motivation/engagement score as compared to organizations that did have a motivation/engagement score (despite whether the rating was high or low). The literature has revealed that innovation champions are essential component of innovation generally (Papadakis & Bourantas, 1998). Therefore, this question determined if the same standard applies to the social innovation realm.

**Qualitative Research**

Interviews are a powerful data collection tool because they allow for one-to-one interaction that offers the opportunity for explanations and exploratory dialogue (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2009). Open ended qualitative interviews allowed for deeper insight and understanding
related to specific social innovations and the organizational factors that influence those processes. According to Tashakkori and Teddlie, the most commonly occurring mixed methods combination is close-ended questionnaires followed by qualitative interviews (2009). Quantitative questionnaires can be used to generate large numbers of responses while qualitative interviews based on a small number of participants who generate in-depth information that can supplement the quantitative portion of the research (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2009). For this research, the findings for the influences on the social innovation process in public and private sectors were furthered explained with the qualitative portion of the study. Essentially, the qualitative portion of the study can be used to confirm the findings from the quantitative section of the study. For this reason examination of the output generated during the interviews was an important component of the analytical process. (Tashakkorri & Teddlie, 2009) It involved dividing the information into categories relevant to the research; thus, providing areas for commentary to be grouped and analyzed.

As previously mentioned, the qualitative portion of the research was implemented in order to further enhance the findings of the quantitative section of the study. The qualitative aspect consisted of interviews of a subset of the respondent innovation champion population. The goal of these interviews was to expand upon the social innovation experience of the respondents’ particular organizations. In this sense, the interviews were semi-structured and many of the questions were guided by the responses of the participants. The narrative presented in these interviews enhanced the research by providing qualitative details regarding an organization’s social innovation processes. The ability to probe was an essential component of the interviews. Probing questions are difficult to execute during a structured interview process;
therefore, the rigid nature of a structured interview would not have been conducive to the interview format sought with this study (Bryman, 2012).

There were a total of eleven qualitative interview respondents. Six of these participants were from private sector organizations and the other 5 were from public sector organizations. These qualitative interview participants were selected using the quantitative survey tool. At the end of the survey, all respondents were asked to provide contact information if they were willing to participate in a qualitative interview. Of the fifteen respondents who provided contact information, eleven participants participated in the qualitative interview. The calls lasted between 35 minutes to just over 1 hour. The semi-structured interviews followed a general structure as noted in Appendix 2. To summarize, the interviews were opened by the researcher with an explanation of the purpose of the study. The respondents were then asked to describe their organizations and their roles within their organizations. The respondents were also asked to describe social innovation processes they had been involved in and to describe how they managed these processes as innovation champions. The participants were additionally asked to provide details regarding their perceptions of promoters and barriers to the social innovation process. Participants were also asked to provide details related to the creative process within their organizations, the level of innovation undertaken by their organizations and their idea of what the main drivers to social innovation may be. Finally, the respondents were asked to assess the importance of the use innovation champions during the social innovation process. These questions and others, as the conversation allowed, provided the substance for the qualitative section of the study.
Chapter 4: Results

This research pursued a deeper understanding of social innovation practices in the public and private sectors by using a mixed methods approach. Because social innovation is a somewhat new concept, the quantitative results could be further explained by the collection of qualitative feedback. A survey tool comprised the quantitative portion of the research and qualitative interviews were conducted in order to supplement the results of the survey. A greater emphasis was placed on the quantitative portion of the survey; however, the interviews provided information that served to fortify the outcome of the data analysis from the surveys.

The research was divided into several components and was designed to understand if there were innate differences in the social innovation process based on the sector and whether internal and external organizational factors had an influence on the organization’s motivation to participate in social innovation. Finally, the research sought to better understand the importance of innovation champions during a social innovation process. Using Berry and Berry’s Unified theory as a foundation the following research questions were proposed in this research:

- Research Question 1: Do internal organizational factors have more of an influence on social innovation processes of private sector organizations than external organizational factors?
- Research Question 2: Do external organizational factors have more of an influence on social innovation processes of public sector organizations than internal organizational factors?
- Research Question 3: Are public and private sector organizations’ motivation to implement social innovation influenced by both internal and external organizational factors?
- Research Question 4: Do organizations with a high motivation to implement social innovation processes believe innovation champions are important to the social innovation process?
A majority of this research is based upon feedback from innovation champions provided in relation to internal and external organizational factors. Innovation champions were asked to assess the level of importance of the organizational factors.

The organizational factors identified in this study are a cornerstone of Paul Nutt’s research on decision making. They have also been used to assess tendencies towards organizational creativity and innovation in general in studies such as Wayne Morris’s survey of organizational creativity (Last accessed on November 23, 2013), the North Carolina Innovation Survey and Personnel Psychology’s, *How to measure organization innovativeness* (1955). These organizational factors were used to assess the differences in public and private sector social innovation processes by serving as the measurable parameters which promote or deter the social innovation process.

**Population**

As mentioned in Chapter 3, this study used publically available social innovation and sustainability organization membership and conference attendee lists, the researcher reached out to innovation champions to solicit participation in the online survey.

There were a total of 148 respondents for the quantitative survey.

N=148

The frequency breakdown for understanding public and private sector representation is as follows.
Table 3. 
*Respondent Population.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were 64 (43.2\%) respondents from the public sector and 84 (56.8\%) from the private sector indicating a slightly higher response rate from individuals in the private sector.

**Quantitative Analysis Results**

Research questions 1 and 2 were based on two theories:

- Diffusion theory which suggests that innovation is influenced more by external factors and;
- Internal Determinants model which suggests that organizations are more influenced by internal factors.

Using those theories as a basis and Paul Nutt’s extensive research regarding organizational factors and how they influence creativity and decision making within organizations (1999) the following hypotheses were proposed:

- Hypothesis 1- The social innovation processes of private sector organizations are influenced more by internal organizational factors than external organizational factors.
- Hypothesis 2 – The social innovation processes of public sector organizations are influenced more by external organizational factors than internal organizational factors.

In order to test these hypotheses, the survey tool (See Appendix 1, questions 12-24) asked that respondents rate the level of influence of specific organizational factors on social innovation processes within their organizations. The independent samples t-test provides a comparison for the mean influence value, for public and private sector respondents, associated with each organizational factor represented in the social innovation survey tool.
Table 4. *Independent Samples t-test results.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Factor</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>Sig (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization’s Risk Tolerance</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Support</td>
<td>1.136</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of funding</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of qualified personnel</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear goals and objectives</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible organizational structure</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of research and information</td>
<td>14.238</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal requirements</td>
<td>8.298</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with members of network</td>
<td>10.755</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will receive benefits from external environment</td>
<td>2.640</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives from government</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>2.971</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer/user opinion</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data exhibited in Table 4 allows the researcher to easily identify if there were significant differences between public and private sector respondents’ assessment of the influence of internal and external organizational factors. Based on the analysis of the organizational factors,
the following two factors recognized a significant difference between the mean of public and private sector respondent answers:

- Question 15, personnel – availability of qualified personnel
- Question 18, research – research and information available to decision makers

The group statistics provide additional information related to these organizational factors. In relation to the availability of qualified personnel, public sector respondents had a mean score of 4.26 while private sector respondents collectively had a mean score of 3.90 in their assessment of importance of this factor. With regard to research and information available to decision makers, public sector respondents averaged a score of 4.15 while private sector respondents assessed its importance lower at 3.71. Of the thirteen organizational factors included in the survey, these two were the only that indicated a significant difference. According to the literature, these two organizational factors are considered internal to an organization (Nutt, 1999; Nutt, 2005). Based on this analysis the data suggests that there are no significant differences in the assessment of importance between private and public sector innovation champions in a majority of the organizational factor areas. In addition, where there was a significant difference, the public sector respondents appeared to place more of an emphasis on those internal organizational factors. A breakdown of the means for each organizational follows in Table 5.
Table 5.  
*Organizational factor means – Public and Private Sector*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Factor</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizations Risk Tolerance</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership support</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Funding</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of qualified personnel</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear goals and objectives communicated to all stakeholders</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility of organizational structure</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and information available to decision makers</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal requirements and laws</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations ability to interact with stakeholders within its network</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations perception that the social innovation will produce benefits based on the external environment</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives from government to implement social innovation</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer/User opinion</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As previously mentioned, the means were significantly different in only two cases; however, when examining the mean values alone on a case by case basis one may discern that the public sector had higher influence values associated with seven of the thirteen organizational factors; five of which were internal factors and two external factors. When examining the private sector, it is revealed that the private sector was influenced more by external factors; four to be exact, while only rating higher than the public sector with two internal factors. When examining this chart as a whole, the data reveals that public sector organizations were more influenced by internal factors and private sector organizations were more influenced by external organizational factors.

Table 6 evaluates each individual organizational factor mean score by sector. It reveals that both sectors gave their highest level of influence ratings to leadership support, an internal organizational factor. Competition and government incentives, both external factors, ranked as least important among the respondents in both sectors.
Table 6. Organizational Factor Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Sector</th>
<th>Private Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Leadership Support</td>
<td>Leadership Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Availability of qualified personnel</td>
<td>Availability of Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Research and information available to decision makers</td>
<td>Clear goals and objectives communicated to all stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Availability of funding</td>
<td>Organizations risk tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Clear goals and objectives communicated to all stakeholders</td>
<td>Availability of qualified personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organizations risk tolerance</td>
<td>Consumer/User opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Organizations ability to interact with stakeholders within its network</td>
<td>Organizations perception that the social innovation will produce benefits based on the external environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Organizations perception that the social innovation will produce benefits based on the external environment/flexibility of organization structure</td>
<td>Legal requirements and laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Consumer/User opinion</td>
<td>Research and information available to decision makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Legal requirements and laws</td>
<td>Flexibility of organization structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Incentives from government to implement social innovation</td>
<td>Organizations ability to interact with stakeholders within its network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Competition</td>
<td>Incentives from government to implement social innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Competition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research question 3 sought to determine which organizational factors had the greatest level of influence on an organization’s motivation to innovate by measuring the organizational factors against the motivation/engagement score. The frequency analysis reveals basic information regarding the respondents’ motivation/engagement score. Of the participants half had participated in a social innovation process and/or had a formal social responsibility program in place within their organizations. A motivation/engagement score of 3 or 4 was the most prominent scores among the respondents. Higher motivation/engagement scores of 13 and above were less prominent among the respondents.

Table 7.
Motivation Score Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation Score</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td>System</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The calculated mean score for public and private sector respondents is as depicted in Table 8 below. Public sector respondents had a motivation/engagement score of 6.8 while private sector respondents measured at an average of 7.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you work for a public sector or private sector organization?</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6.8333</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.73297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>7.8444</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9.31508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8.67622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research question 3 used three linear regression analyses to determine which organizational factors had an influence on an organization’s motivation to participate in social innovation.

The hypothesis presented for research question 3 is:

- The motivation to implement social innovation processes in public and private sector organizations is influenced by both internal and external organizational factors.

