

## Let's do it together!

Handbook for local collaborative social innovation

Kobro, Lars ; Andersen, Linda Lundgaard; Hygum Espersen, Helle; Kristensen, Kjetil ; Skar, Cathrine ; Iversen, Håkon

*Publication date:*  
2018

*Document Version*  
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Kobro, L., Andersen, L. L., Hygum Espersen, H., Kristensen, K., Skar, C., & Iversen, H. (2018). *Let's do it together! Handbook for local collaborative social innovation*. Høgskolen i Sørøst-Norge/Senter for sosialt entreprenørskap og samskapende sosial innovasjon.

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

### Take down policy


If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact [rucforsk@ruc.dk](mailto:rucforsk@ruc.dk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Lars U. Kobro (editor)

# Let's do it together!

HANDBOOK FOR LOCAL COLLABORATIVE SOCIAL INNOVATION





---

Published in March 2018 by the University of Sout-Eastern Norway/  
Norwegian Centre for Social Entrepreneurship and Social Innovation.

Let's do it together!  
Handbook for local collaborative social innovation  
978-82-7206-472-2: Printed edition  
978-82-7206-473-9: Digital Edition

The publication is issued as Creative Commons and may be freely  
copied and distributed to others free of charge. The names of the  
author and editor must be stated correctly.  
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-ncsa/4.0/deed.no>

Drawings can be copied stating the name of the illustrator,  
Tor Erling Naas.



# Preface

This handbook is written for, and in a Norwegian local context. It is namely the case that in Norway welfare is in fact created mainly locally in the country's 426 (current) municipalities. It is therefore more meaningful to talk about the welfare municipalities rather than the welfare state in Norway. Interest in, and emphasis on, such a social innovation perspective is great in many other countries than Norway. Through our membership in EMES ([www.emes.net](http://www.emes.net)), we have therefore been strongly encouraged to translate the handbook into English. We have made some adaptations in respect of content in the translation, but have nevertheless mainly done a fairly direct translation into English of the Norwegian book.

Good collaborative social innovation work is characterized by the fact that people with different resources, experience and knowledge work together. In this handbook, we present key concepts and a model for collaborative social innovation with relevant advice and recommendations on how the model, and the knowledge it is based on, can be used.

A team of different contributors is behind the work with the handbook. The initiative came from KS (The Norwegian Association of Local and Regional Authorities). We are grateful for their challenge, and we would like to commend KS for their close and constructive continuous follow-up in the working process. The handbook is one of several products of a project on social innovation and collaboration in Norwegian municipalities, developed by the same team. In addition to the handbook, there is a research report, as well as two internet tools – currently only in Norwegian.

- Democratic innovation-theories and models for collaborative social innovation in Norwegian municipalities, with an English summary.

- SAMSON, an interactive internet tool for local collaborative social innovation.
- SolImpact, a tool for measuring social results of innovation efforts.

These resources are downloadable here in Norwegian:  
**[www.ks.no/samskaping](http://www.ks.no/samskaping)**

The team behind this book and the resources above, has comprised of the following people/institutions:

- **Lars Ueland Kobro** -Centre for Social Entrepreneurship and Social innovation-SESAM
- **Linda Lundgaard Andersen** – Centre for Social Entrepreneurship Roskilde University – RUC
- **Helle Hygum Espersen** – Det Nationale Forsknings- og Analysecenter for Velfærd – VIVE
- **Kjetil Kristensen** – SoCentral
- **Cathrine Skar** – SoCentral
- **Haakon Iversen** – SoCentral

A sense of reality and the practical relevance of the work are ensured by the fact that five municipalities with six specific social innovation projects have been linked to the project. In addition, a case from Denmark has been used as a reference model. Focus group interviews, surveys and a workshop for peer-assisted learning with participants from all the cases provided a valuable practical foundation for the material that is presented. Thanks to the case partners for your valuable contributions.

Lars Ueland Kobro  
Editor/Project Manager  
**[kobro@usn.no](mailto:kobro@usn.no)**

# Contents

Foreword.....	2	4. Seven fields of action.....	30
<b>1. On a trip together.....</b>	<b>5</b>	Ensuring equality.....	31
A local area of collaboration.....	7	Working with common goals.....	32
A practical textbook for local processes.....	7	Communication.....	33
The terrain we are going to move in.....	8	Anchoring.....	34
Municipalities out of their comfort zone?.....	10	Facilitate.....	34
Nuances of collaboration.....	12	Focus on resources.....	36
Advice and recommendations.....	15	Working with several competencies simultaneously... ..	37
		Advice and recommendations.....	39
<b>2. Let's build social values together!.....</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>5. Innovation and roles.....</b>	<b>40</b>
Collaborative social innovation.....	17	Innovation.....	41
An important key ring.....	18	Social entrepreneurs.....	41
With room for conflicts of interest.....	19	New roles for many – especially for the municipality... ..	42
Double target.....	20	Five steps for a collaborative municipality.....	44
Advice and recommendations.....	21		
<b>3. Four common values.....</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>6. Impact measurement.....</b>	<b>46</b>
A model for local collaborative social innovation.....	24	Demanding activity.....	47
Openness.....	24	SolImpact.....	49
Democracy.....	26	Socio-economic models.....	52
Creativity.....	26	Social Impact Bond.....	53
Leadership.....	27	No straight lines.....	53
Advice and recommendations.....	28	Advice and recommendations.....	54
		<b>Footnotes.....</b>	<b>56</b>
		<b>References.....</b>	<b>58</b>

# 1. On a trip together

The Norwegian welfare state model is in need of renewal. Not because it is broken, but because it is under pressure. The greatest pressure is in the municipalities where people live. Therefore, it is there that it is most relevant to develop new and useful solutions in the welfare state. Being successful with social innovation in the municipality is not just about finding the right path to new solutions, it is as much about finding someone to go along with.



## A local area of collaboration

There is increasing awareness among practitioners, scientists and policymakers around the world about how the future's welfare needs should be resolved. Many point out that better resource-sharing across sectors and areas of expertise is needed<sup>1</sup>. Many people find that the public sector has distanced itself from the inhabitants, and therefore we need to strengthen society's democratic values. Stronger democratic links require that we, to a greater extent than what has been usual, view the municipality as a *place* – not an organization. New solutions must be developed based on the widest possible perception of a common “we” at each place. This handbook goes through some important principles and tips for action for a common route for people from different sectors, industries, voluntary organizations, users of welfare services, and others.

A municipality is both a place and an organization. In all places in Norway, the municipality as an organization is an important factor for local social innovation. In Oslo, the municipality employs about 10 percent of the city's workforce, while in some smaller municipalities, more than half of all workplaces are municipal. The municipal workplaces are, therefore a prominent factor in all places. In addition to all the tasks that the municipality itself handles through its own employees, the municipality is also the main regulatory authority at the location. The municipality therefore defines the framework and content for a far greater proportion of social development than it produces itself. Nevertheless – although the public sector seems to be such a dominant factor, all places have much greater resources and potential to solve the welfare challenges of the future than that the municipality represents through its own employees, regulations and other provisions. Civil society is an important partner for municipalities and private businesses, with the potential to contribute with democratic participation,

management, legitimacy and proximity. Ever more welfare benefits are now being carried out through inter-sector cooperation models, although we do not see this movement as clearly in Norway as in many other places, at present<sup>2</sup>. The new models are characterized by the fact that voluntary associations, public organisations and private businesses work together in far more equal ways than what has been common in Norwegian welfare policy.

Collaboration and social innovation are different phenomena and concepts. By connecting the two terms and writing about *collaborative social innovation* in this book, we will point out the potential inherent in creating new sustainable, locally-based multi-disciplinary welfare solutions with active involvement by residents. Such solutions are intended in practice to combine collaboration and social innovation. This is the kind of common route for which this book will show some road signs.

## A practical textbook for local processes

Collaborative Social Innovation is the term for the concrete cooperation that moves across citizens, professional and voluntary forces, at both the interpersonal level, and across organizations. Social innovation addresses challenges through the involvement of citizens and partners as equal contributors, and the handbook will show how a local initiative that aims to be social and innovative should be handled. The handbook is therefore a handbook with a practical purpose, it is not a cookery book.

A cookery book has recipes that you can follow point by point, with lists of ingredients, amounts and temperatures. An apple pie is an apple pie according to a given recipe,



whether we make it in one kitchen or another, whether we make it alone or together. This is not the case with local social work. *It depends on a situation.* There is no general recipe. The work of integrating immigrant women in one city must of course be carried out differently from work in preventing bullying in another city. It is important to take into account different traditions, experiences, and the possibilities that exist in the different areas in which the activity takes place. – As publishers of this book we receive from time to time questions about *how social innovation and social entrepreneurship should be effectuated?* Behind this question lies the expectation that there is a method, a universal solution that works everywhere. Unfortunately, such expectations cannot be met with general formulae. What specific steps should be taken in each case, at each individual location, must be resolved — precisely in each situation. There is no way around it.

However, the road is not unknown. The emerging international knowledge in the fields of social entrepreneurship, social innovation, thin co-creation and thick co-creation can provide useful information about the bends and hills to be traversed in such processes. Experience we have gained from our own work in Danish, Norwegian, and international contexts, is an additional source of insight.

So there are no shortcuts to collaborative social innovation in a local context, it is however a number of dead ends. This book's input on the topics that it is particularly important to focus on, will help to illuminate the most navigable paths and routes for such work. It will be able to prevent wandering into dead ends. The road we illuminate the clearest is the one called *collaboration*. We will soon get to know that road better.

### **Reader guide**

In this first chapter, we start by reminding you that there are many forms of cooperation. Even though we say that we are cooperating with someone, this does not really say much – there are so many forms of cooperation. In Chapter 2, we discuss certain types of cooperation that are particularly relevant for the work on social innovation. We will present

some keys that it is important to have along the way. Chapters 3 and 4 on the four values and seven action fields, go through some concrete references from the research project that forms the basis of the handbook, and which in total create the model on which the book is based. The model can be found on page 23. The two chapters are then followed up with a review (chapter 5) of some aspects of social innovation that are not specifically dealt with in the model, but which we feel are useful to know and bear in mind in the local field of collaboration. Finally, we present a chapter on impact measurement with some commentary on tools for measuring the value and effects of social work. We specifically present a tool for measurement of the collaboration's outcome called SolImpact, see link to this in the preface of this book. This ends with a reminder that of one of the book's– and the field of collaborative social innovation's most important points – that social innovation has a dual purpose: to create social value in both its process and its final product.

## **The ground we are going to cover**

In much of Europe the interest for collaboration between residents, civil society, politicians, businesses and public administration has turned into new paths<sup>3</sup>. Linda Lundgaard Andersen has previously dubbed this “a collaborative turn”<sup>4</sup>. The new aspects are characterized by several things: A stronger emphasis on, and trying out of, new forms of collaboration in many arenas; the development of democracy in local affairs with user committees, local environment committees and others in steadily new areas of politics; in local community development, school development, in the health and care sector, etc. In recent years, user involvement and collaboration have been mentioned in innumerable policy documents, strategy plans and in political speeches, both from national and local speakers' platforms, in Denmark and in Norway.

At the same time that the attention to, and interest in, new models and contexts spreads, there is limited insight into the practical aspect as to which building blocks they stand

most steadily upon. In addition, various terms and concepts are confused. It is therefore useful at the start of a handbook aimed at assisting in practical work, to become slightly more familiar with what collaborative social innovation is – and why we should be doing it.

If we start with the latter, it is appropriate to take a look at the condition of the welfare state. Only then will we be able to understand the need for social innovation.


### **A welfare state in change**

The Norwegian welfare state has been a success but finds itself at a crossroads<sup>5</sup>. A number of symptoms point to a need for significant change. All new challenges in the welfare society can no longer be solved with the measures we have resorted to earlier. Neither efficiency improvement, more money in all directions where unresolved problems are registered, nor new laws and policies that will secure increasingly new rights for the municipality's residents, can guarantee the welfare of the future. The inhabitants expect to have an increasing level of influence on the solutions. Norwegian municipalities already have more than enough functions compared with the resources they have at their disposal<sup>6</sup>.

The belief that the government and the public authorities should be the main driving force behind social development has been a determining premise for the welfare state. But this belief has been weakened. It has made way for new experiments with social innovations and social entrepreneurship in many places. Most initiatives have grown out from the ground roots of local communities, among innovators within the public sector (where of course enthusiasts and entrepreneurs are also to be found<sup>7</sup>), or in civil society outside the municipality organization. In the Nordic countries, social innovations are characterised by their taking place in close cooperation with the public sector<sup>8</sup>.

Changes to demographics, legitimisation problems and increased costs, combined with increased expectations to social welfare benefits and emphasis on citizens' rights, create a pressure. At the same time, the welfare society

faces a growing number of complex problems, often called "wicked problems" (see text box). They cannot be resolved through standard solutions, or solely by increased budgets.



***Wicked problems** is a collective term for complex social, health, and environmental challenges that are complex, changeable in their nature, and closely intertwined with other problems. Wicked problems are characterized by that cause and effect relationships cannot be defined unequivocally and clearly, and that any solutions depend heavily on who is considering them. One example of wicked problems is social inequality in health. That some groups have poorer health than others is connected to several factors related to individual factors such as diet, smoking, alcohol, and physical activity. But it also applies to structural and social conditions, such as occupation, place of residence, network and social class. Wicked problems are characterized by the fact that they cannot be solved by isolated efforts in one particular social area/special field.*

With this background, we observe in all Nordic countries a growing interest in how complex problems may best be solved with more and different involvement of stakeholders both from civil society and private businesses as resources for ideas and resolution of tasks. There is a growing realization that collaboration must be established between fields of professional expertise, industries and sectors. Such collaboration is most frequently developed within various network constructions. Heterogeneous networks can include a wide range of people and groups. Networking solves common issues, creates and shares resources, and develops new scopes of action that then benefit the local residents – not least socially vulnerable people and groups. This type of interaction is characterized by an attitude that is distanced from that of the public sector alone being responsible for developing new services and offers *for the* inhabitants, rather than recognizing that one must develop these together *with* them<sup>9</sup>.

This may sound easy, but the reality is that such an interaction between different stakeholders and skills belonging to different sectors encounters many difficulties. Some are financial, others are legal, political, structural, administrative, or cultural. Working with citizens' active democratic participation challenges many municipal thought patterns. This is discussed in detail in the research report produced in parallel with this handbook – see link in the preface.

### **Welfare municipalities**

In Norway, we do not really have a welfare state, we have *welfare municipalities*. That is where the residents receive their welfare services. However, there are some major cogwheels in the welfare society's machinery in the form of hospitals, colleges, universities, secondary schools, and more. However, most cogwheels keep running in villages and cities; in Norwegian municipalities. That is where the sick and the elderly are to be found, before and after ever shorter admissions to the hospital. It is in the municipalities the immigrant population will find its place in school, working life and in social networks. That is where people who are struggling to tackle a normal job must find meaning and

copied in everyday life, and it is in the municipalities the emerging imbalance becomes visible between increasing numbers of elderly on social security and declining numbers of young people in jobs. We are accustomed to think that much of this is the government's responsibility. The public sector has therefore also stretched itself a long way to take on such a responsibility. The Norwegian welfare model is based on an aim of ensuring welfare for all, without limits<sup>10</sup>. But perhaps in fact the limit has been reached - we must in any case intensify our efforts to look for new solutions and new models for local welfare production. Business as usual is no longer sustainable.

### **Municipalities out of their comfort zone?**

When municipalities have teamed up with external partners to address identified welfare challenges, this has usually been characterized by a orderer-performer relationship. A common, and probably comfortable type of collaboration has been that the municipality fills the role of a supplier of conditions for various actors, who then compete to win advertised assignments/orders-if the municipality has not decided to solve the assignment within its own service portfolio. Such competitions for contracts are regulated by the Government's regulations for procurement and contracts.

If the assignment is advertised, it is a typical procedure that the assignment – which is also more or less the solution to be implemented – is described in detail in the announcement request for tender. Involving external suppliers in this way is in reality no involvement in the sense of collaborative social innovation. Therefore, this model must be challenged in social innovation work with collaboration as its framework. In a field of collaboration it is necessary for the municipality (and other authorities) to fill a different role (see more on this in Chapter 5). This could mean that the municipality, the local office of the Norwegian Labour and Welfare Administration, and other public actors have to enter into relationships and behavioural patterns that are only described or formalized to a limited extent in the prevailing regulations.

They must enter into *reciprocal cooperation* with individuals and different stakeholders. The new roles lie somewhat beyond what most municipal employees are trained to do. Therefore, collaboration also presumes organizational innovation in many contexts.



### **Sectoral change**

A great deal of collaborative social innovation takes place in the interface between traditional and business sectors<sup>11</sup>. There are many such gaps in Norwegian municipalities and local communities. New ideas can be conceived and developed where people from different competence traditions meet and mix. In such collaboration, there do not occur *gaps* primarily between them, but rather *there is becoming an increasing number of areas of overlapping*.

The most interesting development of new welfare services we are currently witnessing in many countries, therefore, does not take place in sectors. Perceptions of the “sector society” probably function better as a memory image of how the community worked before, rather than as a map for where we should move forward. New ideas can be conceived and developed where people from different competence traditions meet and mix in a local context. This is where much of what we see referred to as social entrepreneurs develops<sup>12</sup>. See more about social entrepreneurship in Chapter 5. Many examples from areas of practice and experience in a strongly developing international research field on social innovation, show that many innovative solutions to defined complex challenges, take place in new overlapping fields.

Actors that meet across traditional professional interests, above worn out sector divides, and use local resources in civil society, have a potential to democratize municipal welfare solutions. In this way solutions can meet many years of criticism that public service production has distanced itself a long way from those to whom the services apply. The realization of innovation gains and democratic values, however, will depend on how the concrete collaboration is designed – how the scope of action is established. Later in

the book, therefore, we will look into what actions and alternatives it is prudent to apply to building up such a collaboration. But before that, we need to become a little more familiar with this book's supporting concepts. We have already used them several times: *Co-creation/co-production*, merged into the term collaboration.



*In one municipality in western Norway, a disagreement arose between elements in the municipal management and an environment that grew up “alongside” the municipality, with the ambition of providing advice to entrepreneurs with social business ideas. “It is our responsibility to provide consultancy to entrepreneurs”, it was argued on the part of the municipality, which then rejected the use of municipal budget funds for the purpose. “Can’t we do this together in a joint effort and in collaboration by drawing on each other’s strengths?” representatives of the new environment asked. The discussion that followed challenged both parties’ traditional views on sectors and division of responsibilities where, at the time of writing, a new common realization is developing of how local collaboration can look beyond traditional roles and sectors – and work with challenges together.*

## Nuances of collaboration

In the Nordic countries, collaboration is often mentioned in the same breath as social innovation, social entrepreneurship, empowerment and/or governance<sup>13</sup>. The terms are related, but they are not twins. The affinity relates to some common features:

- The concepts relate to different ways of creating more robust, sustainable, and targeted solutions for identified complex social problems.
- The terms emphasize that users of social services, and other inhabitants of the civil society, are important and equal contributors for welfare solutions, with the potential to create greater democratic value.
- The concepts refer to phenomena where the borderlines between private businesses, the public sector and civil society, are increasingly diffuse.
- The terms relate to ambitions of creating new solutions across established organizational boundaries and dividing lines.

Despite such common features, the concepts are nonetheless different in a number of other areas. In particular, the differences set us on the trail of different perspectives of the collaboration. An important nuance, that the increasing public rhetoric in the area rarely provides room for, is easiest to elicit if we look at two English concepts.

### **Co-creation and co-production – thin and thick collaboration**

With collaboration, knowledge, resources and experiences are brought together from residents, social entrepreneurs, associations and businesses. Solutions are developed *together* with involved residents instead of *for* them see KS' theme pages on this<sup>14</sup> (only available in Norwegian).

Collaboration represents a breakaway from the sector society's logic. It causes uncertainty and insecurity for some - others see it as an opportunity with a new scope of action which they are enthusiastic to adopt. No matter what spontaneous reaction one receives in the face of something new, it is helpful to go in depth with the concepts to see what they can actually mean in practice. This is especially true if one has a leadership role in the municipality, private business, voluntary associations, or is a social entrepreneur.

English-language research literature brings out an important nuance in the concept of collaboration by dividing the phenomenon into two terms: *co-creation* and *co-production*. The two differ from each other primarily in that *co-creation* suggests *creating* something new – a new service with value, while *co-production* to a greater extent suggests a *production cooperation*. *Co-production* encases the cooperation right from the development phase and throughout to the actual delivery – it therefore presumes an interdependence between different actors over time. *Co-production* is carried out in the development of the welfare production, both on the “drawing board” and in the “engine room”. *Co-production* is characterised by long-term reciprocal cooperation relationships, while *co-creation* is a more strategic measure for involvement and dialogue in interim processes. In *co-creation*, the cooperative relationship between partners will end before production starts. Local social innovation work can be organised according to both *co-creation* and *co-production* principles.

*In this handbook, we use collaboration as a collective term throughout the continuum between co-creation and co-production.*

In Denmark, the development of terminology in the field has led to *co-creation* being translated as *samskabelse*, while *co-production* translates as *samproduktion*. This is different in Norway. *Samskaping* is in the process of “sticking” as the Norwegian term. It embraces both of the two dimensions. It

is of course somewhat unfortunate, since it is more difficult to reflect together on the differences in a field where the nuances are not expressed in words. Instead of resorting to English (or Danish) concepts, we will refer to the continuum by using the terms **thick- and thin collaboration**. Thin collaboration is collaboration characterized by traits from *co-creation*, and thick collaboration points towards *co-production*. See Figure 1 below.

Collaboration, from thin to thick collaboration, may be conducted within the framework of a municipal service, it can take place with private welfare actors, and we can find it in voluntary associations. In other words, new cooperative models or organisations need *not* be established in order to

collaborate - but it may be so. Regardless of the form of organizational association that embraces the collaboration, it is nevertheless characterised by the fact that it involves *various types of actors*; professions, bureaucrats, both employees and volunteers in voluntary associations, different resident groups, individuals, and so on. *It is the relationship between these actors, the duration of the work and the handling of power and obligations between them*, which are the main factors which determine where on the continuum between the thin and the thick (*co-creation - co-production*) collaboration we find ourselves. Collaborative social innovation characterized by *co-production* will have embedded elements of *co-creation*, while in a *co-creation* there will not be *co-production*.




Figure 1. Characteristics in distinguishing between co-creation/thin collaboration and co-production/thick collaboration<sup>15</sup>.

## Other sources of knowledge

In Figure 2 we show how thick collaboration is developed in an area where the joint effort in the planning and design of solutions on the one hand, coincides with the joint effort in *producing/delivering* on the other (the two grey areas). The figure shows different versions of collaboration in the green boxes, broken down by who conducts the activity. Is it people/environments belonging to professions and public administration alone – in the figure these are called “professionals”- or is it actors in civil society who are responsible? In the figure these are designated as “civil society”. Alternatively, the welfare services are planned/produced jointly - the centre panes in the model, both vertical and horizontal.

This handbook springs from a widely-dispositioned research project involving five case municipalities with six social innovation projects and one Danish model case. The cases have to varying degrees mobilized various actors, but a social enterprise has had a central role in all cases. The research activities have resulted in the model on which this book is built. The project is presented in a more complete form than we allow space for here, in a separate research report: *Democratic innovation - theories and models for collaborative social innovation in Norwegian municipalities*. See the link address in the preface to the book.

		Responsibility for service and design of services		
		Professional planner alone	Professionals and players in civil society plan together	Players from civil society plan outside the professions
Responsibility for the production of service and services	Professionals are alone responsible for providing the services	Traditional professional services	Professional services where civil society has participated in planning (thin co-creation)	No activity
	Professionals and players in civil society create together	Cooperation in production of professionally planned services	<b>"CO-PRODUCTION" (THICK COLLABORATION)</b>	Services planned by players outside the professions, but with contributions from them
	Players in civil society provide the services alone	Orders and tendering services	Produced outside the professions, but with the professions' contributions to planning (thin co-creation)	Self-organized services in civil society

Figure 2. Combinations of various forms of collaboration in the planning and production of welfare services<sup>16</sup>.