The first regression analysis combined the public and private sector results. As described in the literature, each independent variable is evaluated in terms of its predictive power, over and above what is offered by all other independent variables (Pallant, 2010). The linear regression had an “R” value of .555 and represents the correlation when all independent variables are taken together and compared with the dependent variable weight. The R square value of .308 suggests that 30.8% of the variance in the dependent variable can be explained by the model. The ANOVA description identifies a significance value of .0034 suggesting that there is a low probability that the variation explained by the model is due to chance. This aggregated model revealed that the only organizational factor that contributed to an organization’s
motivation/engagement score at the .05 significance level is the availability of funding. At the 90% confidence level competition among organizations became significant as well.
In order to further understand the data, disaggregated linear regression analyses were run to separate the public and private sector responses. The separate regression analysis was run first on the public sector respondents followed by the private sector respondents.
For the public sector regression analysis the “R” value of .920 is the correlation coefficient which represents the correlation when all independent variables are taken together and compared with the dependent variable weight. The model summary in the regression analysis output indicates an R square value of .846. As such; about 85% of the variance in the dependent variable can be explained by the model. The ANOVA description identifies a significance value of .001 (less than .05) suggesting that there is a low probability that the variation explained by the model is due to chance. The model summary indicates that the research has presented a strong and significant model.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>157.18</td>
<td>49.252</td>
<td>3.191</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations risk tolerance</td>
<td>-4.277</td>
<td>5.394</td>
<td>-0.357</td>
<td>0.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership support</td>
<td>-8.25</td>
<td>4.896</td>
<td>-0.584</td>
<td>0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of funding</td>
<td>-8.172</td>
<td>3.652</td>
<td>-1.286</td>
<td>0.042*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of qualified personnel</td>
<td>-6.953</td>
<td>4.452</td>
<td>-0.438</td>
<td>0.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear goals and objectives communicated to all stakeholders</td>
<td>-1.783</td>
<td>3.066</td>
<td>-0.204</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility of organizational structure</td>
<td>-1.855</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-0.239</td>
<td>0.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and information available to decision makers</td>
<td>-26.836</td>
<td>7.439</td>
<td>-2.141</td>
<td>0.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal requirements and laws</td>
<td>14.755</td>
<td>2.835</td>
<td>3.108</td>
<td>0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations ability to interact with stakeholders within its network</td>
<td>-17.067</td>
<td>6.857</td>
<td>-1.166</td>
<td>0.026*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations perception that the social innovation will produce benefits based on the external environment</td>
<td>29.694</td>
<td>8.163</td>
<td>2.904</td>
<td>0.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives from government to implement social innovation</td>
<td>3.009</td>
<td>2.156</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>1.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>10.725</td>
<td>2.604</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>4.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer/user opinion</td>
<td>-12.885</td>
<td>4.324</td>
<td>-1.795</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
The research has presented a strong model for understanding the factors that influence motivation/engagement score and the potential implementation of social innovation in the public sector; therefore, it is also important to understand the specific organizational factors that made a significant contribution during the data analysis. There were a total of seven organizational factors that contributed uniquely and significantly to the model. They were availability of funding, research and information available to decision makers, legal requirements, the organization’s ability to interact with stakeholders within its network, the organization’s perception that the social innovation will produce benefits, competition, and consumer/user opinion. Of these seven factors, two are considered internal organizational factors and five are external organizational factors. Using the beta value of the standardized coefficients the organizational factors that had the highest amount of influence on the model were legal requirements and laws, followed by perception of benefits to the external environment and then research and information available to decision makers.

For the private sector regression analysis, see table 11, the “R” value of .680 is the correlation coefficient which represents the correlation when all independent variables are taken together and compared with the dependent variable weight. The model summary in the regression analysis output indicates an R square value of .463 Therefore, about 46% of the variance in the dependent variable can be explained by the model. The ANOVA description identifies a significance value of .001 (less than .05) suggesting that there is a low probability that the variation explained by the model is due to chance.
Table 11.  
*Private Sector Organizational Factors-Regression Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>19.417</td>
<td>14.740</td>
<td>1.317</td>
<td>.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations risk tolerance</td>
<td>-2.811</td>
<td>3.595</td>
<td>-.318</td>
<td>-.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership support</td>
<td>10.760</td>
<td>4.116</td>
<td>1.196</td>
<td>2.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of funding</td>
<td>-5.736</td>
<td>4.447</td>
<td>-.502</td>
<td>-1.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of qualified personnel</td>
<td>-2.114</td>
<td>2.492</td>
<td>-.234</td>
<td>-.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear goals and objectives communicated to all stakeholders</td>
<td>4.381</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>1.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility of organizational structure</td>
<td>-1.915</td>
<td>2.246</td>
<td>-.233</td>
<td>-.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and information available to decision makers</td>
<td>2.722</td>
<td>2.917</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal requirements and laws</td>
<td>-2.399</td>
<td>3.037</td>
<td>-.277</td>
<td>-.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations ability to interact with stakeholders within its network</td>
<td>7.701</td>
<td>3.456</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>2.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations perception that the social innovation will produce benefits based on the external environment</td>
<td>-10.708</td>
<td>3.160</td>
<td>-1.386</td>
<td>-3.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives from government to implement social innovation</td>
<td>-4.714</td>
<td>2.068</td>
<td>-.605</td>
<td>-2.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>-4.018</td>
<td>3.785</td>
<td>-.477</td>
<td>-1.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer/user opinion</td>
<td>3.464</td>
<td>3.072</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>1.128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
The organizational factors that contributed significantly to the private sector motivation model are; leadership support, availability of funding, networking, perception that social innovation will produce benefits to the external environment and government incentives. Of these factors two are classified as internal organizational factors and the other three are identified as external organizational factors. When comparing the beta value of the standardized coefficients leadership support and perceived benefit for the external environment made the strongest contributions to the model for the private sector.

Research question 4 sought to determine if organizations with a high motivation/engagement score to innovate believed that innovation champions are important during a social innovation process; more so than those organizations with a low motivation/engagement score towards social innovation. Both a correlation and crosstab analysis was done to determine if organizations involved in social innovation, differed in how they viewed the use of innovation champions. The Pearson Correlation revealed a negative relationship between motivation/engagement score and the importance of innovation champions with a value of -.017. However, the significance associated with this outcome is .882; therefore, clearly not significant. The researcher then looked to the crosstab for additional information regarding the relationship between level of motivation to perform social innovations and the importance of innovation champions.
This crosstabulation compared organizations with low social innovation rates and those with high social innovation rates. Of the 75 respondents who indicated that they had participated in social innovation processes and/or had a formal social responsibility program, these respondents designated innovation champions as either very unimportant, somewhat important or very important.
As depicted in the tables above, the chi-square test and the Cramer’s V results indicate a lack of significance with a value of .403 for both.

In order to further assess the importance of innovation champions the researcher thought it was important to do an additional comparison of those who have participated in social innovations processes, both at a high level and at a low level, to those who have no motivation/engagement score at all. This means that their organization does not have a formal social responsibility program nor have they participated in a social innovation process. As with the comparison between high motivation and low motivation groups, a correlation and a crosstab was completed on the groups.
Table 15.
*No motivation and innovation champion correlation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Innovationchampion</th>
<th>MotivationScaleb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovationchampion</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MotivationScaleb</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.178*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlation analysis reveals a positive relationship between motivation and the importance of innovation champions with a value of .178. The significance value is .032 which means that the correlation between the two variables is significant. The crosstabulation provides additional data regarding the relationship between motivation to participate in social innovation and the assessment of an innovation champion’s importance.
Table 16.  
No motivation and innovation crosstab.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>InnovationChampion</th>
<th>MotivationScaleb</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unimportant</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Unimportant</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The crosstabulation measured those respondents who had a formal social responsibility program and/or have participated in a social innovation process (value = 1) against those who had done neither (value = 0). The crosstabulation reveals generally that those who have not participated in formal social responsibility or innovation had a lower assessment of the importance of innovation champions. A majority of those who have done so generally assessed innovation champions as important or somewhat important. There appears to be a distinct difference between those who have participated in social innovation and those who have not. In order to confirm this differentiation an assessment of the chi-square value is required.
Table 17.  
No motivation and innovation champion chi-square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>14.562</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>18.826</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>4.595</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson chi-square has a value of 14.562 and a significance of .006. The chi square indicates that the assessment of importance of innovation champions is significantly related to whether or not an organization had participated in social innovation or, the organization had no motivation/engagement score which means that the organization essentially had no participation in social innovation efforts.

**Summary.** This study sought to understand if there were differences in the organizational factors that influenced the public and private sectors. The literature presented several factors that were categorized as internal and external factors. These categories of factors were used to facilitate the analysis of the public and private sector responses. Research questions 1 and 2 assessed the influence of organizational factors by asking respondents to rate the level of influence each factor had on social innovation processes. The independent samples t-test revealed that there were only two organizational factors that rated significantly different among the public and private entities. The availability of qualified personnel and the research and data available to decision makers were internal organizational factors that ranked with higher importance among public sector respondents versus private sector respondents. When
examining the mean scores of each organizational factor in the public versus private sector, it surprising to note that public sector respondents applied more importance to internal factors and private sector respondents assessed more external factors at a higher level than internal factors. Nevertheless, it is still true, for eleven of the thirteen factors, there was no significant difference between the public and private sectors.

Research question 3 attempted to understand which organizational factors influenced an organizations motivation to innovate. The regression analysis was initially performed on a consolidated date set of public and private sector responses. This regression revealed only two organizational factors that made a significant contribution to the model. Availability of funding and competition (at a 90% confidence level) were the only two organizational factors that uniquely and significantly contributed to the model. Disaggregated regression analyses were then conducted in order to understand the data as it is applied specifically to the public and private sectors. These analyses provided a bit more insight into motivation to innovate and revealed that public sector organizations’ motivation to innovate was influenced by the availability of funding, research and information available to decision makers, legal requirements, the organization’s ability to interact with stakeholders within its network, the organization’s perception that social innovation will produce benefits based on the external environment, completion and consumer/user opinion. Of these two factors two were considered internal organizational factors and five were considered external organizational factors. The private sector regression analysis showed that private sector motivation to innovate was influenced by; leadership support, availability of funding, networking, perception that social innovation produce benefits based on the external environment and government incentives. Of these five factors two were considered internal and three were considered external organizational
factors. It is important to note that there were a few commonalities among the public and private sectors in terms of organizational factors that influenced the motivation to innovate. Both sectors realized significant contributions from three organizational factors; availability of funding, networking and the perception of benefits to the external environment were each significant to both sectors.

Finally, the motivation/engagement score was used to assess the importance of innovation champions. Organizations were divided into high and low motivation/engagement scores and crosstab analyses were conducted to determine if those with a higher motivation/engagement score attributed more importance to the use of innovation champions. The data did not reveal a significant relationship in this case. Therefore, the research went further in order to understand if there was a difference between organizations with a motivation/engagement score and those with no score at all (meaning they had yet to establish a formal social responsibility program nor had they participated in a social innovation process). The data was able to conclude that those organizations with no motivation did not believe that the use of innovation champions was as important.