In 2015 and 2016, work was carried out in a wide process with a guide for cooperation between social entrepreneurs and Norwegian municipalities. See text frame. We recommend this booklet. It can be downloaded here (unfortunately only available in Norwegian language):

<https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/veier-til-samarbeid/id2540583/sec1>

Following the work on the Norwegian “Guide”, process material was prepared to facilitate the use of the guide. The process material was developed in cooperation with Ferd social entrepreneurs and the Norwegian Association of Regional and Local Associations. It can be downloaded here (also only in Norwegian):

<http://www.ks.no/fagomrader/utvikling/innovasjon/samskaping/Prosessmateriale/>

Otherwise please refer to the literature list in the back of this book. This is a list of sources for further reading and studies from both the Norwegian, Nordic and other international contexts, linked to the handbook's main topic.

## Advice and recommendations

- Reflect a little over the differences between the municipality as a location/community and the municipality as an organization. What are the untapped local resources to be found when new welfare challenges are to be solved?
- What do thin and thick collaboration mean for your work? Are there any topics or areas where the collaboration is moving more towards joint production than in other areas - or is a thinner collaboration around planning and design of solutions an appropriate level of ambition?
- If, in the process of reading and working with this book, you would like to know more about collaboration and innovation, you can study the research report or familiarize yourself with the literature in the reference list at the back.



### *Routes to collaboration*

*«We need the ability to innovate that social entrepreneurs and social innovators represent,» writes the Municipal and Modernization Minister in a booklet designed to demonstrate ways of improving cooperation between actors from different sectors, in the face of unsolved welfare needs. The inspiration booklet «Veier til samarbeid» was developed through a broad process of participation, with input from many sides and from many fields of competence. This led to six specific topics/chapters that point to possible barriers and*


*relevant opportunities to be found in the field of collaboration between local authorities, social entrepreneurs and other actors with a common aim to increase social value creation. The topics addressed are:*

- Welfare services developed in collaboration
- How to get started?
- Forms of collaboration
- Social entrepreneurs' meeting with the municipality
- To measure impact
- Myths about public procurement



## 2. Let's build social values together!

Social innovation is innovations that both have social impact aims and that are social in their method of implementation. This chapter examines how this can be handled in conjunction with identified social challenges in local contexts.



*“There is nothing as practical as a good theory”*

(Kurt Lewin)



**Social innovation** is created by new ideas that address urgent unsatisfied social needs. We can simply describe it as innovations that create social value in both aim and method. Social innovations are new solutions (products, services, and methods of organization) that meet social needs (more efficiently than other alternatives), and that create new social collaborative relationships at the same time<sup>17</sup>.

## Collaborative social innovation

Everything new is not necessarily innovation. In order for a new solution to be called innovation, or *social innovation*, it should in the first instance solve an identified problem (read more about innovation in Chapter 5). In the work of social innovation, the persons affected are often involved themselves as active and authoritative experts and contributors. This creates democratic values and qualifies the professional understanding of the relevant problem area in a different way than when people with a professional knowledge of the problem design the solutions alone. In social innovation the inhabitants' experience-based knowledge is on an equal footing with professional knowledge. This involvement can contribute to both the planning and implementation of solutions - in thin and thick collaboration. Social innovation thus contributes to developing both cross-sector professional and democratic values.

When first new ideas lead to the solution of an identified problem, when it finds a form and a practice that works *for some*, that is an innovation. An innovation is therefore *new*, it is *useful* and is utilised. The latter, the implementation, is the entrepreneurial dimension in the work of innovation. New

and useful solutions may be left unused – in that case there is no innovation. One reason may be the lack of funding or technology - think of Leonardo da Vinci's helicopter drawings. The helicopter idea was definitely new, and helicopters would have been useful in the 15th century, but there was

no source of energy to allow for implementation. Another obstacle to the usefulness of good ideas may be poor distribution to the customer/user. The poem of the Norwegian Inger Hagerup about the solitary baker on his tiny island lacked entrepreneurial skills. Large boats passed by, and on the island were the most delectable baked goods with cream and jam. Nevertheless, they were of no use – it ended tragically for the baker, he ended up dead on a pile of cakes. There was no innovation on the island, it lacked an entrepreneurial solution. An obstacle to usefulness can be habits – they are known to be difficult to change.



*JodaCare is a digital mobile service designed to make communication between healthcare professionals and relatives as flexible and functional as possible, in respect of the organization and follow-up of patients living at home. The solution is new and useful, but in several municipalities where it is considered to be both good and desirable, it still takes a surprisingly long time to implement it. Even though the decisions to put it into use have been made. The first-line service is accustomed to doing things differently, so they often «forget» to use the new solution. The importance of habits is easy to underestimate.*



## An important key ring

We saw in the previous chapter that *co-creation* and *co-production* along the continuum from thin to thick collaboration were two important keys in the work of local social innovation. Now let's hook up the keys.

Real co-creation and co-production, whether endeavouring to create a thin collaboration, or having the intention of institutionalizing collaboration in a thicker, more enduring and mutually binding relationship and activity, are regardless not just a matter of *asking* those it applies about their demands or opinion. Nor is it about *listening* to them – it is not even about *helping* them. Collaborative social innovation is about inviting participation in reciprocal cooperative partnerships whereby people who have unsatisfied social problems, people who are close to them (relatives), and people who have different practical perspectives on how to address the problem, are allowed to give independent contributions on how to define, design, introduce, and promote solutions together with the professions, public administration and political authorities. In conversations about the welfare society, we often talk about the “support system”, so we then usually refer to a set of public services – a system whereby some people help others. The best

## With room for conflicts of interest

“systems” for helping people out of social problems in many situations, however, may be the people themselves – *together with others*. Collaboration is therefore another type of “support system”. It is not just those who wear the shoes that know best where the pressure is, it is probably also they who know best where in the shoes the pressure should be put in the shoe. With the proper pressure in the shoe it is possible to set the speed, go farther, higher, and persevere longer.

The Norwegian welfare society needs expertise from those who know best about the cause of the problems in their own lives and the effects of possible solutions. But then there is also the need for insight from those with expert knowledge, those who have the exams, work experience and certificates - of course. It is the breadth in co-creation and co-production that is the key to local collaborative social innovation. So it is all about getting this to stick together. *Networking* is a key word in this respect.

In social innovation, problems are not fully delineated and defined in advance by individual actors, or by an initiating organization. Unlike what is often common in other innovation measures, the challenges are specified and addressed jointly by several interested parties. That is why the process dimension is so central to the work of innovation. Collaborative processes are a foundation for developing holistic solutions, which can address several challenges at the same time rather than fragmented solutions (see text box on wicked problems on page 9). It is difficult to achieve this without working in a network. “Social innovation knows no fixed boundaries. It moves in all directions and across all sectors – public sector, private sector, third sector and households in the civil society”<sup>18</sup>. Active social innovations arise from, and therefore develop best in, open, trusting, complementary networks. It is perhaps the case that birds of different feather flock together – but only if calm and harmony are the aim. If development, creativity and innovation are the aims, we think rather that *birds of a feather* at least *create* most interesting *new* things.

Inviting inhabitants, civil society, user organizations and interested parties from other areas of expertise than the traditional welfare professions into the public welfare society’s production space is relatively new in the Norwegian context<sup>19</sup>. While it is a method that has great potential for social innovation, it also creates a minefield of contradictions and conflicts of interest. Tensions between different ways of viewing the world may make it difficult to arrive at agreed aims. It can lead to open conflicts of value. Another possibility is that openness to giving other voices a chance, is only superficial – that it peters out as pseudo-participation or as *decoration*<sup>20</sup>. There is a risk that important conflicts of value and interest are hidden under a semblance of rhetorical agreement when everyone no doubt wants to create a better society. Good collaborative social innovation deals with such conflicts openly and constructively – sweeping them under the rug will probably do the most damage in the long term. Norwegian and international literature on social innovation shows that the potential for innovation and quality is high where different interested parties and inhabitants are involved in development, implementation and evaluation – when the collaboration is based on confidence and trust<sup>21</sup>.

### **More than just talking together.**

It will promote the social innovation, if the relationships on the spot are characterized by the interplay between action and talk. When something is being done together, it is wise to talk properly together about what has to be done – but it’s just as smart to reverse the process: When you have done something together, you should discuss what came out of it. Then one can possibly do more of what worked, and less of what did not work – then discuss it again. The model in Figure 3 on the next page is a simple illustration of how learning and creative processes are characterized by a continuous interplay between joint action and putting the cooperation into words – obvious, but often forgotten.




Figure 3. Collaboration assumes an interplay between conversation and interaction in a dynamic and durable circular process<sup>22</sup>.

Not only is the relationship between action and conversation circular. In collaborative social innovation processes, the whole cooperation, the learning between the participants and the development of the field of action they are in, should have a circular form. Figure 4 illustrates this. Firstly, an area is revealed with a need for new solutions (*Map It*), next the focus is on what to work with that is likely to have the greatest positive impact (*Focus it*), the work involves drawing on resources from the inhabitants, and among other partners most affected by the work (*People it*), before making sure to talk about the work, because conversation and information will be able to create an understanding that




Figure 4. Social innovation in a circular motion<sup>23</sup>.

underpins new action (*Market it*). This will give the process energy to grow, if it is correctly rooted (*Grow it*). A constant repetition and development of these focus areas will make it possible to get the work to evolve in an upward circular movement – a spiral shape.

### A double target

It is not only that collaborative social innovation in many cases will create better *results* – It will also create better *processes*. New relationships have in themselves social

## Advice and recommendations


value, because new relationships challenge established thought patterns, generate new ideas and open up for new joint scopes of action. This is so important that when a European expert committee gives advice on the EU policy on social innovation, they stress that the “social innovations are innovations that are social both in their ends and their means”<sup>24</sup>.

The notion that it is the public authorities that must develop and deliver new solutions to meet the welfare needs of the inhabitants is an idea that is deeply rooted with many. For many years, the idea that the welfare of the population should be created around a public (municipal) fulcrum has been underpinned by a strong belief that such production must be governed and controlled by organizational principles derived from business; so-called *New Public Management*<sup>25</sup>. A focus on competitive tendering and division of as many as possible tasks into independent units managed by objectives, is a bad solution for collaborative social innovation. The management by objectives model focuses attention solely on results with little emphasis on values to be found in processes. This book's collaboration model (Figure 5 in the next chapter, p. 23) challenges such a *mindset*. But the model also challenges the ideas behind much of the so-called empowerment. Initiatives we find in Norwegian municipalities. User involvement is in many places strongly characterized by an *us-and-them* attitude that rarely surmounts the threshold of a real area of collaboration with equality<sup>26</sup>. – “They don't say me any more, from now on they say we”, writes Haldis Moren Vesaas in a famous poem, albeit from a far more dramatic time than we are experiencing<sup>27</sup>, but it is nonetheless a poetic expression of an attitude whereby we move from separateness to shared responsibility – and that it is possible to be inspired by, also for our purposes.

- Be sure that the problem to be solved really is a problem for some. Spend time understanding the problem along with those who know it best. It is in new understandings of problems that the seeds of new solutions are most often to be found.
- Innovation is not just about creativity; to devise new ideas. It is about implementing them - making sure your ideas are utilized. So make sure that the local innovation work holds onto good ideas all the way until they are utilized.
- The social innovation has the greatest effect when it creates social values, both in the way the work is carried out, and in the results the collaboration creates. Stay focused on both. Talk about - and look for specific ways to deal with it.
- Do you allow enough time to talk about what you are doing - and do you have a good enough framework to do what you are talking about? What is the balance between talk and action?
- Do not be satisfied with just talking together. Convert talking into action. The best way to find out if an idea that one has conceived in a conversation works, is to try it out.
- Do you think that the collaboration moves in a circle, a spiral? Is it moving forward? What is the most important driving force? See Figure 4 in this chapter. Discuss together how you work in the different parts of the circle.

### 3. Four common values

We begin in this chapter with a review of the model for collaborative social innovation on which this book is based. The model shows four values and seven action fields. We will start with the four values.



*“If we are to better the future, we must disturb the present”*

(Catherine Booth)<sup>28</sup>




Figure 5. Model for collaborative social innovation



## A model for local collaborative social innovation

In the research activity that forms the basis of the handbook, we have uncovered a set of characteristics that appear to have general validity for collaborative social innovation. Figure 5 shows that these elements can - and should be seen in context. The components can be used for locally-adapted work that takes into account the organizational, legal, financial, political, structural and cultural situation at each place. So what is generally valid is not the model that it is possible to go straight into for creating a local project without any adaptations. The model nevertheless provides a knowledge-based foundation for action, and for developing fully-grown local collaboration with an innovative effect, in both process and result.

The model shows that the collaborative social innovation is driven by seven fields of action. Four common values cut vertically upwards in the model and keep it all together. The values ensure that the whole is given buoyancy.

In collaboration, there are three qualities in particular that are important for supporting the actions, three of which are *openness, democracy and creativity*. In addition, we have included a fourth value; *leadership*. – that may seem less intuitive as a value, but collaborative social innovation does not move forward by itself. A particular form of leadership is required, and we emphasize that leadership is not a particular feature or field of action beside everything else we need to do. It is more a flavour added into the whole process.

### Openness

Openness is a prerequisite for cooperating with inhabitants and actors who are different from ourselves. Openness spreads learning across actors and environments.

There should be a low threshold for being able to propose untraditional ideas and solutions within a local collaboration. New ideas may sound strange, seem provocative, or simply look a bit “stupid” at first. But there is a great deal that at first seemed stupid, but which has later become obvious. Established thought models have to be cleared away, neglected, or even destroyed in order for new ones to grow. Openness is therefore a value that ensures that it is possible to say unusual things, propose untraditional things, and question the established truths. It is of course not always the case that all “crazy” ideas are good. All untraditional suggestions need not be implemented. It is still good for cooperation if they are allowed to be aired. Hidden between ten or twenty strange and unworkable ideas, a breakthrough may be hidden.

Openness is also a value for trust and transparency. Collaboration often quickly develops a group identity. That is good. A high level of trust often requires a “we culture” in the group. However, it must not be perceived as exclusive or closed to people and environments on the outside of the group. It is a challenge. It is wise that collaborative social innovation makes the effort to give *out* information – show what they are doing and create systems for inviting input and ideas from outside.

Openness is also about accessibility. How accessible are the participants to each other? Do they share their mobile phone numbers with each other, dare to bump into each other with ideas and associations in the afternoon – this is often the core time in civil society while it is “overtime” in the council offices. Getting together in a group on social media can make it easier to share information outside of the informal meeting structure. It may not be desirable, but it is helpful to discuss with each other about how open you are going to be to each other, also on a purely practical level.

## DISRUPTION

Disruption is a new word in the Norwegian language. It is associated with the destruction, and is often used in discussions about innovation: Something must be destroyed, or at least cleared away, in order to make space for new thoughts, ideas, solutions or other matters. Joseph Shumpeter, who was one of the first to be occupied with the theory of innovation and entrepreneurship, is known for his theory of creative destruction. The entrepreneur, with whom he was particularly concerned, had the courage and abilities to initiate such destruction. A common obstruction to innovation that many people point out (not all – there is a discussion in the academic world about this), is that the will, ability and tolerance of disruption are low in many organizations. The concept of disruption (Eng.) was introduced into innovation literature by Clayton M. Christensen in 1995. Later, he and others have used it to point out the phenomenon of innovation in many fields, including in the health- and care sector (Christensen et.al. 2006).



## *A solution outside of business hours*

*The project team had a somewhat difficult meeting on Friday. The participants had left each other in a somewhat discouraged mood. They had not managed to find a model for the project's continuation that everyone could agree on, and it was urgent. The municipality would finalize its budget work in the coming week and funding from there presumed that there would exist a collaborative model that everyone could agree on. It was then that Tore, active in the municipality's volunteer centre and participant in the project team, got an idea on Saturday while he was driving with furniture for the recycling station. Excitedly he called Lars-Martin who works in the municipality. They quickly agreed that Tore's idea for the continued operation could probably be a solution in everyone's interests. They were really fairly sure that it was a «Columbus' egg». Tore found the Facebook profiles of the other six in the group, and quickly set up a closed group which he invited them to join. There he briefly described the idea with a couple of links to other sites where something corresponding had been tried out. During the Sunday, all six had accepted group invitations and complimented Tore's proposal. Before the working day began on Monday, everyone agreed that they would meet the coming Wednesday afternoon to make a decision and a short-term plan for the project's continued operation in line with the model in the proposal that now lay on the table. It would be in time for the municipality's budget process. – Trust, openness and accessibility had worked.*

## Democracy

Naturally, democracy in this context is not about casting your vote in an election; indirect democracy. Democracy is a value that ensures real influence over the design and implementation of problem solutions. It is especially important to remember that end users — for whom the solution is primarily intended to make a better life, have as much influence on the work as everyone else. Thus the democratic value is actuated. Democracy is closely associated with what is often called *governance* in International (also in some Norwegian) literature<sup>29</sup>. Democracy does not only presume new attitudes towards cooperation, but also good systems, routines and practices to take advantage of the cooperating actors' resources and competence. We can call it a "democratic ecosystem". In such an ecosystem, there are few skills hierarchies. There, life experience is an equally valuable skill as credits and professional affiliation – *not instead of*, but *in addition to*. Democratic values often challenge power relationships. Talking openly about power and influence is therefore of great benefit if one wants to do something with such matters. Established power constellations are deeply imbued in many places. Democracy values put knee-jerk reactions to the test. That is when other's interests are in conflict with mine that the strength of democratic values proves itself. Am I still willing to let the interests of others play in the decisions to be made - just as much as my own interests and opinions? If not, collaborative social innovation can become a decoration, not a part of the work's basic values.

## Creativity

It may seem unnecessary to point out that creativity is a common value in a model for collaborative social innovation, but why should we omit the obvious? There is also a lot of cooperation that has a low level for creativity, even though it aims to create renewal. It all boils down to the obvious and minor corrections to current practices. We are all pretty tightly stuck in habits. If you want to work together for new solutions to defined problems, it is therefore useful to ask yourself and each other: *Is this new?* This is not always the aim, but it is often the very point of social innovation. The innovation ambition can be connected to a new way of seeing the problem, a new perspective when looking for reasons for services, proposals for a new organizational model, a new method of implementation, new actors and relationships, new ways of communicating, new methods of measuring social impact, etc. We should therefore ask questions as to whether we stretch ourselves far enough when looking for new ideas throughout this range of topics. Are we grasping at what is new and useful, or lapsing into habits?

It is not the case that some people are creative and others absolutely not. Of course, we may have acquired out different skills, even when it comes to the ability to open up for new ideas. But it is often about opportunities – structure and culture. Is there room for - permission and opportunities to - think beyond the routines and models we usually follow? Moreover, creativity is not first and foremost an individual

---

*I have had a look at this idea of collaboration. I don't think it is anything for us. It will mean us giving away quite a lot of power!*

(Municipal Department Manager for Public Health)

---

skill. Work with ideas is a collective effort<sup>30</sup>. We can help each other (or prevent each other) in thinking — and working creatively.

Traditionally, research relating to creativity has been mainly directed at individuals in the creative process. It has given rise to myths about the creative genius. Today's creativity research is directed to a far greater extent at creativity as a collective phenomenon in processes related to everyday arenas and activities<sup>31</sup>. Everyday creativity does not occur in the minds of individuals, but in discussions between people who have different views, where they succeed in sharing their different ideas and views with each other.

There are many techniques, tools and methods for promoting such collective creativity, in some instances referred to as *interactive thinking*<sup>32</sup>. "Interactive thinking" is the opposite of "group thinking" whereby the group, often subconsciously, harmonizes its perception of reality with its way of thinking. The group must be encouraged to get out of group thinking (which practically no groups believe they have). That brings us to the next value.

## Leadership

A collaboration with openness, democracy and creativity must have leadership. This does not primarily refer to a person. Leadership is an important factor behind the cultural codes that develop in a working community. A different logic applies to leadership of collaborative social innovation processes than that of conventional organizational management. Other tools and methods must be used in leading network processes than if one is leading an organisation with a group of employees over whom one has authority to issue instructions<sup>33</sup>. Running a network- and process organization is about creating frameworks for self-governing

systems. Such leadership is intended to emphasize motivation and mobilization of resources across organizations and citizens' groups.

Network leadership can be divided into a number of main functions:

1. Design the network. Specific actors and inhabitants must be invited and included, ground rules for the collaboration must be prepared/facilitated with a high level of openness.
2. Establish framework for the network. Values must be established within a collective framework. A narrative has to be created about the work. Why are we collaborating?
3. Monitor the network forward. Progress must be secured in direct interaction with the participants. Participation is supported through qualification measures, marginal groups are included, confidence is supported, conflicts are dealt with, and the groundwork is laid for knowledge-sharing.
4. Ensure participation in the network. Close, trusting relationships must be created and the quality of dialogue maintained so that none of the participants feel that their views are being ignored.

One party should not have "all power" in an area of collaboration, instead leadership should be handled in a process whereby the involvement of all parties rests on their own motivation and feeling of influence. Leading such collaborative social innovation may be like "The King's Hares"; they run wherever they want, but with the right balance between spreading and gathering together, leadership will succeed<sup>34</sup>.

## Advice and recommendations

Leading collaborative social innovation is about making sure that this process works, that there is a steady influx of ideas and knowledge so that the innovation processes do not stop up.

Collaborative social innovation is intended to deliver services/products with social value, develop practices and generate ideas, and/or create new organizational solutions in a high-quality process, not just as an occasional stunt. Social innovations should not be mediocre just because they are social. On the contrary, when working with the aim of creating the highest possible social value, the focus on quality should influence all actors. Quality is not ensured by a single party's understanding of quality being set as a premise. Instead it assumes an understanding of quality and a quality of work that contains different understandings.

Leadership is required in a broad function field to achieve this. It requires attention in four directions at the same time: It requires understanding of the *production* you are involved with; the field you are working in – it requires *order and structure* – ability to *produce results* – it has the need for *renewal and flexibility* – and requires the determination and ability to take care of *relationships*<sup>35</sup>.

- It could be helpful to remember the four recurrent values when doing a particular task, if the temperature rises and you are in a hurry to tackle all the tasks. Write the values up on a poster or somewhere else that is visible and that can remind you of them when your work is dominated by deadlines and tasks.
- Talk about each of the values. How well do you think the value is taken care of in your collaboration? Are there differing interpretations of this in your collaboration?
- Try to place the values in your local context. In which situations are the values visible, and when are they missing? See if you can find out whether one or more of the values needs vitalizing in your work. If so, seek out sources of knowledge and tools for this. Set aside time to work on it. The operative work often takes the focus away from a conscious work on values.
- What do the different partners have the best qualifications to lead? Talk together on how to take care of and strengthen the collaboration through new forms of shared leadership. Talk about your habits. Can there be other ways of leading than the way you do?



## 4. Seven fields of action

In this chapter, we look more closely at the seven fields of action that drive forward social innovation, see figure 5 on page 23. Although we describe each of the seven separately, we would still remind you that the seven are closely interconnected. In the practical collaborative work of innovation, actions and values glide into each other. See Model 5, page 23.



## Conservation of equality

Equality in cooperative relationships may, when it works at its best, create mutual exchange of knowledge and resources, learning and synergy. It can strengthen democracy and ownership with inhabitants and other partners. It will in turn create added value to both implementation and result. The same field of equality, therefore, forms the energy field for collaborative social innovation. It is all about doing the right things – that is why we have put it in the model's action field.

It takes time to establish trust between actors, but you have to endure taking that time. Patience is important, but entrepreneurs do not always have it. Cooperation between the municipality and the volunteer sector is at risk of carrying over the traditions of previous cooperation where the balance of power usually underpins the municipality's role as the dominant part. Ideal and voluntary organisations are accustomed to relating to municipal grants, permits and goodwill. Such habits must be challenged and gradually replaced with a new practice in a reciprocal cooperation. It may be necessary to change both structural and cultural elements in more of the collaborating partners – things have to be done differently.

Attempts by municipalities to use volunteering as a means of fulfilling their own goals and agendas, prove to be unsuccessful. Equivalence must be organized in specific work – what is often called facilitation<sup>36</sup>. A field of collaboration with equivalence must be expressed in practice. For example, it is advisable to create shared meeting places where this is natural, either in the volunteers' home territory or on “neutral” territory. Cooperation meetings in the Council Chambers between 09:00 and 11:00 are not the right venue for equivalence.

The role of the public in equal social innovative collaboration does not require the municipalities to withdraw – on the contrary.