**Qualitative Analysis Discussion**

Qualitative interviews for this study were conducted from November 12, 2013 to December 13, 2013. Interviews were conducted with a total of 11 respondents. Six of the respondents worked in the private sector and the other 5 were employees of the public sector. All interviews were conducted by telephone. Table 18 identifies the respondents by sector and title.
Table 18. 
**Qualitative Interview Respondent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Chief Sustainability Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Sustainability Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Professor, Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Environmental Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Coordinator, Office of Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Manager of Strategic Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Senior Product Portfolio Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the quantitative analysis generated three questions (Q1, Q2, and Q3) that were explored using the semi-structured interview process. The theme related questions posed during the qualitative interview process were (1) Can you describe the specific barriers you have encountered during the social innovation process? (2) Can you describe the specific promoters you have encountered during the social innovation process? (3) What motivates your organization to participate in social innovation processes? An excel codebook was created to identify all of the themes form the semi-structured interview responses. There were a total of 8
themes generated from the interviews. Four themes identified with Q1, 3 themes identified with Q2 and 2 themes identified with Q3.

The chart below identifies the themes developed during coding of the qualitative output, the number of respondents who identified the theme and to which question they attributed the issue.

Table 19. Qualitative interview themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th># of respondents addressing the theme</th>
<th>Question Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Available financial resources</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Q1, Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to network</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of community</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective and ineffective leadership</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>Q1, Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed planning processes</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective communication</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-Private Partnerships</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned in the literature review, there are several organizational factors, internal and external, that contribute to innovation processes by organizations and the level of influence these factors have may be due, in part, to whether an organization is public or private. Based on the quantitative results there was no significant difference between public and private sector organizations and the level of influence an organizational factor may have on an organization’s social innovation process in most of the categories. In fact, the only statistically significant difference between the public and private sector organizations were related to the availability of qualified personnel and research and data available to decision makers, both of which are internal organizational factors. In an attempt to further understand the perception of promoters
and barriers to social innovation processes, the respondents were asked to describe barriers and promoters they have encountered during their social innovation processes. The themes identified with each question are described in the sections below.

The quantitative analysis revealed that there were minimal significant differences between the public and private sectors as it relates to the influence of internal and external organization factors. The qualitative analysis provided the opportunity to gather specific details regarding which factors may promote or deter social innovation processes.

**Financial Resources.** Each of the innovation champions were asked to describe their organization’s barriers to social innovation and 100% of the respondents mentioned financial issues or profit margins as a barrier to social innovation. The comments implied that the organizations may not have enough money to pursue social innovation at a meaningful level or that it is difficult to begin social innovation processes because these types of initiatives do not promote profit. One public sector respondent stated,

> It’s really simple. Funding is limited. So much more of the money goes to items that generate a fast and tangible outcome, these more strategic and wishful thinking tasks end up not getting the financial attention they deserve (Respondent 8, personal communication, December 3, 2013)

It is interesting to note, that a private sector employee had a very similar perspective,

> Social innovation may not directly contribute to a company’s bottom line; therefore, it is really easy to discount its value. There has to be a financial payback (Respondent 1, personal communication, November 12, 2013).

Since each respondent identified financial restrictions as a limiting factor for social innovation processes, one could likely conclude that there is no difference between the public and private sector in terms of money. Dependent upon the organization, the money may be a concern up front or it could be more of an issue when assessing profits; however, it is clear that economic resources play a major role in the development of social innovation processes.
Leadership. The innovation champions also consistently mentioned leadership during the qualitative research process as witnessed by the fact that 73% of the respondents mentioned this concept. Characteristics of leadership were mentioned as both a promoter and barrier to social innovation processes dependent upon the experience of the respondent. It appears that leadership is a cornerstone of social innovation processes and it is verified by the quotes presented below.

When organizations try to execute innovation from the top down, that’s not effective leadership and it will not lead to successful social innovation processes (Respondent 3, personal communication, December 13, 2013).

Political cycles lead to constant, frequent leadership change in the public sector. This lack of consistent leadership means that oftentimes creative initiatives don’t survive. The changing regimes means that projects often change and disheartens the employees involved. (Respondent 5, personal communication, November 25, 2013).

Based on the quotes above, respondents were able to readily identify where leadership encounters issues and in turn becomes a barrier to social innovation processes.

Social innovation should be a process that is inclusive, and the leadership is responsible for ensuring that creative thinking happens throughout the organization. One respondent stated,

Leadership should promote focus groups and think tanks that foster new and innovative ways to think across the organization. This type of activity gets people excited about the work and helps people learn to speak the same language. Social innovation processes do not work without this in place (Respondent 2, personal communication, November 15, 2013).

The innovation champions involved in this qualitative research provided important insight into how ineffective leadership can be a barrier to the social innovation process and once again, individuals in both the public and private sector provided commentary in this area.

Planning. Sixty-four percent of the qualitative research participants identified ineffective planning as a barrier to social innovation processes. The research analyzed in the
literature review suggests that clear goals and objectives is an internal factor that could have a direct influence on the success of social innovation processes.

Haphazard planning leads to the breakdown of social innovation processes. In order for employees to know what they are trying to achieve an effective plan should be developed and communicated to all those involved (Respondent 1, personal communication, November 12, 2013).

Another respondent commented that each participant should be involved in the planning process for social innovation.

For the sake of clarity, each participant should be involved, in some way, in the planning process. This makes sure that everyone on the team knows what the ultimate goal should look like (Respondent 8, personal communication, December 3, 2013).

This type of planning can even be very baseline and take the form of creative thinking sessions.

Team members can reflect and say whatever is on their mind in order to foster non-traditional thinking. If people are shut out of the creative thinking and planning processes they will not be able to contribute to the social innovation (Respondent 5, personal communication, November 25, 2013).

Based on these qualitative interview discussions with the innovation champions, it is clear that thorough planning, that does not involve the entire team on some level, could lead to problems within the social innovation process.

Communication. Finally, while not identified as an organizational factor that may influence social innovation processes, 64% percent of respondents mentioned faulty communication as a barrier to social innovation processes. The quantitative portion of the research identified the communication of goals and objectives as an internal organizational factor; however, there was no statistically significant difference between the public and private sectors and their assessment of its importance during the social innovation process. As mentioned, 7 of the 11 respondents mentioned communication during their interview process. The respondents generally spoke from experiences where they identified communication breakdowns as barriers to social innovation processes, as identified in the quote below.
Communication about project progress and status is not always carried through on a consistent basis and this leaves gaps in knowledge that can prove fatal to innovation processes (Respondent 10, personal communication, December 5, 2013).

They did not tell us what was going on with this one particular project. In fact, some of us even thought it was dead, when it actually wasn’t (Respondent 10, personal communication, December 5, 2013).

Communication vehicles have also been identified as barriers to social innovation processes to the extent they are not used. For example, one public sector employee made the following statement:

Communication is our weakest link. We would like to use Twitter and Facebook more since we only utilize a newsletter and our website to communicate today. I think we could have more interaction that would help our social innovation ideas if we utilized these tools more (Respondent 4, personal communication, November 19, 2013).

Based on the feedback received from the respondents, one may conclude that ineffective communication hinders the social innovation process.

In an effort understand the organization’s promoters to social innovation processes the research as the respondents to specifically describe those factors.

**Networking.** Paul Nutt’s studies identified collaboration as a requirement for public agencies. He asserted that public organizations needed to network in order to have access to more resources. However, during the qualitative research portion of this study, it was noted that 10 of the 11 respondents mentioned that the ability to network as a characteristic that could promote social innovation processes within organizations. With 91% of the respondents addressing the importance of networking, taking a closer look at their comments provides insight into how networking is important to social innovation processes.

It is very important for our organization to receive outside feedback. The new members of our board bring in creative ideas and novel concepts which prompt the entire organization to think differently (Respondent 4, personal communication, November 19, 2013).
Most organizations like to claim credit for success stories; however, the ability to network allows multiple agencies and corporations to receive recognition for projects that have ultimately helped the community (Respondent 5, personal communication, November 25, 2013).

People have generally accepted the idea that innovation cannot be done in a silo. It requires multiple players, each with a defined role aimed at facilitating the end goal (Respondent 10, personal communication, December 5, 2013).

If organizations can enhance their ability to let go of their egos and work towards the same goal, networking would be an amazing promoter to social innovation (Respondent 3, personal communication, December 13, 2013).

Sharing ideas across organizations and networking allows organizations to use the best thinkers and superior resources (Respondent 2, personal communication, November 15, 2013).

According to Respondent #1, networking is important to social innovation because it prompts much needed discourse amongst all those interested in pursuing social activities and generally helps to promote the process (Respondent 1, personal communication, November 12, 2013). Clearly, networking among organizations emerged as an important promoter for social innovation processes.

**Public-Private Partnerships.** Related to networking is a concept that came up during the interviews with the innovation champions. Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) are way of delivering and funding public services using a capital asset where project risks are shared between the public and private sector. (Hawkesworth, 2011). Four of the eleven respondents mentioned public-private partnerships as a way to promote social innovation processes within organizations. According to Respondent #5, it has been generally accepted that the public is weaker in terms of innovation; therefore, partnerships with the private sector are essential in terms of providing much needed resources and ideas (Respondent 5, personal communication, November 25, 2013).

Other respondents chimed in with the following comments:
Corporations are bigger and more powerful than most government agencies. However, public agencies often times have insight that corporations do not. Therefore, private organizations must team up with government and nonprofits to promote social innovation (Respondent 3, personal communication, December 13, 2013).

Ideas must be shared across sectors. Public-private partnerships can help organizations learn to speak the same language to create better social environments across the globe (Respondent 2, personal communication, November 15, 2013).

Public-private partnerships bring together individuals who are interested in driving social innovation. These combinations generate energy and progress (Respondent 1, personal communication, November 12, 2013).

The four respondents who referenced public-private partnerships suggested that these arrangements are becoming increasingly widespread and important. It appears that if organizations in the public and private sectors developed these types of arrangements social innovation would have an additional means of viability and could potentially attain more success.

**Leadership.**
Leaders who are excited about social innovation and drive social innovation within their organizations will likely incite action from their employees (Respondent 11, personal communication, December 6, 2013).

Additional responses mentioned that leadership did not necessarily need to come from the top but general staff members could be leaders in the realm of social innovation.

Project management skill enhancement for leaders at all levels of an organization could help facilitate and better the chances for success of social innovation projects throughout my agency. An organization can build leaders wherever their needed, they don’t have to be at the top and that would certainly help social innovation everywhere (Respondent 7, personal communication, November 26, 2013).

Innovation champions are much needed leaders. They are the project managers who essentially manage the project from beginning to end; and, they are also the champions, or the passionate individuals that attract others to the process (Respondent 2, personal communication, November 15, 2013).
Based on the discussions with these innovation champions, effective leadership is yet another component of successful social innovation processes and this concept does not vary across sectors.