The strategy requires a self-aware municipality that dares to play a different role than that which their habits often encourage. See additional comments about the role of the municipality in the section “Five steps for a collaborative municipality” on page 44.





***Sisters in Business** is an initiative in Asker which creates work for immigrant women. It is based on a number of hybrid collaborative solutions that it is difficult to understand if you are only wearing the sector society's glasses. People from the municipal social enterprise «Asker Products», who themselves have mixed ethnicity, took the first initiative. Women from the immigrant community were soon engaged in idea development and planning. NAV Asker set aside its strictest guidelines for course- and training support by calling it R & D work, and Asker municipality put its working capacity and expertise at their disposal. Eventually, IKEA joined the collaboration with their requirements to efficiency and results. It all grew from what the participants themselves experienced as an organic process where very little emphasis was placed on how much power, what mandate and institutional commitments each person had outside of the collaboration. Diversity was used as a resource in building up a «we» culture, the participants say.*



## Working with common goals

It is wise to keep a joint flag for collaboration flying, both at the start and underway in the work process. It is difficult to create social values together when there are far different interests, values and purposes with the work. It is common knowledge that the targets and spending limits of public organizations are often a poor match with ambitions of creating experimental social solutions by actors in equal roles across sectors and traditional roles and outside the limits of what has been tried before. In working with such ambitions it is wise to divert the focus from traditional roles, sector boundaries and control regimes. Instead, you have to discuss what is the work's common *vision*, and angle the work accordingly.

A vision is not a slogan, it is a desired image of the future. Each party to the collaboration often has clear ideas about this, and often thinks that this must be the same for everyone else. We have already emphasized differences in qualities but such differences should be connected with a *clear common goal*. When we put together jigsaw puzzles we do it with different pieces but with one final picture in mind or in front of us. Likewise, we can work with different parts of the picture, with different and complementary pieces in a collaboration – it must still be directed towards a larger common picture.

That said, we might also add that it does not matter so much if there are also slightly different perceptions or weightings of the collaboration's goal and purpose. It is not unusual for different actors to have their own agendas in the collaboration. Such individual player's objectives may be legitimate subsidiary objectives in the collaboration, but they must still not overshadow the work's shared vision. When there is a common vision, one can be generous and open to the fact that each participant also has its own interests. Collaboration established on the basis of one party's objectives tends to obtain an instrumental character, and becomes a medium for the dominant party's objectives. We would warn you against this. Such instrumental collaboration rarely creates

good co-creative qualities - it slows down innovation. Establishing networks outside our own core organization, with space for users and user groups as equal participants, takes a lot of time. It is a resource some might think should have been used more effectively, if there just wasn't so much talk! But if added value, synergy and joint action with the most social value creation is the objective, then it is better to use the time it takes to talk together and coordinate together, than to make the fastest possible progress. It may be the case that you make more progress with less co-creation, but it is of little help if you arrive faster at the wrong objective.

## Communication

Open and honest communication is a mainstay of collaborative social innovation, both in preventing problems and as a tool when problems may need to be sorted out. Although communication is currently sailing up as a field of expertise in many arenas, it is really quite simple. Communicating about how we communicate (meta-communication) forms part of a good collaboration.

At the practical level, first and foremost it means talking together regularly in a proper manner whereby everyone makes themselves heard with their own language. If the discussion is characterized by a single player's "tribal language" it may be experienced as strange and uncomfortable for others. The Japanese term *Ba* describes a context characterized by open, trusting knowledge sharing<sup>37</sup>. It may be a physical place but is not always that. The term not only relates to physical spaces, it also includes cultural frameworks for good knowledge sharing. It is a communications room in the broadest sense, where it feels natural for all participants to share ideas, knowledge, concerns and hopes. Everyone should ask the question as to whether they have such rooms, such frameworks, in their own work and cooperation.

The communication between the interested parties in the collaboration field should have a sustained character. Research shows that participants in heterogeneous cooperation often need several years to build up enough experience and knowledge with each other in order to recognize and appreciate each other.

In good socially innovative collaboration processes, participants discuss with each other in a way that breaks down the classic distinction between "us" and "you" or "them", a distinction we are very familiar with from traditional hierarchies. It is wise to think and talk together if communication takes place in a way that contributes to the development of such a common "we". A positive answer to that question suggests that the participants in the collaboration communicate with each other orally and in writing in a way that everyone can identify with. All the digital platforms available in our time should be places where it is natural to "meet" between the project meetings, not just to be informed.

Communication *externally* is also a factor in the collaborative social innovation. The whole thing may quickly become *cosy* and somewhat internal, if all quality work related to the communication is directed inwards. A good innovation project will encounter the need for support from environments outside the inner circle – see the section on *anchoring*. The work should, therefore, to the extent relevant, ensure that the public is kept informed, and that other important interested parties in the environment experience that they are being kept updated on the purpose and progress of the work.

A stumbling block in the communications field is *representativeness*. Our experience is that much of the criticism directed at social innovation projects in many places is about lack of representativeness. Such criticism can be based on envy or misunderstanding; an experience of someone gaining exclusive advantages through the innovation work. A great deal of social innovation work is developed precisely to

improve situations for a limited group that has identified problems. An open communication on this, could help to curb the criticism. It is also wise to think through who should represent the collaboration externally. If it is impractical for everyone to step forward and front the work collectively, one or a few people may often have to. Who should that be? People have roles, and most people often attach a great symbolic value to roles. It is not always the case that people attach the greatest importance to *what* is being said, they sometimes attach equal importance to *who* says it. It is therefore far from unimportant who and how the work is presented externally.

## Anchoring

The term in the heading is a maritime metaphor – it brings to mind the ship's anchor and the necessity of ensuring that the vessel does not drift freely with the wind and current. A good anchorage point provides stability and security. These are qualities that it is natural to wish for in collaborative social innovation. It is precisely because the activity is about change, that there is often greater room for uncertainty. Secure anchoring is therefore important. Such security can be given obtained through shrewd anchoring in two ways. A clarification of the ambiguity of the anchoring concept is therefore necessary in order to clarify two ways of working strategically, that the concept partially obscures.

When you throw out an anchor, we strongly recommend that it is thrown over the rail and down into the water; towards the bottom and the bedrock below. In other words, anchoring should take place “outwards” and “downwards” with those for whom the work is intended to provide help and support. Such an understanding of the concept gives reason to ask whether the collaboration is sufficiently anchored with the users and partners in the praxis field.

Good collaborative social innovations include the users in the work - in both planning and implementation. But then? It may prove that such anchoring is still not enough. Especially if a storm blows up around the work. Then it is also necessary to secure a good *mooring*. We attach the mooring line to the jetty. Let us stick to the metaphor and use mooring as an image for securing the work “upwards” with the superior authorities; in political decisions, budget resolutions and plans that provide support for the work's activities. Such leadership mooring is of course about formal decisions, but it is also about psychological support. Many innovation initiatives have experienced how important it is that leaders higher up in the organisation's hierarchy are both aware of and support the activity personally – and vice versa, how vulnerable they can be if they lack such support.

If we call all our anchoring points *mooring*, both those we find outside/downwards in user environments and among partners, and the support we need higher up for plans; in decisions/budgets and with managers above us, then we may lose sight of the nuances of the concept and the necessity of working on anchoring in more ways. Collaborative social innovation activity should work with finding and securing good anchoring points for their activity both “downwards” and “upwards”.

In addition to the above, there is yet another form of anchoring that is often underestimated in collaborative social innovation. It is about securing support in the underlying functions or units in *your own organization*. There may be someone there who is willing to attend to all the administrative work that is generated. The expectation that collaborative social innovation can take place without a supportive organizational infrastructure, is one of the most frequent reasons why such work fails<sup>38</sup>. Innovation work without administrative support runs the risk of running aground.


## Facilitate

Collaboration with equality and common objectives, with good communication and anchoring, does not happen by itself. Goodwill is not enough. We have written about leadership, and briefly touched upon the subject of facilitating. Here we are diving somewhat deeper into an area which, which in many ways is the leadership function's field of action.


Facilitate is a word that fits here<sup>39</sup>. The word comes from the Latin "facilis" which means "easy", or "making easier". It means more than finding a vacant room, sending out notices of meetings and making coffee. Facilitation is about making cooperation as easy as possible for all parties, with a clear focus on involving all parties in the collaboration's different activities. It is about doing the right thing at the right time, in the right place – among other things. The collaboration must be facilitated both in terms of formal structure and appropriate culture. Collaboration partners should meet regularly and be well-prepared. This is necessary in order for trust to be developed. In meetings, decisions should be made that everyone could have thought through in advance, and it should be possible to refer to previous minutes in a shared archive resource etc. There should be venues and ample opportunities for informal contact and relationship-building in the collaboration. A good preparation for this includes organizing the collaboration at times, dates, places, and with routines that all parties are comfortable with<sup>40</sup>. The devil is in the detail, as we say. Our experience is that the destructive details often emerge with weak facilitation or a lack of facilitation.

Facilitation and collaborative social innovation are also about being able to share impressions and experiences of the operational work with which one is collaborating. This could mean that the parties may have to meet at the locations where the services take place in practice. Such facilitation will prevent the *co-creation* from ending up as a *co-nversa*

*tion*. Good facilitation creates a team spirit. It is better to develop the practical framework of the project together than just one of the parties always inviting the others onto its home ground, with the rules of the game that apply there.



*The Norwegian National Housing Bank, Southern Region supports social housing work in Larvik for low-income families, together with the University College of Southeast Norway, NAV Larvik, Larvik Municipality's Service Office and Property Department, plus the Volunteer Centre in Larvik. Five families from the target group are included as equal partners. The meetings of the collaborating partners take place in the afternoon in the kitchen of the Volunteer Centre's recycling station. Before and after the meetings, the participants go around in the second-hand shop to see if they can find anything interesting, not just the low-income families. The premises are located some way outside the town and not all of the families have a car or a driving licence. Therefore, carpooling has been organised for all meeting participants, and baby sitting is available in adjoining premises, thus ensuring the collaboration is easily facilitated.*



## Focus on resources

When working with collaborative social innovation processes, it is important to be both forward- and outward looking. Such a view focuses on resources rather than problems. Not because problems and obstacles are being overlooked, but there is a time and place for everything. Having seen what new opportunities collaboration can create, it will be possible to work more purposefully in dealing with obstacles and threats. An opposite approach is poorly suited to the work of collaborative social innovation. An early focus on obstacles will also characterize the collaborative social innovation's ability to see opportunities and glorious future prospects. We can show this in an illustration.

The person in Figure 6 stands in the moment, as we all do – always. There, he can choose to focus his attention and powers of thought on the past - in the lower part of the thought figure - of everything that went wrong, everything he

has disliked and is dissatisfied with. He does not want it to be that way, but yet he focuses on it. When his thoughts are there, they are in the “Moping Room”. It is okay to identify problems that you want to get out of, but there is no innovation in the “Moping Room”. Instead he can focus upwards, but still towards the past. He can think of everything that has worked well before; previous successes. This is the thoughts' “Reminiscing Room”. It is nice to be there, but there is no innovation there either. Thoughts and learning from the past should therefore be aimed forward towards the future – to what *might happen*. But there is also bottom room. Concerns that something unfortunate might happen – yes, even thoughts that we might fail, may arise. They lie in the “Concerns Room”. Preparedness and prevention are wise to have, but worries create little energy for innovation. The desire to find new solutions to recognised needs must instead be lifted upwards and onwards to a *focus on unrealized desired solutions*. Focusing on something positive, but that has not been realized, is not the same as focusing on something unrealistic. Looking towards unrealized good solutions, admittedly, gives the impression of dreaming, and in our experience does not have the best reputation in planning and public administration. But all innovation is borne forward by the fact that someone dares to imagine something that is not “true” in the sense that it does not exist for the time being. Nonetheless, there are some people that get together to realize it. This is the basic principle of innovation<sup>41</sup>.

The person in the figure is woefully alone. Working forward with a focus on possibilities is supported by building networks. Dialogue and negotiations with “diversity thinking”<sup>42</sup> can lead to a new understanding of problems, new common goals, and ideas for achieving such goals in the dreamroom and eventually in the actual world




Figure 6. Illustration of four mental rooms in which to become oriented.



*There was a mood of despondency and pessimism in Evje and Hornnes municipality when it became known that the Norwegian Armed Forces would close down Evjemoen military base some years ago. Evjemoen with nearly 300 officer jobs and even more conscripts, was the village's most important workplace and asset. Then someone came forward and said: The situation is not primarily a threat, it is our opportunity! Now we can create our own future, not just be a location for the Army. Then a discussion started about the possibilities, the environment grew and new actors with new perspectives and ideas joined the process. The Government's contribution to restructuring helped, but the money was not the determining factor for new businesses and new jobs being created at Evjemoen. The process was characterized by the will and ability to look into the future, and that other actors than those with the interests and expertise connected to the past actively participated. Today, Evjemoen houses around twenty businesses with more jobs than there were during the time the military was there<sup>43</sup>*



## Working with several competencies simultaneously

In working for collaborative social innovation we must understand something new. Innovation begins with new knowledge. We might therefore just as well have called this section *Learning*, because the field of action focuses on knowledge's *activity* – that is learning.

There are many definitions of knowledge and probably even more of learning. In collaboration, emphasis is placed on an experience-based approach. Learning in such a perspective is about the acquisition of new knowledge and skills based on experience, and leading to a lasting change in mindsets and practices<sup>49</sup>. That fits our purpose, because this book is about creating change<sup>44</sup>.

Professional participants' professional knowledge is an important resource in the local collaborative social innovation, but their knowledge is not the only legitimate area of competence in the interaction. It is very important that participants with a specialist professional standpoint are willing to bring their professionalism into play along with the skills that the other participants have<sup>45</sup>. This requires an open attitude towards learning by all parties.

The opinion of knowledge has changed over time. Previously, knowledge was seen as a unit that can be stored, communicated, received and archived – much like an object or a product. Today we view knowledge more as a process – knowledge as the basis for new knowledge in the face of other knowledge. This in turn forms new knowledge when applied in the face of others, etc. Knowledge therefore has little value if it does not lead to wishes and abilities to *act* in certain ways. Knowledge *application* is therefore a key, something that ties the term closely to the competence concept. Competence is the source of action because it embraces both theoretical knowledge, life experience,

abilities and skills. A good collaborative social innovation process will therefore be a learning community. A more conventional focus on knowledge and learning as an individual phenomenon, must thus give way to a view and a treatment of learning as a social phenomenon. In light of this, a local collaborative social innovation should become a *Learning Community*<sup>46</sup>

On the way from knowledge to action, thoughts must go down to the attitude level. It does not help to have the knowledge and skills to make changes, if there is no *desire* to put them into action. Working in collaboration with complementary competencies must therefore take place in a dynamic field where attitudes are also worked with. Also, the part of the competence work to do with attitudes should be raised in the collective processes.



*– What have we learned since the last time? That is always the first question on the agenda in a collaboration about the inclusion of released prisoners «Together for Life» in the Vestfold region. The aim is to prevent a relapse into new crime and imprisonment. Through the organization, follow-up and «mediation» between the region's businesses, the Norwegian Correctional Service, NAV, a municipal social enterprise and a large industrial enterprise/investor, work is being carried out for social value creation. Each of the collaborators has a high level of expertise, but they all realize that they have to learn*

*something new in the overlap between everything each of them can do, as they express it. The systems we have for follow-up care and employment do not work well enough for people with a longer prison record than a CV, said one of the initiators. The collaboration partners understand that they must develop new practices on the basis of a new understanding of the complexity of the problem. That's why they ask themselves: What can we learn from each other, and what can we learn from the experiences we share? Then what change to practice must the new insight lead to?*





## Advice and recommendations

- Equivalence is a key prerequisite for collaboration. In order for the cooperation to be equal, both parties must share a common perception that the prerequisites for equality are present. Often, this is defined differently, so it is therefore useful to raise this as a distinct topic.
- Visions are not slogans, visions are images of the future – imagined stories about a desired future. When such a desired image is created jointly, greater obligations and support arise than if they are created by one of the parties alone or by an external consultant. By all means make room for your own agendas and “hobby horses” in the collaboration area, but make sure that everyone agrees to the same goal that you are all going to aim for. Do you have such a vision?
- Talk together - a lot. And talk to others around you; with interested parties and the public authorities. – Do not hide yourselves away, be visible and clear also towards each other. Talk together about what you are doing, and then do what you are talking about.
- Language shapes action patterns. An effective means of promoting productive collaboration is precisely to talk about it<sup>47</sup>. Provide key concepts in the interaction field with concrete content.
- If you have your own website, make sure it is updated and that it shows the breadth of those who are participating. Think hard about what is said and what images you use.
- Ensure that the work is securely grounded in its foundations; among those who experience the problem in their own life. Grounding in civil society, among the public, in business, in appropriate organizations, etc. will be able to provide robustness. What about the leadership of your own organizations; in the municipality, are you moored there - right up in the top management of the administration? What about the municipality's political leadership, have you done anything to moor your work there? If it is a long time ago, perhaps they should be briefed again on how things are going with you and what you are doing.
- Hunt for resources, look for opportunities! If you turn your problems around then you might see possibilities behind the problems. Imagine the world the way it is when you are at your best. What does a desired future look like – exactly? It is easier to create a future that you first imagine. Such narratives will give your work energy and progress.
- Be humble and inquisitive in relation to alternative perspectives on your work. Don't view other approaches as troublesome, don't stare too long at threats and barriers. Spend time looking for opportunities, look for resources outside the pathway you most often follow.
- You may certainly have broad expertise, but is there still an insight, an area of life, any experience that could have been useful to have? When did you last look for new surprising skills that can complement your own?



## 5. Innovation and roles

Working with collaborative social innovation requires us to take on new roles. We need to see things differently, change perspectives and allow new actors to enter the stage. This may feel strange in the beginning. Unfamiliar, and perhaps somewhat threatening. But it is necessary – and it usually goes well. We will now be looking more closely into all of this from an innovation perspective.



## Innovation

Innovation as a concept was originally associated with the development of new products in manufacturing and production of physical products. Today the term is also used for processes that bring forth new solutions to social challenges. Innovations rarely occur spontaneously by themselves. Research on innovation in general, and on social innovation in particular, will find the basis for talking about innovation-stimulating and innovative environments or culture – or vice versa; innovation-restricting environments. Organisational factors are therefore of great importance. While classic innovation in private enterprises often has the objective of improving competitiveness and increasing earnings, social innovation, as we have seen are social both in their ends and their means. Unlike more traditional innovations, the challenges of many interested parties are specified and addressed by many of the parties together. The community works together in understanding the problem itself, which thus helps to develop overall solutions that can relate to more challenges at once. Social innovation is good for meeting complex problems, see the “Wicked Problems” text box on page 9. Dual aims and an involving profile in multi-disciplinary environments are demanding.

In innovation literature there is a distinction between radical and incremental innovation. Incremental innovation is about adapting to the factors that are known and used already – we might call it a gradual renewal. In radical innovation more fundamental changes are made - things are not just done a little differently, instead you do completely different things.

## Social entrepreneurs

Some of what grows up with a resource focus and creative force in the overlapping field between the classic sectors of the welfare state is known as social entrepreneurship<sup>48</sup>. In Norway, we do not always distinguish between the social entrepreneur in the sense of an individual; a driving force or entrepreneur who startups with social innovative activities, and a social entrepreneur in the sense of a *social economic enterprise* with an idealistic objective. When we refer to social entrepreneurs below, it is the latter definition we refer to – an organised enterpris, innovative with a social aim.

Social entrepreneurship is therefore characterized by the fact that it creates social value through innovations, which it usually includes an additional element in that it uses economic value and business methods as a means of creating the desired social change. Therefore, social entrepreneurs often act in the junction between the public, private and ideal “third sector”<sup>49</sup>. They often make use of models and solutions that secure the economic foundation for achievement of the social goal. A final characteristic is that social entrepreneurs often also have a strong democratic profile. Users/relatives or other residents who are close to those for whom the services are aimed to create social value, are involved in the work. With these characteristics, social entrepreneurship can move between different varieties of thin- or thick collaboration, ref. Figure 5, page 23.

In European research on social entrepreneurship, it is highlighted that those social entrepreneurs work with realizing the development- and change potential that they

## **SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP IS CHARACTERISED BY**

1. Creating social value
2. Innovative
3. Actors in civil society have a prominent position as a producer or co-producer in the business.
4. The work has economic significance, either as regular income through the sale of goods/services (business model), via better inclusion of people in the job market, or through other efforts that imply that certain people/groups no longer - or to a considerably lesser extent - have use for public assistance<sup>50</sup>.

identify in the local contexts of which they themselves are a part <sup>51</sup>. In an American context there is a tendency to view social entrepreneurship as an arena for entrepreneurial loners, who heroically pursue their ideas despite efforts and challenges. Social entrepreneurship is primarily associated with links between civil society and the conditions of the private market. The Government and the public sector at large, play no - or only a small role. In the Nordic countries, we see more clearly that social entrepreneurship unfolds in collective processes. The phenomenon must therefore be understood on the basis of the networks, relationships and the surroundings of which it is part. Social entrepreneurship as a growing field in the Nordic region is therefore not primarily a consequence of a sole person's individual attitudes, actions and choices<sup>52</sup>. Naturally, the latter also influences the social entrepreneur's relationship with its own

ideas and practices – that it must be seen in the context of the local community that it unfolds in, or where it aims to act as a power to change.

Because social entrepreneurs often operate in hybrid models across various sectors, they must combine logic, expertise and skills from several areas<sup>53</sup>. It can create uncertainty and turmoil in their surroundings. It raises questions as to what these actors are really doing. At the same time, it is precisely their ability to combine different logic and apply the ground rules from several sectors of society, that creates the level of innovation in social entrepreneurship<sup>54</sup>. Therefore, social entrepreneurs work on the basis of several forms of rationality<sup>55</sup> -with local community initiatives and volunteering in local networks (civil society logic), with ground rules from the market in their business activities (business logic) – and usually they work in close relationship with, or are dependent on the public sector in respect of official regulations, appropriations, or agreements where they must learn to deal with official ground rules (governmental/ municipal logic).

The use of social entrepreneurship in innovation activities is not an end in itself, it is a means of achieving social goals-even for the social entrepreneurs themselves. Social entrepreneurs will therefore often, but not always, enter into some form of collaboration in the social innovation field, either of a long duration; In a thick collaboration field or in more temporary thin collaborative processes.

## **New roles for many – especially for the municipality**

There is no doubt that it is the municipality that is faced to the greatest extent with the challenges of changing roles and learning new manuscripts in local areas of collaboration. Collaborative social innovation is a field that, on the one hand, presumes that actors venture over into slightly different roles than they have had before – it can create resistance - on the other hand, collaboration can also be

stimulating for role transformation. Once one has entered into collaboration according to the model we present, roles will gradually change as a consequence of the relationships and values in the collaboration.

The municipalities have a great deal of expertise in many disciplines. This represents a strength in collaborative social innovation. The municipality has an overview and knowledge of the challenges in the local community. It is an expertise that is valuable and that can be used to substantiate the other players' ability to succeed. The municipality's overview and knowledge may also be useful in scaling good solutions to apply to the whole local society, or several local contexts - perhaps even the whole country. This knowledge is important in the role of organizer/facilitator.

It is in the role of facilitator that the municipality's professional expertise and other competence can be used more widely to inspire and coordinate rather than to control. In an open, equal partnership as described in this book, the role of the municipality could be to facilitate the collaboration's collective efforts through funding, professional expertise, oversight, guidance and by making the municipality's own network accessible.

A role which is largely based on such facilitating skills is the role of the *incubator*. An incubator is an organisation established to provide support for businesses in the start-up and innovation phases<sup>56</sup>. If we focus on the incubator's *role*, there is a great deal that municipalities can learn from such practices. The value of the incubator role is to be found in its strong emphasis on the process perspective. An incubator helps to develop robust innovations by connecting various resources together and adding knowledge to the processes, either from their own sources or by connecting knowledge resources from outside. Of course, financial resources play a role, but it often proves to be equally important that the incubator manages to connect together complementary knowledge resources that otherwise would not find each other without such an effort. It can strengthen innovations if guides are available in the collaboration field that can lead

the work through the multitude of government agencies and regulations that act as important frameworks for the field in which the innovation takes place.