The respondents provided detailed and thought provoking insight when asked to describe their motivating factors for social innovation.

**Financial Resources.** The quantitative analysis revealed that public and private organizations were significantly motivated by the availability of financial resources. However, the qualitative component of this study sought to understand if there were additional underlying factors, outside of the organizational components identified in the survey tool, which influenced whether or not an organization participates in social innovation processes. The qualitative analysis confirmed what was revealed in the quantitative portion of the study. Financial resources indeed play a role in an organization’s motivation to participate in social innovation. Availability of funds promotes social innovation and the lack of financial resources is definitely a barrier to social innovation. Each of the respondents verified this fact in their responses and it is succinctly detailed in the statement by Respondent 1, “We certainly cannot innovate without financial resources to do so. If we had to struggle for funding it would definitely make it harder to put social innovation at the top of our to do list (Respondent 1, personal communication, November 12, 2013).

**Community.** The qualitative responses provided an additional piece of insight regarding motivations for social innovation. A concept that is not innate to an organization and cannot be characterized as an organizational factor is the idea of community. Based on the answers provided by the respondents, it appears that individuals have a growing sense of community and
a deeper desire to help those in need. Inevitably, this desire is reflected in their careers and ultimately their organizations.

According to Respondent #4, there is a general trend in society towards acknowledging environmental issues and sustainability. Because more people are interested in social issues, there is a focus on community and promoting beneficial change in society (Respondent 4, personal communication, November 19, 2013). Respondent #5 asserted that the social innovation concept has been slow to develop; but, since it strikes a chord with human nature individuals are willing to participate in hopes of making a difference in the world (Respondent 5, personal communication, November 25, 2013). According to a private sector innovation champion, social innovation gets people excited. They want to commit to the project because they actually see benefits within their communities. The sense of community motivates individuals to do extraordinary things (Respondent 2, personal communication, November 15, 2013).) Respondent #1 suggested that oftentimes motivation may come from inside the organization. The respondent went further to add that employee interest is huge driver and this is a direct reflection of individual’s desire to promote social change in their local communities and beyond (Respondent 1, personal communication, November 25, 2013). Apparently, the sense of community and the desire to better those communities is a huge motivation for social innovation. It is realized at the individual level and rolled up into organizations and is ultimately reflected in their behavior, which may be participation in social innovation processes.

**Innovation Champions.** The quantitative analysis of this study sought to determine if organizations with a high motivation to innovate placed a high value on the use of innovation champions. The data analysis revealed that there was no significant difference between organizations with high motivation to innovate versus a low motivation to innovate. However,
Innovation champions are like social entrepreneurs. They are the individuals with the energy and passion needed to recognize the social issue and promote the social change necessary to make the innovation a success (Respondent 9, personal communication, December 5, 2013).

Respondent #1 mentioned that innovation champions are vital to the process; and, it is important that innovation champions are individuals that are not the CEO’s or other executives. Other staff may have additional insight and networks that can supplement that skills and abilities of the executives (Respondent 1, personal communication, November 12, 2013). Respondent #3 categorized these types of innovation champions in two roles; the first is the tactical innovation champion that manages the logistics of the project. The second innovation champion is the individual who manages the strategic approach of the social innovation process. Finally, respondent #3 stated that while their executive director acts as the champion for the social innovation projects, once a project is underway each member of the staff operates as a champion as it relates to their role in the process (Respondent 3, personal communication, December 13, 2013).

As revealed in the quantitative analysis, the overall opinion is that innovation champions are vital to social innovation processes. It may appear to be somewhat of a conflict to inquire about the importance of innovation champions to innovation champions; however, the insight provided in the quantitative analysis shows that organizations that have not completed a social
innovation project have a lower opinion of their value. Nevertheless, both the literature and the analysis in this research validate the significance of innovation champions.

Summary. The qualitative component of this study consisted of eleven innovation champions. Six of the participants were from the private sector and the other five were from the public sector. The qualitative section of this research was intended to supplement the findings of the quantitative portion of the research. In doing so, it provided validation for numerous quantitative findings. Primarily, financial resources are key to the development and success of any social innovation process. The respondents overwhelmingly agreed on this point by having 100% of the respondents mention this factor during the interview portion of the research. Second, also in agreement with the quantitative results, is the finding that leadership support is an important element. Effective leadership may lead to successful social innovation process, while ineffective leadership can easily deter the process. Effective planning and communication were also mentioned as important factors that, if not done properly, can derail a social innovation process. Clears goals communicated to all stakeholders was ranked in the top five for organizational factors that influence motivation in the quantitative section of the study. Finally, the quantitative analysis revealed that both sectors valued the ability to network and the perception that the external environment may benefit from social innovation processes. This is clearly reflected in the fact, that networking and community were important themes during the qualitative analysis. Networking clearly helped to motivate organizations to participate in social innovation processes. In addition, a sense of community encouraged organizations to innovate and it was based on a desire to enhance community and global social situations. Finally, a concept that was not addressed in the quantitative analysis but was brought forth in the qualitative interview was the concept of public-private partnerships. Some innovation
champions identified public-private partnerships as a key model for advancing social innovation processes across sectors. This structure is in direct correlation to the networking and community themes that emerged during both the quantitative and qualitative portions of the study. As mentioned, the qualitative analysis was done to further explore the findings of the quantitative results. The interviews with the innovation champions provided important details related to the organizational factors, in addition to verifying the findings of the survey.
Chapter 5: Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

An increasing number of organizations have recognized the importance of innovation to build a competitive advantage (Kessler, 1996). Social innovations are those innovations that lead to sustainable social transformations that may ultimately benefit an organization in numerous ways (Datta, 2011). Organizations must take the lead in bringing organizations and society together in order to create sustainable solutions for society’s ills (Porter & Kramer, 2011). Because organizations both public and private are faced with finding social solutions to global problems, this research sought to understand if the process in public and private sectors was inherently different based on the types of organizational factors that influence the social innovation processes.

Berry and Berry’s Unified Theory offered a platform which suggests that an organization’s motivation to innovate is not influenced solely by internal or external factors; however, it is a combination of those factors that ultimately determines when and how an organization will commit to social innovation. (Berry & Berry, 1990). Conversely, this study sought to test literature presented by researchers such as Paul Nutt which have concluded that private organizations are influenced more by internal organizational factors while public organizations are influenced more by external organizational factors. In an article written by Frances Westley, he asserted that sustainable transitions will require radical, systemic shifts in deeply held beliefs, patterns of social behavior and governance and management regimes (2011). The conclusions reached during this study certainly offer insight into this changing method of practices.

The purpose of this final chapter is to combine the quantitative and qualitative analysis and relate the findings to the overall conclusions of the dissertation. The quantitative portion of
the research was used to make an initial assessment of five research questions. It was conducted using an online survey of public and private innovation champions. The qualitative section of the analysis was used to further explore the results of the quantitative analysis and provide additional insight into the research questions. A subset of the respondent population participated in semi-structured telephone interviews in order to provide the qualitative feedback needed to further explore the research questions presented in this study.

Summary

Social innovation has become increasingly important to both public and private organizations. The section that follows summarizes the quantitative findings for each research question and then explains further supplemental information provided by the qualitative portion of the analysis. The theoretical foundation used for this research was based on Roger’s diffusion theory and Mohr’s internal determinants model in combination. A theory actually presented by Berry and Berry in 1990, Unified theory, suggests that an organization is not solely influenced to participate in social innovation by internal factors or external factors. Instead, a combination of these organizational traits determines when and how an organization embarks upon an innovation process and ultimately complements each other during the process (Berry & Berry, 1990). Research by Paul Nutt suggests that the factors that influence organizations during the decision making and innovation processes differ dependent upon whether the organization is in the private and public sectors (Nutt, 2005). As referenced earlier, an IBM Global Business Services report from 2006 stated that the biggest barrier to innovation for corporations were internal characteristics that can be directly controlled by the corporation itself (ibm.com/bcs, last accessed February 26, 2013). Conversely, government agencies are forced to interact with other organizations and institutions external to their organization and are therefore; more influenced by external factors as suggested by Winistorfer (1996). This theoretical background led to the first
Discussion

- Research Question 1: Do internal organizational factors have more of an influence on social innovation processes of private sector organizations than external organizational factors?
- Research Question 2: Do external organizational factors have more of an influence on social innovation processes of public sector organizations than internal organizational factors?

An independent samples t-test was used to assess whether the level of influence an organizational factor has on a social innovation process differs between public sector and private sector organizations. This analysis was used to test the hypotheses for research question 1 and research question 2. Innovation champion respondents used a scale to assess each factor as very unimportant to very important. The independent samples t-test assessed the difference in means for each sector. The analysis revealed that the public sector respondents and private sectors respondents differed significantly only in their assessment of two organizational factors:

- Availability of qualified personnel – Public sector innovation champions ranked this higher in its level of influence on social innovation process than private sector innovation champions.
- Research and information available to decision makers – Once again public sector innovation champions assessed the influence of this organizational factor higher than private sector innovation champions.

If you recall, the literature suggested that there were several internal and external factors that could potentially influence a social innovation process. Availability of qualified personnel and availability of research and information were both classified as internal organizational factors.
This is the only area in which there was a significant difference between the public and private sectors. And contrary to the hypotheses presented, these internal factors were weighted more heavily for public sector respondents versus private sector respondents. Further analysis of the means showed that public sector respondents generally ranked external factors higher than private sector respondents while private sector respondents generally ranked external factors higher than internal organizations factors (although these differences were not statistically significant).

The findings based on the quantitative analysis do not correlate with the literature; therefore, the research turned to the qualitative analysis to enhance an understanding of the results. The qualitative interviews revealed several themes in terms of organizational factors as promoters and barriers to social innovation. Those topics are summarized succinctly below.

Table 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promoters</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>Financial Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-Private Partnerships</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon initial review of the quantitative research, it appears that the responses regarding organizational factors as barriers and promoters are as varied as the number of respondents. However, a few key themes emerged during the qualitative research and there was an ultimate finding which validated the quantitative analysis. Leadership is identified as an organizational factor that can effectively promote social innovation while at the same time being an organizational factor that can become a barrier if ineffective leadership is guiding the social
innovation process. Overall, leadership is an important organizational factor in terms of promotion and hindrance and this is consistent across the public and private sectors. The quantitative data reflects this level of influence as witnessed by a rating of 4.35 for public sector respondents and 4.49 for private sector respondents; the highest overall values in the assessment of influence. Financial resources ranked relatively high in terms of level of influence scoring 4.13 for the public sector respondents and 4.35 for private sector respondents. In addition, communication of goals and objectives ranked high with scores of 4.10 from the public innovation champions and 3.99 for private innovation champions. Finally, networking scored 3.94 from public respondents and 3.65 from private respondents. The means assessment also showed that the availability of qualified personnel and research and information available to decision makers ranked high, and these were the only two components that differed significantly between the public and private sectors. It is also important to note that while there was only a significant difference between the sectors in two areas, there were a couple of commonalities that are important. Leadership support ranked highest among both sectors receiving the highest scores from the respondents. On the opposite end of the spectrum both sectors ranked government incentives and competition lower than all other organizational factors. To summarize, while the hypotheses were not proven in these cases, the qualitative analysis supports the quantitative data which shows there are no distinct differences between the public sector and private sector in terms of level of influence for most internal and external organizational factors. As noted by the qualitative research participants, there are numerous factors that may promote and deter social innovation and those that play a role in the process may vary based upon the individuals involved and the social innovation process itself.
It is important to note that a promoter which was not included in the survey instrument became a theme during the qualitative analysis. Somewhat related to networking is the concept of public-private partnerships. This evolving concept suggests that public and private organizations need to work together to implement social innovation processes. The concept was mentioned by four of the eleven respondents. While not a majority, it provides insight into how joint ventures across sectors may prove to be valuable to social innovation overall.

In sum, it is clear that there are various organizational factors that promote and deter social innovation. Based on this research, there are no clear distinctions between internal and external organizational factors based on sector. Social innovation is an emerging concept and at this point it would appear that all stakeholders are in a learning stage.

The null hypotheses cannot be rejected for research questions 1 and 2.

- Research Question 1 - The social innovation processes of private sector organizations are not influenced more by internal organizational factors than external organizational factors.
- Research Question 2- The social innovation processes of public sector organizations are not influenced more by external organizational factors than internal organizational factors.

As mentioned previously, there are a variety of factors, internal and external, that influence an organization’s ability to be socially innovative. Regardless of which factors are most influential, the literature suggests that organizations involved in social innovation are influenced by both. This leads to research question 3, are public and private sector organization motivation to implement social innovation influenced by both internal and external organizational factors? A frequency analysis revealed that the average motivation/engagement score was 6.8 for private sector organizations and 7.8 for public sector organizations. Using this
motivation/engagement score variable and the organizational factors influence scale, regression analysis was utilized to analyze the research question. Specifically, regression was used to determine which organizational factors were able to best explain an organization’s motivation to innovate. An initial aggregated regression was run which combined the answers of the public and private sector respondents. This regression revealed only one organizational factor that was significant at the .05 level, availability of funding. The study went further to assess the respondents answers and divided the data into public sector and private sector responses. By splitting the data into two groups, public sector and private sector, the analyses revealed two significant models. The public sector analysis showed a total of seven organizational factors that made a significant contribution to an organization’s motivation to innovate. This group consisted of two internal factors; availability of funding and research and information available to decision makers. There were five external organizational factors that contributed to the model; legal requirements, organization’s ability to interact within its network, perception of external environment benefits, competition and consumer/user opinion. Legal requirements were the main driver for public sector organizations with benefits to the community and information availability following in the level of importance. The regression analysis for the private sector identified fewer organization factors making a significant contribution to the model; however, the perception of benefits to the community ranked highly among private sector respondents just as it did for public sector respondents. Leadership support, however, was the most important factor identified among the private sector set of respondents. After closely examining the data presented by these analyses it is clear that while there are some commonalities among the public and private sector respondents, in terms of social innovation processes, these organizations are influenced by both internal and external organization factors. Schaltegger and Wagner (2010)
suggest that an organization’s business model has a direct effect on its ability to be a social innovator, while Sartore and Walker (2011) concluded that social innovation tendencies are a direct reflection of consumer opinion. An abundance of the literature suggests that multiple factors, both those internal and external to an organization, have a role in a social innovation process. Further, Berry and Berry’s theory asserts that innovation is a product of organizational factors internal and external to an organization which have a complementary affect and are both needed to attain successful innovation (Berry & Berry, 1990). The quantitative analysis in this study is able to further support previous literature and Berry & Berry’s proposition. Internal and external factors both play a role in whether or not an organization pursues social innovation processes.

The qualitative analysis was used to gain a deeper understanding of the organizational factors that influence an organization’s motivation to innovate and a couple of themes emerged. As it relates to motivation to participate in social innovation, the following two factors were identified by respondents, who have participated in social innovation processes, as important to the process:

- Financial Resources
- Community

As identified in the quantitative analysis, the availability of funding has a significant relationship with an organization’s motivation/engagement score in the aggregated and disaggregated analyses. As one respondent noted, “Social innovation doesn’t make us money, or at least not so far. It’s hard to get buy in for significant amounts of money for social innovation projects because there is little to no tangible return on the investment” (Respondent 10, personal communication, December 5, 2013). This assertion is further supported by the literature in
which several studies have concluded that financial resources play a significant role in social innovation (Datta, 2011).

In addition to financial resources factor, several respondents in the qualitative interview portion of the research mentioned “community” as a strong driver of motivation. The frequency with which this was addressed by the qualitative interview participants is consistent with the level of importance assessed by public and private respondents for the perceived benefits to the external environment. Seven of the eleven participants in the qualitative portion of the interview mentioned that a sense of community and desire to enhance the society overall prompts social innovation. As organizations are measured in terms outside of their profit margins; social responsibility and sustainability have become more important to the companies and government agencies (Ellis, 2011). These new measures of social worth are becoming more important to the organizations, the employees and the community (Ellis, 2011). This understanding regarding an organization’s obligation to its community has prompted a desire to be socially responsible and to further develop new innovative ideas; social innovation (Westley et al., 2011).

To summarize, the quantitative analysis identified several factors that significantly affect an organization’s motivation to participate in social innovation processes. While the public sector seemed generally more influenced by organizational factor whether internal or external, it is clear that both sectors experience significant influence by factors internal and external to the organization. The qualitative interviews supported these findings as community and financial resources were both mentioned as main reasons for participating in social innovation processes. This would exemplify an internal organizational factor and an external organization factor. For this research question the study can reject the null hypothesis as identified below.
• The motivation to implement social innovation processes in public and private sector organizations is not influenced by both internal and external organizational factors.

Research question 4 asked if organizations that have a high motivation to implement social innovation processes believe that the use of innovation champions is important. The role of innovation champions is a fairly new concept; however, organizations both public and private have realized the benefit of utilizing individuals who promote innovation within and around the organization (Winistorfer, 1996). Because the use of innovation champions is a growing trend, this research sought to make a determination as to whether those organizations with a high motivation to participate in social innovation believed that the use of innovation champions was important; more so than those organizations with a low motivation to participate in social innovation. The motivation/engagement score was used once again to differentiate between those with high and low level motivation to participate in social innovation. A correlation was then run using those scores and the respondents’ assessment of the importance of the use of innovation champions. These analyses did not depict a significant difference in the assessment of importance of innovation champions between those respondents with a high motivation/engagement score and a low motivation/engagement score. In an effort to further understand the data, the researcher sought to analyze the differences in those who had participated in social innovation processes or had a formal social responsibility program and those who had done neither. These analyses revealed a positive relationship between the importance of the use of innovation champions and the motivation to innovate. Additionally, the findings revealed that those respondents who had not participated in a social innovation process nor had a formal social responsibility program had a lower assessment of the importance of the use of innovation champions. Conversely, a majority of those who actively participated in social
innovation process believed that the use of innovation champions was important or somewhat important. In short, there was distinguishable difference between those respondents who had participated in social innovation processes and those who had not.

The qualitative portion of the research included eleven interviews where only two of the respondents had not participated in a social innovation process. However, all of the respondents indicated that the use of innovation champions is important to a social innovation process. Innovation champions need not be the organizations’ executives or CEO’s (Respondent 1, personal communication, November 12, 2013). However, innovation champions should be individuals who manage strategic and logistic components of the social innovation process while generating energy at the same time (Respondent 3, personal communication, December 13, 2013). In addition, innovation champions must have an innate passion to succeed and a strong desire for social change (Respondent 9, personal communication, December 5, 2013). Based on the feedback received from the respondents, it is clear that the role of innovation champions is important to social innovation processes. The null hypothesis for research question 4 is:

- Organizations that have a high motivation to implement do not assess the value of the use of innovation champions higher than those organizations with a low motivation to participate in social innovation.

Based on the quantitative findings in this study, the research cannot reject the null hypotheses.

**Theoretical Framework**

There were three theories used as a foundation for analysis in this research. Roger’s Diffusion Theory, Mohr’s Internal Determinants Model and Berry and Berry’s Unified Theory each present a perspective on the major influences of innovation. Roger’s theory is a broad concept which attempts to describe patterns of innovation based on circumstances and factors external to an organization (2003). Lawrence Mohr’s Internal Determinants model suggests that
characteristics internal to an organization determine when and how innovation will be adopted by a particular organization (Mohr, 1969). Berry and Berry suggest that the two frameworks combined constitute the most complete and accurate foundation for innovation with the presentation of the Unified Theory. Unified Theory asserts that there are combinations of internal and external organizational factors that ultimately help determine innovation adoption by an organization (Berry & Berry, 1990). This study used these theories and extensive research conducted by Paul Nutt as a basis for questioning and understanding internal and external organizational factors and how those factors may influence the social innovation process in public and private organizations. The data was not able to produce significant conclusions that proved that private organizations are more influenced by internal factors and public organizations were influenced more by external factors. In fact, this research revealed that, in terms of social innovation, the public sector is generally more influenced by internal organizational factors. In addition, public sector organizations ranked the importance of external organizational factors slightly higher than internal organizational factors. The disaggregated regression analysis provided further evidence that both sectors’ motivation/engagement scores are influenced by a myriad of organizational factors by revealing that private and public sectors are significantly influenced by internal and external organizational factors. The quantitative data was further supported by qualitative feedback. Eleven respondents were subjected to the semi-structured qualitative interview and the important themes revealed in this portion of the study were supportive of the quantitative findings. Of the public and private respondents, several themes emerged in terms of organizational factors effecting social innovation processes. Financial resources, networking, community, leadership, planning and communication all were noted as important factors for social innovation. There were no significant differences in the
mentions of these factors between the public and private sector respondents. In short, both qualitative and quantitative sections of the study did not suggest any significant differences in how public and private sectors are influenced by internal and external organizational factors. However, based on this analysis, it is safe to conclude that organizations across sectors experience a myriad of organizational factor influences, internal and external to the organization, during social innovation processes. These results offer clear support for Berry and Berry’s Unified Theory.

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

This research was structured using a mixed-methods approach. The qualitative components followed the quantitative portion of the study in order to further enhance and offer support for the conclusions reached during the quantitative segment of the study (Bryman, 2012). However, the study itself encountered several inherent limitations. The first being social innovation itself. Social innovation is a new way of thinking which is prompting organizations to generate transformative new ideas in the realm of cultural and social well-being (Phills, et.al., 2008). Because the concept of social innovation is emerging and there is much to be understood, testing in many different areas is required (Anon, 2006). The definition of social innovation is broad and there are not many studies that have examined how social innovations are initiated and developed (Datta, 2011). Given the fact that social innovation is a new concept that is has not been widely researched, there are very few noted commonalities. Each respondent’s experience and understanding of social innovation is different. With different backgrounds, each respondent participated in this research with different perspectives. These differences could influence how each respondent answered the questions presented in the quantitative and qualitative portions of the study. Until social innovation becomes a universal concept with a
common understanding, the varied experiences and influences of participants could present a limitation for social innovation research.