In the same way as there are in Norway and in many other countries, incubators in the form of business-based organisations/companies that often support different industries and business sectors, municipalities can take on such a role for social entrepreneurs, voluntary organisations or individual enthusiasts in civil society. Another possibility is that the municipality, possibly along with neighbouring municipalities in the region, and together with other relevant external partners, establishes its own incubator organisations for social innovation/social entrepreneurship.



*The Norwegian National Housing Bank has for some time experimented with a new model and method of collaboration through the project «Morgendagens generasjonssamfunn». This model creates an arena where the municipality along with residents, businesses, the voluntary sector and social entrepreneurs look at the challenges facing the community, and then jointly initiate new forms of cooperation and develop new solutions.*

## Five steps for a collaborative municipality

In the Danish network *Den National Bevægelse for Samskabelse (The National Movement for Collaboration)*. Professors Jacob Torring and Eva Sørensen describe in a blog article

the need for new roles in the municipal sector in the form of a stairway<sup>57</sup>. The metaphor is not intended as a definite linear model but, however, points to some new habits and roles that municipalities can learn if they want to be good partners in local collaborative processes.

On the first step we meet the **curious municipality**. The municipality has taken the first step and started to ask whether it is perhaps possible to do things differently – in many areas of society. They realize that local associations, private businesses and individuals among the municipalities' inhabitants have valuable experience, ideas and resources. Their curiosity is real and it creates a new method of dialogue. Are invitations given to open discussions. But the municipal organization is still characterized by clear specialist and administrative silos with little real crossing of lines within its organization. There is mostly *co-chat* with the surroundings, not so much *co-working*, and definitely not *co-production*.

Municipalities that come one step further up may be called **inviting municipalities**. The chat moves on to planning. Residents are invited to put forward ideas and proposals for solutions – to issues where the municipality itself has a set understanding. Therefore, no real involvement comes out of the collaboration. Some attempts at cooperation across sectors are resolved in projects outside of the ordinary activity of the municipality. However, the need for new roles and new forms of leadership has become visible – to some. Our experience is that we find many Norwegian municipalities on this step.

On the next step we find **the ambitious municipalities**. Anchoring, in both the management and first line is secured. The organization takes steps to change. Participation and cooperation are not only topics for speeches and extraordinary actions. The municipality carries out structural changes and establishes new ground rules because they have seen that old structures and role behaviour hinder collaboration. The municipal leadership cooperates tightly and closely with organizations outside the municipality. Other municipalities with similar ambitions and/or challenges are consulted.

Among the ambitious municipalities the principles of collaboration are in the process of affecting both the structure and culture of the organization. The local civil society has also changed its expectations to the municipality – from *demand* to *interact*. Roles change gradually - recognition of the new practice spreads. It results in continuous and spontaneous inquiries and ideas emerging from many different sources.

On the fourth step we find the **mature municipality**. There randomness and ad-hocness are replaced by more enduring and systematic network efforts. The municipality has developed new routines and behaviour patterns. Large complex collaborative processes are supported by competent/educated process advisors/facilitators. R & D institutions are coupled to the work, and there are fixed norms and routines so that all tasks are reconsidered in relation to the gain potential of collaboration solutions. Collaboration on the continuum between thin- and thick co-creation/ co-production is not something that takes place on the outside of municipal practices, it has become municipal practice.

**The collaborative municipality** has walked up all the steps, and needs to constantly walk them up again – time and again. Real and radical thick co-creation requires continuous determination and sustained maintenance of systems for collective reflection, willingness and ability to act. A knowledge-based evaluation of the work's effects requires updated knowledge and a watchful eye on movements in the continuum between thin and thick collaboration. Collaboration is not the name of an objective, it is the designation of a practice. In a collaborative municipality, there has been an erasure of different competing forms of government and expertise environments. Collaboration has found its way into arenas that were previously characterized by a rather strict exercise of authority and division of professional interests. Everyone has learned new roles – even the politicians. They no longer spend all their time in meetings with piles of finished cases. Instead, they spend time on policy development together with the inhabitants in

different workshops, working groups and open theme meetings. Forums have been created where politicians meet people from civil society who have knowledge of other relevant aspects of society. The bearing principle is that the community develops best when it focuses on challenges and tasks together – rather than solving tasks based on which profession or sector they are viewed from.

### **A balancing exercise between operation and development**


In every municipality on every step, there are tasks related to operation, control and security on one side, and development, testing and innovation on the other. It creates uncertainty in many municipalities. When should a control logic be used with control and security, and when can testing be allowed with the risk and acceptance of error. Municipalities that want to develop their collaborative abilities must find a good balance. And there are two ditches to fall into – even though we would dare to assert that there are few that end up in the innovation ditch. There are certainly more on the other side of the road, where the need for security, the fear of risk and focus on control have become too strong.

Moving up the stairs, and between the two ditches, is not easy. It requires an awareness of power and roles, and it assumes not only willingness to change – it also requires expertise and competence. It is first and foremost a leadership responsibility.

### **To stand on several steps at the same time**

The steps in the text above are an illustration of the changing values and roles in a municipal organization. From fragmented management and control, to interaction and innovation. Our experience with the municipal sector in Norway is that the pace of movement in many places is somewhat halting. The municipality may be standing with its feet on several steps at the same time. Developing attitudes for more internal collaboration in the municipalities, while at the same time maintaining organizational structures and management principles that are counter to interaction, is probably also a position that many recognise. Having several strong interactive

measures going on in one part of the municipality, while others hang on to old habits, is another position. It may of course be demanding to be in this kind of position, but less demanding if one understand why there is a substantial difference. The stair metaphor may form the basis for discussion and reflection on tasks, roles, leadership and anchoring. A recurrent point in the stair metaphor is that municipalities that wish to make progress, do not perceive themselves as being in a special position in respect of their environment. Collaborating municipalities are included in equal relationships with a number of interested parties in their local society, outside of the municipality organization.



*In 2014 and 2015, the residents, politicians and employees in Holbæk Municipality (Denmark) tried out new forms of dialogue, cooperation and local democracy. The framework for this work was known as *Demokratiexperimentariet* (the Democracy Experimentarium).*

*The driving force in the experiment was a project committee with seven politicians from the city council. They invited others to participate in activities and dialogue relating the development of local democracy in Holbæk municipality. The overall aim of the Democracy Experimentarium was to create new insights and experiences in three areas: dialogue on political direction, development of a solution for the municipality's functions, and the support of local initiatives.*

*Many of the lessons and ideas have been implemented in a new organizational construction: «Projektudvalget for local Udvikling». (Project Committee for Local Development) There politicians continue their work, together with residents and employees in the municipal administration, strengthening residents' participation in different political areas<sup>58</sup>.*

## 6. Impact measurement

Social value is created in complex collaborative social processes. It involves many actors. We see the effects of such efforts in different areas and at different levels. There is therefore great uncertainty associated with methods of identifying what is the certain effect of a given measure. But that does not mean we are going to stop looking. Creating greater social value in restricted areas is the very impetus for much of the social innovation work that takes place in Norwegian local societies. It is therefore both useful and necessary that we know methods for measuring social value creation – even if it is difficult.



## A demanding activity

What exactly is the effect of our innovation work? Many people ask this question, both outside and inside the work's picket troops. Measurement of the effects of the collaboration presumes the use of different methods, both in terms of values created in the collaboration process, and of what results at the end of it. The methods one chooses for such effect measurement should be decided with strong involvement of all the relevant collaborating parties. Thus measurement and evaluation also become part of the collaboration.

The goals set in a social innovative collaboration process will often change along the way as the participants become wiser, when new opportunities open up, and as the collaboration becomes more courageous and ambitious. The participants in the collaborative social innovation work may also sidetrack them into new unexpected solutions in the course of the process that may benefit the work. With all these dynamics, it is demanding to measure social impact. Fast-frozen indicators and measurement regimes may undermine the innovation, the effect of which the measurement was intended to pinpoint.

### **Measurement of unsure effect**

The aim of collaborative social innovation is increased social value, and such social value can be created, as we have seen, both in the interaction itself and in the results coming out of it. SAMSON is a tool for measuring social values in the process – see link to the tool in the preface (only in Norwegian). But we also have a need to find out if the end-product of the interaction creates social value.

It is relatively easy to find out if commercial/economic values  
-other

financial targets. This can be measured by financial calculations according to professionally agreed and recognized accounting methods. It is different with social value. In this perspective, the challenge is that we are not only measuring what is easy to measure (economy), but we are also measuring what it is equally important to know the effect of (social value).

Although the causal relationship between effort and effect is rarely clear in social work, it is still important to know whether the resources one uses may lead to the anticipated social results and effects. It is helpful if the involved partners (municipalities, inhabitants, civil society, private entities, investors, social entrepreneurs, etc.) use a type of measurement tool that they experience as a resource in the work. It is our experience that such measurement tools are seldom used, at least in Norway today.

– I need help figuring out if the work is worth the effort! A social entrepreneur in Sandefjord, Norway was about to start a cooperation with the local government and the public NAV office for work experience for people excluded from working life. In the assessments to be made, he frequently encountered the question as to whether the money to be invested in the project would “pay off”. Now one can of course wonder whether all public actors ask the same question of their own practice and services, but we will let that debate lie. In any case, the question of “profitability” is timely, and easy enough to ask – but is by no means easy to answer. - Is it possible to measure the effects of social work? the entrepreneur asked. It is demanding, but not impossible. In that case, you must allow for some important assumptions. One of them is that such measurement must



be taken using other indicators than just the financial ones. We will illustrate this with a relevant genuine example.

Fatima is a 60 year-old, somewhat disillusioned Kurdish woman who has lived in Norway for ten years. She sits a lot at home alone, she is a widow and her children have left home. They have learned Norwegian and are well integrated into Norwegian social life in all respects. Fatima is not. One day she is called in for yet another consultation at the local NAV office. She brings along her 26 year-old daughter as interpreter. Fatima believes this will be yet another meeting without results – she dreads it. But this time, the NAV consultant has something new up her sleeve. A dressmaker's workroom is to be set up as a socially-innovative collaborative project between a large private player, a municipal social enterprise, a social entrepreneur and the local municipality. It appeared that there is demand for sewing services among people who want to have sewn curtains, clothes etc. Fatima has a weak CV, so the NAV consultant asks her if she can sew. Fatima lights up in a way the daughter tells us she hasn't seen her mother do for years. It turns out that the mother is a highly skilled seamstress, and that she also loves to sew. -Today she is working in the newly-established sewing workshop where she is also learning Norwegian. She has escaped from loneliness, she gets to do what she likes best, everyday life has been meaningful, and she earns her own money. – It is obvious that it is profitable for NAV, and for society. Fatima feels healthier, and she is less of a burden on the public health budget than before. It is probably profitable also for Fatima. Large economic utility values have been saved. But is it only economic values that are created? Of course not. A cost-benefit analysis that only focuses on money saved, will lose sight of important social values.

Social values can be documented if focus is on social *changes*. In Fatima's situation, it is easy to spot such changes, as was also possible with our contact in Sandefjord. Social changes can be identified and measured. Fewer days alone, better language understanding, more friends, a better experience of meaning with life, or even experience of

*happiness* can be recorded if we collect data from the voices of the users themselves – something we naturally should do when measuring social value.

### **Impact measurement**

There is a difference between outcomes and effects. Let's keep that in mind. – BUA<sup>59</sup> is a social entrepreneur that collects used sport- and activity equipment that is then lent to children and adolescents. An underlying thought is that not all families can afford to buy expensive sports equipment so that their children can go skiing and skating, on bike rides, or other activities. The equipment is free for everyone to borrow for so as to not create a stigma for borrowers who could easily be branded as "poor" if they were the only users. Registration of opening hours, or the number of skates or other equipment, is a measurable *result* of the offer. An increase in children from immigrant families attending the school's ski-day may be one effect. It is quite a short-term and fairly certain effect. Without skis, no participation on the ski-day. But nevertheless we cannot be absolutely sure that it is a direct consequence of the loan from BUA. Let us therefore call it a *consequence* to distinguish it from what we can comment on as a more long-term *effect*. Children from low-income families often have poorer health than those who are in a better social and financial situation. Measuring whether the offer from BUA has *effect* on children's health is a complex and difficult task. There are so many other factors that have an affect on this that an impact measurement of BUA's lending on children's health must make use of a lateral perspective, namely to refer to *general knowledge* from relevant research. We know that physical activity has a positive effect on a range of health indicators. If we can measure that lending leads to increased physical activity, we must therefore be able to "jump" to the conclusion that BUA's lending also produces better health as an *effect*.