As mentioned previously, this study was further limited by the use of a convenience sample. Social innovation is an emerging trend; therefore, there aren’t many individuals that are aware of the intricacies and details of a social innovation process. This study sought to gather the insight of innovation champions, or those who are intimately involved in the social innovation process. However, given that the research only sought the response of innovation champions who happened to have made their contact information available publically, the results cannot be deemed to be generalizable to the population overall. This study was undertaken understanding this limitation with the belief that any insight would be helpful because it would offer some insight into the new realm of social innovation.

In order to improve this study further research could attempt to assess the viewpoints of respondents who have each participated in a similar type of social innovation. The classic experimental design involves 1) independent and dependent variables 2) pretesting and post-testing and 3) experimental and control groups (Babbie, 2002). A recommended approach for future studies of this type may pursue a classic experimental structure where all respondents have been exposed to a similar social innovation in an effort to provide consistency. Some respondents in the qualitative portion of the study mentioned the growing trend of public-private partnerships. A questionnaire assessing the differences experienced during a public-private initiative with the public and private participants might offer valuable insight into the barriers and promoters of the social innovation. This type of analysis is not a controlled scientific procedure; but, one that would be categorized as a natural experiment (Babbie, 2002). These types of experiments also have validity and generalizability concerns as once again there are no
comparability options; however, the respondents would have the same social innovation experience with which to base their observations.

This study purposely sought the viewpoints of a very specific group of individuals. Innovation champions have recently become popular among organizations seeking various innovation processes (Winistorfer, 1996). One component of this study sought to understand the importance of innovation champions. Since all respondents selected for this survey were innovation champions and essentially were a convenience sample, the outcomes developed here are not representative and cannot be generalized to society as a whole. However, the researcher believed that the conscious sampling bias would offer keen insight into a process that is new to public and private organizations. While the split between public and private sector employees was not 50/50; the study was able to effectively capture the views of both sectors so that the responses were not skewed in favor of one sector over the other. The goals of this study was to effectively gather the views of public and private innovation champions. While understanding that the convenience sample had its limitations, the research did provide the insight originally sought.

Conclusion

This research has revealed that public and private sector organizations do not differ significantly in how they assess the influence of internal and external organizational factors. Private sector organizations are not influenced more by internal organizational factors and public sector organizations are not influenced more by external organizational factors, converse to the theories set forth in the diffusion and internal determinants models. Instead, in agreement with Berry and Berry’s unified theory, both sectors are influenced by internal and external organizational factors. This in-depth analysis had an ultimate goal of understanding which
factors, internal or external influenced the social innovation process in public and private sector organizations. Through the survey questions posed, the data revealed some important commonalities among the public and private sector respondents. Primarily, the quantitative and qualitative analysis showed that leadership support ranks #1 in terms of its level of importance among the respondents. According to respondent 7, “leaders that have not learned what is important to society can prevent good social innovation” (Respondent 7, personal communication, November 26, 2013). Further, of those organizations motivated to participate in social innovation, there were three organizational factors that consistently contributed to the motivation/engagement score model in a significant fashion. The availability of funding, the ability to network and the perception of benefit to the external environment were each important factors in an organization’s motivation to participate in social innovation.

Organizations throughout the world are pursuing sustainability initiatives knowing that good business character builds image, reputation, respect and loyalty (Valentino, 2006). Achieving sustainability will require organizations to address the world’s biggest social challenges by creating new business models, new products and services that deliver lasting viable solutions. Individual organizations will not be able to accomplish this task alone (Phills et.al., 2008).

This research revealed that while individual organizational innovation initiatives are very important, there is desire for and opportunities for the public and private sectors to merge to participate in social innovation tasks. The quantitative analysis revealed that a motivating factor for both public and private sector organizations is the ability to interact with stakeholders within their networks. Respondent 5 stated that” most people think that governments are not innovative; but, based on experience, when partnering with the private sector, social innovations
are able to get off the ground” (Respondent 5, personal communication, November 25, 2013).
The literature suggests that sustainable social innovation is a complex task; however, if organizations combine their resources they may be able to make progress in this area. (Phills, et.al., 2008). This research provides key insight into understanding the social innovation processes among public and private sector organizations and has sought to understand where these entities differ and this has the potential to inform the literature in areas where organizations are seeking to pursue network interactions and alternative models for their approach to social innovation. In addition, the data has revealed that the public and private sectors do not differ greatly in how they are influenced in the social innovation realm. In fact, they face similar challenges because both types of organizations are faced with predicaments that are social in nature. The commonalities regarding the source of the innovation may certainly explain why both sectors face similar challenges.

A public-private partnership (PPP) is a relationship where public and private resources are combined to achieve an objective that is mutually beneficial to both entities. History has revealed that PPP’s can combine innovative efforts from the private sectors with new policies from the government to be better communities in numerous ways (Witters, Marom, Steinert, Alcatel-Lucent, 2012). PPP’s are now even better equipped to manage complex tasks with advancement in technology and other communication tools (Lovett, 2013). PPP’s have the power to improve various aspects of the social environment including: transportation, economic development, public safety, healthcare and other social services. (Witters, Marom, Steinert & Alcatel-Lucent, 2012). Faced with economic challenges across the globe, it is important to acknowledge that reducing or eliminating services may not be required if organizations can effectively use PPP’s to change the business model and transform how products and services are
created and delivered. As mentioned in Chapter 1 of this research, social problems are complex and therefore require complex solutions. Researchers have acknowledged that the challenges of the 21st century cut across sector lines and while organizations are not generally made to collaborate in this fashion, it does not mean that evolution is not practical (Lovett, 2013). Take for example, Living Cities USA. This organization is an innovative, collaborative concept that involves over 20 of the world’s largest public organizations and private financial institutions that have come together to provide solutions to the economic ills of urban society. An excerpt from their website:

We have spent the last three years working to determine how we can best serve as a trigger to bring philanthropy, investors and the public sector together to help re-imagine underinvested neighborhoods and find new ways to connect low-income people to economic opportunities wherever they exist in a region. Fundamentally, Living Cities works to re-engineer long-broken public systems such as education, workforce development and transportation for the 21st century. - www.livingcities.org/about

As exhibited with Living Cities and other PPP’s like them, it is important for various organizations to pursue collaboration in order to address the challenges of today’s society. These arrangements can be large, like Living Cities or they can be smaller in nature. Nevertheless, having an understanding of factors that influence the social innovation process for these organizations may only inform and enhance the innovation and then hopefully lead to sustainable practices that better communities throughout the world.

As mentioned, the quantitative and qualitative analysis has revealed that networking among stakeholders and public-private partnerships are important to social innovation processes. The literature asserts that social innovation offers solutions to complex problems (Mulgan, 2006). Understanding how organizations differ when pursuing social innovation in networked or partnered environments will provide basic foundational information for these entities. When examining this research, it is safe to conclude that the public and private sector do not differ
vastly in how they assess the influence of organizational factors. Roger’s diffusion theory, Mohr’s internal determinants model and Nutt’s decision making analysis would suggest that private sector entities are more influenced internally while public sector organizations are influenced more by external factors. This research did not support those models. Instead, the study showed that public and private sector organizations are influenced by factors internal and external to the organization. As organizations approach public-private partnerships or other networked arrangements, it may help to know that organizations from both sectors are significantly influenced by the following:

- Availability of funding – access to financial resources is key driver for motivation to participate in social innovation for both public and private sector organizations.
- An organization’s ability to interact with stakeholders within its network. If organizations have the ability to combine resources and form partnerships with organizations with similar goals, they may experience a positive influence on their motivation to innovate.
- Finally, a perception of benefits to the community is an important motivation factor for public and private sector organizations.

The qualitative interviews identified networking and public-private partnerships as key components of successful social innovation. The literature presented earlier in this study suggest that corporations and public organizations will not be able to create the new business models, products and services that deliver lasting socially viable solutions alone (Phills et al., 2008). In fact, this research suggests that networking is an important motivating factor for organizations. These opportunities for networking may allow organizations to enter into public-private partnerships that will enhance the ability to achieve successful social innovation goals. Social innovation in itself is a new concept that requires the input from all sectors. Social innovation is a direct reflection of the needs of society (Mulgan, 2006). The unique intersection of public
needs with services that can be provided by public and private organizations makes the structure
of social innovation innately different from that experienced with other types of innovation. This
research has proven that social innovation is influenced by a myriad of factors no matter which
sector is conducting the innovation; however, it is ultimately driven financial resources, networks
and community benefits.

The respondents ranked leadership support as the most important organizational factor in
relation to influence on social innovation processes. Effective leadership can maneuver the
organizational factors that may enhance or deter a social innovation process. Good leaders will
be able to discern which organizational factors are most important and address their ability to
positively or negatively impact the social innovation process. Respondents also agreed that the
use of innovation champions is important to the social innovation process. These leaders and
other leaders within an organization are the most influential component of the process, according
to this study.

Policy Recommendation

Clearly social innovation is important. Moreover, it is important to both public and
private organizations. Both types actively participate in these processes. Based on the results of
this research, the sectors are not inherently different regarding the types of organizational factor
influence they experience; they come from sources internal and external to the organization. It
appears that both sectors are in the same position in terms of social innovation. Even more clear,
based on the qualitative interviews is that it appears that the two sectors need each other. Private
organizations have resources that public sector organizations need and public sector
organizations have insight and experience that private sector organizations require. Public-
private partnerships are an important growing trend in the social innovation realm; therefore, this
research suggests that whenever possible public-private partnerships or other networking arrangements are exercised in an effort to promote social innovation processes. If true partnerships cannot be executed, it is important that the two sectors come together to provide the resources and insight necessary whenever feasible. Societal changes come about as a consequence of the interaction between organizations and institutions (North, 1990). This realization further supports the idea that the connection between the public and private sector organizations can definitely enhance social innovation processes and ultimately lead to sustainability efforts and goals.

As mentioned previously in this chapter, there is a clear difference in the assessment of whether the use of innovation champions is important based upon an organization’s participation in social innovation efforts? Organizations have long since recognized the importance of research and development and other innovation programs. In recent years, they have also recognized the importance of innovation champions or other individuals who manage the social innovation process (Hardy, Hipple, Michalski & Wilson, 2001). The literature suggests and this study can conclude that organizations who are seriously pursuing social innovation processes believe that use of innovation champions is important (Howell, 2005). Therefore, another social innovation policy recommendation is that organizations, both public and private, pursuing social innovation, use innovation champions during those processes. It is incumbent upon leaders to recruit, select, develop and recognize potential innovation champions and embed these individuals into the fabric of the organization (Howell, 2005). The skills and abilities of innovation champions have the potential to lead organizations to successful social innovation and ultimately successful sustainability goals.
Also, important to many of the respondents was the availability of funding. The research question related to influence and the research question related to motivation/engagement score revealed that funding is an important organizational factor and the availability of money or the lack thereof can have a significant impact on the success of social innovation. Therefore, as a result of this analysis, it is recommended that organizations that are committed to social innovation create sufficient and dedicated funding to their social innovation goals. As respondent 4 indicated, “you really can’t make progress in the social innovation space without having money to fund the initiatives and execute the plans. Adequate funding is imperative (Respondent 4, November 19, 2013).

In addition, the research revealed that benefits to the community were significant to the motivation/engagement score of both public and private respondents. Therefore, another policy recommendation is that organizations have an active and visible presence within their local communities and other communities to the extent feasible. This type of interaction will allow the organizations to learn about the social atmosphere around them and understand the potential challenges faced by their environments. This type of interaction will help to inform social innovation processes.

In addition to community involvement, organizations that are committed to social innovation processes should also seek to interact and network with organizations that have common social innovation goals. As exhibited in Roger’s diffusion model, the external environment can influence the social innovation process. Both the qualitative and quantitative portions of the research suggest that the respondents also believe in the importance of networking. Networking can enhance information sharing and access to information and data that may enhance social innovation processes. Respondent 8 in qualitative portion of the study
stated that, “networking is important. You can’t perform social innovation without it, it’s that critical” (Respondent 8, personal communication, December 3, 2013).

Finally, it is important to note that respondents in both the public and private sector ranked leadership support as the most important organizational factor during social innovation processes. Effective leadership fosters a creative environment, one in which the members are recipients of clear direction (Ford, 1995). Therefore, a final recommendation is that organizations that are committed to social innovation utilize leadership that fosters a creative environment fully supportive of social innovation. Once the executive leadership is engaged and committed to social innovation this will allow the organization to capitalize on the promoters to social innovation in their organization and ultimately institutionalize social change atmospheres within their organizational environments. Executive influence has a reach that is bit broader than that of innovation champions. While executive leadership can act innovation champions, the leadership at the top essentially set the tone for the organization and therefore exercise more influence (Nutt, 1995). If an organization has a sincere interest in social innovation, the tone at the top should be reflective of this commitment.

As organizations gain a deeper appreciation for the complexity of global issues, an understanding that social innovations are complex, and sophisticated solutions are required, will ultimately be the key to sustainability (Alvord, Brown & Christine, 2004). An organization’s relationships with its employees, its communities, its customers and the physical environment; define its cultural and social well-being, which are the indicators of successful levels of sustainability. (Phills et al, 2008). Sustainability initiatives are complex solutions to complex problems (Valentino, 2006). Therefore, it is not surprising that social innovation, as a component of sustainability encompasses various factors. As expectations of organizations
continue to grow and evolve, social innovation will become more practiced and better understood. This research can safely conclude that public and private sector organizations face a similar predicament when addressing social innovation. Both sectors are influenced by a variety of factors; however, if entities merge across sectors they may be in a better position to successfully address the social issues at hand. Understanding how organizations are influenced, whether internal or external, will allow organizations to better plan their social innovation processes; therefore, leading to better opportunities for success and ultimately sustainable social innovation.
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Appendix A

Social Innovation - A survey of Innovation Champions

Social innovation is an important business driver for many organizations both public and private. As private sector companies and public sector entities embark upon social innovation processes it is important to understand which organizational factors are barriers and promoters to the process.

This survey of individuals who are intricately involved in those processes will endeavor to enhance the general understanding of social innovation and how it occurs.

Your participation is deeply appreciated!

The purpose of this survey is to collect information about social innovation programs in your organization. This study will seek to identify the influence of various internal and external organizational factors on social innovation processes. Please answer all questions.

Social Innovation, for the purposes of this survey, is defined as solutions to immediate social problems that can mobilize ideas, capacities, resources and social arrangements required for sustainable social transformations. Examples of social innovation are microcredit programs and universal early childhood education programs.

1. Do you work for a public sector or private sector organization?  
   - Public  
   - Private

2. What is your job title?

3. Does your organization have a formal social responsibility program? Social responsibility, also known as corporate responsibility, can be defined as a mechanism for entities to voluntarily integrate community and environmental concerns into their operations; thus, producing goods and services in a way that is not harmful to society or the environment.
   - Yes
   - No
The following questions will be used to assess the history of social innovation processes within your organization.

4 During the last 3 years, January 1, 2010 – December 31, 2012, did your organization introduce any socially innovative products, processes or services? Yes ☐ No ☐

Once again, social innovation, for the purposes of this survey, is defined as solutions to immediate social problems that can mobilize ideas, capacities, resources and social arrangements required for sustainable social transformations. Examples of social innovation are microcredit programs and universal early childhood education programs.

5 If you answered No, to question 4 please proceed to Question 12. If you answered Yes, to Question 4; how many social innovations has your organization undertaken during the last 3 years?

160
Of those social innovations identified above, how many were considered incremental, major or transformative?

Please select one checkbox for each level.

Incremental - small changes which provide continuous improvement for the organization

Major - a demonstrably new product process or service; slightly beyond improved

Transformative - innovation that creates new bases of performance and changes an entire industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>more than 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Incremental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Transformative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the last social innovation process implemented by your organization in mind, rank the number of barriers you encountered at the social innovation level (i.e. incremental, major or transformative) that corresponds with the organization's last social innovation process.

Types of barriers to innovation:
a) Organizational risk aversion
b) Stiff legal requirements
c) Lack of clear goals
d) Lack of leadership support
e) Inadequate funding

Please rank your assessment using the following scale:
Low: 0-1 barrier encountered
Medium: 2-3 barriers encountered
High: 4-5 barriers encountered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 Incremental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Transformative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rate the following internal and external organizational factors in terms of their level of influence (positive or negative) on an organization's implementation of social innovation processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Very Unimportant</th>
<th>Somewhat Unimportant</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization's risk tolerance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of qualified personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear goals and objectives communicated to all stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility of organizational structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and information available to decision makers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal requirements and laws</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization's ability to interact with stakeholders within its network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization's perception that the social innovation will produce benefits based on the external environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives from government to implement social innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer/user opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last question in this survey will be used to assess your opinion on the use of innovation champions.

Innovation Champions are individuals tasked with advocating the introduction of an innovation and directly or indirectly motivating others to support or use it.

Please identify your assessment of the importance of the use of social innovation champions during a social innovation process?

- Very Unimportant
- Somewhat Unimportant
- Neutral
- Somewhat Important
- Very Important
Follow Up
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Appendix B

Semi-Structured Qualitative Interview Questions:

- How important is social innovation? Is it a key objective within your organization?
- Please describe your role and obligations in the social innovation process?
- Specifically describe what you consider to be your organization’s barriers to the social innovation process?
- Specifically describe what you consider to be your organization’s promoters to the social innovation process. How are innovative and creative ideas generated within your organization?
- What organizational factors help or hinder the social innovation process within your organizations?
- What motivates your organization to participate in social innovation processes?
- When and how do you work with other organizations during a social innovation process?
- What do you believe can be done to improve your organization’s social innovation processes?
### Appendix C

#### Qualitative Interview Codebook

**Question:** Can you describe the specific barriers you have encountered during the social innovation process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Social innovation may not directly contribute to a company’s bottom line; therefore, it is really easy to discount its value. There has to be financial payback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bureaucracy and hierachical levels create a lot of complication in organizations generally; but, when you have ineffective leadership running innovation process you are guaranteed failure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Haphazard planning leads to the breakdown of social innovation process. In order for employees to know what they are trying to achieve an effective plan should be developed and communicated to all those involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Obviously, you have to have committed financial resources. This is hard to come by in this day and age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Leadership should promote focus groups and think tanks that foster new and innovative way to think across the organization. This type of activity gets people excited about the work and helps people learn to speak the same language. Social innovation processes do not work without this in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>We have to communicate well because we have stakeholders all over the world. Sometimes it doesn’t happen that way. Breakdowns in communication have led to huge obstacles during our social innovation processes. Time delays, improper direction and missed goals are hard to recover from.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Money, money, money. It’s so important to these types of initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>User ID</td>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>When organizations try to execute innovation from the top down, that's not effective leadership and will not lead to successful social innovation processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Good planning leads to clear direction and clear goals. People have to know what they are working towards and how they are going to get there. Social innovation processes require good planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Well, you really can't make progress in the social innovation space without having money to fund the initiatives and execute the plans. Adequate funding is imperative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Weak leadership leads to ineffective social innovation processes. The organization get strength from its leaders and if they don't have it right innovation struggles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Communication is our weakest link. We would like to use Twitter and Facebook more since we only utilize a newsletter and our website to communicate today. I think we could have more interaction that would help our social innovation ideas if we utilized these tools more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Social innovation is not a profit maker. Organizations really only want to pursue initiatives that will provide a real financial return.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Political cycles lead to constant, frequent leadership change in the public sector. This lack of consistent leadership means that oftentimes creative initiatives do not survive. The changing regimes means that projects often change and disheartens the employees involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Team members can reflect and say whatever is on their mind in order to foster non-traditional thinking. If people are shout out of the creating thinking and planning processes they will not be able to contribute to the social innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>My budget drives everything. It's difficult and sometimes an insurmountable task to find money in that budget for social innovation work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td>Column 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Leadership is a barrier when it's not actualized properly and leadership is not just at the top. Middle managers involved in the social innovation process have to know what they are doing as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Effective planning of innovation gets people excited. Ineffective planning leads to confusion and misdirection. Social innovation cannot succeed this way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>If the project managers and planners are not in constant communication with everyone involved in the process there will inevitably be problems. We have to have a system to make sure that everyone stays in contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>There is no money for social innovation at least any money that will make a significant difference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Leaders that have not learned what is important to society can prevent good social innovation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Remember strategic plans? Not everyone has them these days; but, they were good for something, especially in the public sector. Social innovations without clear plans are difficult to maneuver, that's the problem we encounter. The big plans are not clear anymore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bureaucracy makes it hard to communicate. Making sure the message gets through to all levels is painful sometimes. Having project teams helps the communication aspect; but, ineffective communication has led to a few mishaps for us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>It's really simple. Funding is limited. So much more of the money goes to items that generate a fast and tangible outcome, these more strategic and wishful thinking tasks end up not getting the financial attention they deserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Social innovation is not a scattered obligation within an organization. Leadership has to promote the idea that social innovation work is a responsibility of all the players to in order to ultimately reach its goal. Too many leaders can be a problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Line No</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>For the sake of clarity, each participant should be involved in some way, in the planning process. This makes sure that everyone on the team knows what the ultimate goal should look like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ha, we don't talk as we should. When you are dealing with participants that are scattered throughout an organization a communication tool must be implemented. We've lost so much time with not communicating properly...that's definitely a barrier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Finances are your bottom line. How much will it cost me, how much money will it save me, how much money will we make?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Leaders who participate in social innovation only to claim credit for doing a good thing are in it for the wrong reasons. Social innovations cannot be successful if the motivations of the leadership are wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sometimes our plans are too big, they're not clear, they don't align with the innovation. We need to pay a little more attention during the planning stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>When we are working with organizations on their social innovation and sustainability efforts, the conversation only begins once we've addressed the Finances. That starts the conversation and can also end it if the numbers don't look right. It's really complicated. Organizations want to do what's right and sometimes they can't because money will not allow them to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Leaders that do not effectively gather consensus among its reports can end up leading a process where no one is on the same page. I've been involved in processes like this and it's a disaster. Leaders have to know how to lead especially in new areas like social innovation or it's just not going to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Communication about project progress and status is not always carried through on a consistent basis and this leaves us with gaps in knowledge that can prove fatal to innovation processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
They did not tell us what was going on with this one particular project. In fact, some of us even thought it was dead, when it actually wasn't.

Social innovation is an attractive prospect; but, money is the most attractive component of any process for companies and it can definitely stop an innovation process...quick.

Our organization communicates well. I think that is a category we excel in. There's no way we could take on new concepts like social innovation if we couldn't even talk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding Elements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question: Can you describe your organization's promoters to social innovation processes?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Real social innovation requires networking. In order to be in touch with the community you have to talk to people. Pursuing these networking opportunities actually helps us promote the social innovation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public-private partnerships have been around for a while and there is no reason why they should not be applied to social innovation work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sharing ideas across organizations and networking allows organizations to use the best thinkers and superior resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ideas must be shared across sectors. Public-private partnerships can help organizations learn to speak the same language to create better social environments across the globe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Innovation champions are much needed leaders. They are the project managers who essentially manage the project from beginning to end; and, they are also the champions, or the passionate individuals that attract others to the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>If organizations can enhance their ability to let of their egos and works towards the same goal, networking would be an amazing promoter in social innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Corporations are bigger and more powerful than most government agencies. However, public agencies often have insight that corporations do not. Therefore, private organizations must team up with government and nonprofits to promote social innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>It is very important for our organization to receive outside feedback. The new members of our board bring in creative ideas and novel concepts which prompt the entire organization to think differently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Most organizations like to claim credit for success stories, however, the ability to networks allows multiple agencies and corporations to receive recognition for projects that have ultimately helped the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Most people think that the government is not generally innovative. That may or may not be true. But I know from experience that partnering with the private sector has helped many social innovation concepts off the ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We network all the time, that's how you got my information. From me attending a conference where I was hoping to make connections and learn new things in hopes of advancing our social innovation efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project management skill enhancement for leaders at all levels of an organization could help facilitate and better the chances for success of social innovation projects throughout my agency. An organization can build leaders wherever they are needed, they don't have to be at the top and that would certainly help social innovation everywhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Networking is important. You can't perform social innovation without it. It's that critical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Networking helps us figure out what else we should be doing. We can't know these things without talking to others who understand or share similar goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>People have generally accepted the idea that innovation cannot be done in a silo. It requires multiple players, each with a defined role aimed at facilitating the end goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>That's how we stay in tune to things. We have joined groups and we attend conferences all with the hope of staying informed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Leaders who are excited about social innovation and drive social innovation within their organizations will likely incite action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from their employees.

<table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public - Private</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
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<td>Leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
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</tbody>
</table>
**Question: What motivates your organization to participate in social innovation processes?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We certainly cannot innovate without financial resources to do so. If we had to struggle for funding it would definitely make it harder to put social innovation at the top of our to do list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Our motivation comes mostly from inside. It's our people. Our employees want to see change and this is a huge driver for why we know it's necessary to participate in social innovation. It's our people...it really is our people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>People in my organization are happy to participate in social innovation processes. They want to do it because they can actually see the difference it has made in a particular community. Seeing change makes people want to do even more. It kind of feeds on itself and it isn't sectioned off by organization. Some organizations are motivated by other organizations just based on the changes seen in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Our motivation to innovate is directly tied to our financial ability, I think. I mean how could we be excited about helping others if we cannot help our organization be fiscally responsible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I think it has become widely recognized that organizations are getting the sense from their employees that bettering the community is in everyone’s best interest. My organization is strongly motivated to participate in social innovation by direct influence from the employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Funding is always a struggle for us. However, for issues that our important such as social innovation, I'd imagine that if it is not immediately available we'd find a way to raise it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social responsibility has been the focus of organizations for quite some time. Organizations are now trying to do more and the this desire to help out in bigger ways seems like it comes from an innate desire to help humankind in general. The level of change that comes from a bigger organization or organizations that have partnered together is more impactful and broad-reaching.

Money resources are an indication of strength. We need the funds to perform the social innovations. We need the strength to help our communities, all over the world.

Funding is limiting. It hampers the things we can do.

We have to make special plans to pay for our social programs. Of course, the money could be spent elsewhere and be hugely useful; but, a commitment to social programs requires us to make the money available.

The availability of funds is critical to social innovation processes. It's difficult to put money towards this type of work; but, it must be done. The needs in these areas cannot be ignored by organizations like ours.

In order to successfully innovate you have to have funding available from beginning to end. Money is important and it would certainly eliminate our ability to do social innovation if we did not have any.

### Coding Elements

| Financial Resources | 1 |
| Community           | 2 |
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Alisia Penn Daily

14624 Charter Walk Court * Midlothian, Virginia 23114 * 804-387-2582 * alisiapenn@gmail.com

A responsible self-starter, whose accomplishments reflect a strong academic background and exceptional writing ability, seeks online adjunct professor position.

Highlights of Qualifications

- Excellent writing ability; received perfect score on GRE writing assessment.
- Strong presentation skills.
- Solid analytical and organizational capabilities.
- Work effectively in team environments as well as independently.
- Successful in high pressure; deadline oriented situations.
- Doctoral level research skills.
- Inducted to Pi Alpha Alpha Honor Society in April of 2003.

Education

Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia
*Doctor of Philosophy-Center for Public Policy

Dissertation Phase Underway
Current GPA: 3.7
Graduation Date: My 2014

Key Courses: Research Methods, Survey of Statistical Analysis Techniques, Public Policy Seminar

*Master of Public Administration with concentration in Policy Analysis

Graduated: 2003
Graduate GPA: 3.9

Key Courses: Principles of Public Administration, Policy Analysis, Qualitative and Quantitative Research Methods

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia
*Bachelor of Arts in American Government

Graduated: 1998

Key Courses: Constitutional Interpretation, State and Local Government, Comparative Government

Computer Skills

Platforms: MS Windows 95/98/2000/XP, Basis
Software: MS Office 9703/07 (Excel, Word, PowerPoint, Access, Outlook, Publisher), Windows XP, Introspect Database Management, QRS, SPSS, SAS, Lexis-Nexis, Westlaw, JStor, Academic Search Complete, Infotrac, Factiva, Java, HTML
Hardware: PC, Mac, iPad

Experience

Altria Client Services Inc. (Philip Morris USA Inc.), 6603 West Broad St., Richmond, Virginia 23230

Senior Legal Specialist within the Sales and Marketing Practice Group – February 2014-Present

- Provide Marketing legal support to Nu Mark, an Altria Innovation Company
- Review various marketing campaigns and proposals to ensure compliance with law.
- Draft reports and correspondence as requested by counsel.
- Manage and track projects related to marketing and various other company initiatives.

Senior Legal Analyst within Strategic Planning and Corporate Governance Practice Group February 2006 – Present

- Legal support for majority of Procurement function, IS, Leaf and Import/Export.
- Develop company-wide training for Information Security, Privacy and Risk Management
- Lead and facilitate antitrust training
- Participate in all aspects of the contract generation and negotiation process.
- Review and approve internal and external communications.
- Act as liaison between business function, outside counsel and in-house counsel.
- Provide legal support and analysis related to company wide privacy issues.
- Review and approve invoices, monitor budget spending and adjust line items as necessary.
- Conduct legal research and other analyses as requested.
- Create presentations, summaries and reports.

Legal Analyst with subject matter expertise in RD&E. January 2004-February 2006
- Conducted interviews and document collections for case specific and general collection purposes.
- Reviewed various business documents and apply appropriate security classifications.
- Responded to production requests as needed by processing documents.
- Coordinated document collections in response to anticipated litigation unrelated to smoking and health issues.
- Tracked collection and review progress of Research, Development and Engineering custodians for attorney use.
- Searched QRS for documents responsive to various requests.
- Drafted privilege log entries and create privilege log glossaries.
- Wrote histories and timelines of specific PM processes and studies after conducting database research.
- Trained new employees and special counsel on review criteria and database usage.
- Regularly conferred with colleagues regarding review criteria and production guidelines.

City of Richmond, 600 E. Broad St., Richmond, Virginia 23219 September 2002-January 2004
Assistant to the City Attorney
- Drafted ordinances and resolutions for City council members, City departments and the City Manager.
- Organized meetings within the City Attorney’s department with City officials.
- Maintained updates of the City Code with the Municipal Code Commission and department directors.
- Constructed a database for legislative tracking by the City Attorney.
- Maintained law library and archival processes.
- Drafted and distributed departmental memos and updates.
- Routinely canvassed law journals and other periodicals in an effort to inform the City Attorney of developing stories.
- Acted as office liaison with city departments and citizens.
- Performed survey and research projects as requested by the City Attorney.
- Drafted correspondence, maintained files, and performed general office duties to support three attorneys.

Regulatory Paralegal on the legislative team
- Tracked and researched General Assembly legislation directly affecting City of Richmond operations and made summative presentations to City decision-makers.
- Revised Chapter 29 (Utilities) of the City Code for presentation to and adoption by the City Council.
- Attended conferences and meetings statewide and reported new developments to Department officials in order to ensure compliance with state and federal laws.
- Oversaw administrative duties within the Department of Public Utilities’ legal section. (i.e. filing, drafting correspondence, archiving, tracking bill payment).

Wright, Robinson, Osthimer and Tatum, Richmond, Virginia 2000-2002
Paralegal/Management Assistant on seven million page document production project.
- Served as technical project lead for database production.
- Completed research inclusive of review and analysis of law.
- Created monthly presentations to senior level partners based upon independent research efforts.

Hunton and Williams, Richmond, Virginia 1998-2000
Case Clerk on litigation team.
- Developed extensive witness/plaintiff database.
- Researched expert witness background and plaintiff interrogatory statements as an aid to defense development.
- Assisted in the maintenance of a 50 user database network.

Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service, Charlottesville, Virginia 1996-1998
Research Assistant for publication department.
- Assisted in the research and development of treasurer and clerk certification programs.
- Researched html design in order to formulate initial layout of center website.
- Assisted in policy research for center publications.

Languages
Spanish—Advanced reading comprehension abilities; moderate verbal understanding

Past Research
- Evaluation Study: Richmond YWCA Sexual Assault Program

Keywords Legal Research Policy Document Database