In the book "Kan det betale sig", M. Lindegaard, P. Thoregaard and M. Vienna sets up five recommendations to choice of indicators for social value. We summarise them translated to English, with a few small adaptations for the

purpose of this book:

- *Involve the interested parties.* Both scientists, professions, and administrators have important competencies in identifying measurement indicators, but do not forget those who have first-hand knowledge of probably both the reasons for the problems and the effects of possible solutions. Include the users' expertise in the design of indicators.
- *Search for and use known indicators.* There are a number of good experiences with measurement of social value in many places. Admittedly some bad experiences too, but look for the good experiences and use knowledge gained from them. Thus, considerable effort and a great deal of uncertainty can be saved in your own work.
- *Find indicators that measure value at different levels.* Social value can be created both at the individual level, for organizations (including the municipality), and for society as a whole. Sometimes values at different levels can work against each other. For example, it may be the case that digitization of a service will allow far more users to be served in far less time for the organization that implements the solution. There is no queue in the NAV office when all users are online. But if the personal consultations that users previously had to take part in, first and foremost had a significance for some users that they felt they were *seen*, and gained a sense of *security* in the face of the support service, then the digital service will probably have a limited value for them. It is useful to keep track of the effect of contributions at different levels, for different actors, so that you can make a more enlightened choice as to what one should prioritize.
- *Combine quantitative and qualitative data.* Different registers, accounts, and other data sets can provide valuable information on what change and effect the contribution provides. Interviews, observations and registration of a more qualitative nature can have great value as well. Combinations of different methods and types of information/data can provide a far more adequate

picture of the complexity of the effort and mixed effects, than if only one method and one type of indicator were to form the basis of the evaluation.

- *Prioritize indicators and follow a strategy to monitor them.* The work of identifying indicators and making measurements with them can require time and presumes significant competency resources. It may appear to be costly, but not doing it can be even more expensive. It is therefore advisable to set up a list of what you want to prioritize; What are the absolutely most important objectives with the effort, who are the most important target groups, and which indicators suit them best? Then set up a plan of who will collect what data, who will monitor the score, when, and in what way.

**The So-Impact** is a tool that to a great extent builds on such reasoning as is accounted for here.

## SolImpact<sup>60</sup>

SolImpact is a tool that is designed to select/identify indicators and measure *results, impacts and effects* of efforts for collaborative social innovation. The method is designed to make the threshold so low that as many as possible; from small social entrepreneurs to larger public sector enterprises and collaborative social innovation constellations, should be able to measure the social value creation of their contributions, see Figure 7 on the next page.

The tool is available on the internet here (only available in Norwegian language): [www.ks.no/samskaping](http://www.ks.no/samskaping)

The contribution factors, on the left of the figure on the next page, are a description of the total resources, activities, actions, etc. that are put into the work of creating an expected and desirable social effect. As presented in the figure, such performance factors are outside the focus of the model itself. The tool focuses instead on the measurement of effects at various distances from the performance factors.




Figure 7. Illustration of the factors in SolImpact and how they are connected. Developed by SoCentral.


- Closest to the effort and the specific activities we can count up, we find the output. Results mean the direct result of the activity. E.g.: How many participated in the labour market course? How many days did it last? How many women participated, etc.
- By outcome, is meant the direct effects for the target groups of whom it can be said with a high level of certainty that the efforts lead to (a high level of causality). e.g.: How many people got a job after the course? How many people respond that they feel safer in a job interview situation after participation, etc.?
- Impact mean more long-term impacts on target groups where it can be substantiated that the outputs are at least making a contribution, even if the output is not the sole cause of the impacts. How many are in jobs after one year. How many of the participants have obtained better housing, the family's economy is better for the course participants, etc.
- With *social value* at the far right, it is aimed at more complex socio-economic values that research shows are probable correlations between output and long-term impact. The state of health of a population is related to everyday overall activity, including the job situation. Still, we do not know whether a job-hunting course will produce future savings in the health budget. To determine such correlations between output and impact, extensive investigations are required, often with a broad, basic research-based knowledge of the relevant subject area(s).

In SolImpact, users are challenged by the tool to conduct a ten-step process. There are spaces to be filled out in every phase in the tool. These are the ten steps, translated from Norwegian:

1. Describe the social problem that the work of social innovation should solve
2. Develop overriding objectives
3. Conduct analysis of your target groups
4. Describe the main activities in the effort and define the changetheory of the effort
5. Develop measurement indicators at result, impact, and effect levels
6. Design measurement methods
7. Determine target figures for each of the measurement indicators

8. Conduct zero-point measurements (the starting point of the effort)
9. Carry out regular measurements to control the work correctly
10. Use the measurements to conduct evaluations and adaptations of the effort

SolImpact differs from several other methods of measuring the effect of social innovation in that the tool primarily focuses on the measurement of outcomes and impacts of efforts, where the cause-effect correlation is high. Assessments of the efficacy of the tool are based largely on the correlation between insights from research, and the effects we have measured through the empirical application of the tool. The tool will be able to make it affordable for actors to measure social value creation of the work's impact in a reliable way.



*Boost Refugee<sup>61</sup> is an incubator programme for community entrepreneurs working to make the way into employment easier for newly arrived refugees in Oslo. The programme was carried out in the period November 2016-August 2017, and it used SolImpact to develop indicators for measuring the outcomes and impact of the social value that the program created. The table on the right shows selected results.*

INDICATOR	TYPE OF INDICATOR	FINAL RESULT
The number of refugees who have received assistance	Output	534
The number of refugees who have obtained documented qualifications and/or network	Output	349
The number of refugees who have entered into a dialogue with employers		
• Number of interviews	Outcome	212
• Number of job offers	Outcome	46
• Number of signed employment contracts	Outcome	48
Proportion of refugees who have received assistance and have been in employment for at least 3 months, 3 years after they arrived in Oslo	Impact	Not currently measured

Figure 8. Example of using SolImpact in the Boost Refugee-project.

## Socio-economic models

There are several other analysis models and tools for calculating the output and impact intended to improve the living conditions of people. The Norwegian Government Agency for Financial Management (DFØ) recommends what they call the *socio-economic analysis method*<sup>62</sup>, and the Norwegian Ministry of Finance has given its recommendations for using the method in a circular<sup>63</sup>.

In socio-economic analyses, the impacts of an output are, as far as possible, quantified and valued in monetary units. But because outputs will change many people's livelihoods, one or more impacts must often be assessed qualitatively – it is neither possible nor desirable to put a monetary value on all such impacts. Such non-priced impacts should be a part of the assessment on an equal par with the priced/quantified impacts. There are several ways to do this. DFØ has created a guide that follows a plan through 8 steps, and there are other models and tools. Our experience is that, unfortunately, the models are both complex and imprecise.

*Social Return on Investment (SROI)* is one such method in which one tries to calculate the overall effect of given activities. Basically, SROI is an economic model, developed at Harvard Business School and based on economic logic that calculates utility values and impacts in numerical terms, but with opening for multi-disciplinary inputs. The numerical calculation is supplemented with other more qualitative forms of assessment that are adapted to social value creation. This thus forms a double course as shown in the figure below. The SROI model connects outputs at the micro-level effort to the left in the figure, with impacts identified at the community level to the right. Correlations between the two dimensions at the top and bottom section of the figure can be followed in a course from left to right - from the input at individual level to the impacts at the community level.

Following such cause-and-effect correlations that SROI and other socio-economic models presuppose, is dependent on an overview and knowledge of a lot of underlying conditions.




Figure 9. Socio-economic models, such as SROI, must combine two perspectives in the measurement of impact.<sup>64</sup>

Only through such insights can the correlation between the different levels and the perspectives be established as probable.

## Social Impact Bond (SIB)

A social impact bond is a result-based contract between a public client and a service provider. One or more private investors take on the risk in an initial phase, then they are paid out the profit from their investment if the agreed social objectives/results of the outputs are achieved. Therefore, the measurement and assessment of social impacts is necessary for the application of impact contracts.

The arrangement serves as a model for responsibility- and risk sharing in a public-private partnership. By using SIB, the public sector may be involved in measures that bear the risk that impacts may not be as expected. If the innovations do not succeed, the financial burden is left on the investor. On the other hand; if the innovation proves to be successful, the public partner will take over the funding by paying out the investor according to a prior agreed formula in SIB.

## No straight lines

Above, we have commented on different ways of measuring social value in the collaborative social innovation's end results/impacts. Let us finalise this topic by remembering that the entire handbook has revolved around an understanding of collaborative social innovation that strongly focuses on the work's process. Such work moves like circles in water, not in a linear sequence. It is therefore important to measure social value in both the social work's impacts and process. Collaborative social processes create

new connections that lead to learning, challenge existing understandings of reality, and established roles and new relationships. The basis for social change may arise from such processes. It is therefore also natural to focus on such values in working with collaborative social innovation. It is relevant to be focused on whether an exchange of knowledge and insight takes place between actors and residents, if synergies are created that would not have been achieved without cooperation. Have the actors adopted new roles towards each other, and what influence and power are switched around as a result of the relationships?

We have seen that the synergy effect in the social collaboration arises through sharing knowledge and resources, and that it can create value both in terms of learning (new knowledge), new scopes of action (a structural change) and new outcomes (social value). Working with collaborative social innovation, networks forms a circular movement that constantly expands. It creates new broader scopes of action that residents and organizations can fill with activities and outcomes.

In a doctoral work at RUC (Roskilde University), residents' equal participation in such processes is divided into three roles<sup>65</sup>. Here in English translation:

- Co-Initiator: the residents participate in taking the initiative
- Co-designer: the residents participate in designing the solutions
- Co-implementer: the residents participate in implementing the solutions that others have designed

One way to assess success in collaborative social innovation is to identify the extent to which the inhabitants of local collaboration are included in all of the three roles.

## Advice and recommendations

- What change do you want to create? Work together to find indicators that can be used to identify such a change.
  - Talk together about what choices you can make in terms of recruiting people, environments, and competencies that can help you design the objectives of the work and the measurement methods. Also, think about whether you can supplement your own knowledge and experience with people and environments outside of the obvious circles you usually recruit from.
  - Measuring social value creation is demanding, therefore come to a decision as to why you want to measure. Agree on who you are primarily measuring impacts for, and who should benefit from the results. Is it for your own possibility to steer the process in the desired direction, for the municipality's politicians/leaders, for investors, or others?
  - Make sure that you are measuring impacts of your shared inputs and not just mapping the activity level.
  - Discuss the measurement indicators that may be suitable for promoting and highlighting the value of prevention (long-term gains) versus repair and damage-limitation (short-term gains).
  - Find out if you have the necessary proof from qualified knowledge to have confidence in the correlations between inputs and anticipated outcomes that you may build your assumptions on.
  - Try to register whether there are examples elsewhere of good indicators for measuring outcomes of the input factors you work with.
  - Talk through different ideas for both quantitative and qualitative measurements, allow room for both objective data and obtaining subjective data from those the work is aimed at.
  - What type of interviews, life stories, and experiences can you harvest in your work? These are often good sources for identifying change.
  - Do you have openness, willingness and systems to register – and also learn from negative experiences from the work along the way?
  - Talk about how impact measurements can be used educationally, both externally and internally, to create legitimacy and motivation for your work.
- 
- KS has a number of internet resources that deal with different aspects of innovation in the public sector. See, for example (only in Norwegian):
- <http://www.ks.no/fagomrader/utvikling/innovasjon/Innovasjonsverktoy/>**
- <http://www.ks.no/fagomrader/utvikling/innovasjon/samskaping/>**
-





## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> Fuglesang, Rønning & Enquist (ed.) 2014.
- <sup>2</sup> See for example the initiative “Den National Bevægelse for Samskabelse” (The National Movement for Collaboration” in Denmark: [www.denoffentlige.dk/manifest-national-bevaegelse-Samskabelse](http://www.denoffentlige.dk/manifest-national-bevaegelse-Samskabelse)
- <sup>3</sup> Andersen, L. L. & H. H. Espersen, 2017 a, b & c.
- <sup>4</sup> Andersen, L. L. 2016
- <sup>5</sup> Vike, 2006.
- <sup>6</sup> Vike 2006, Willumsen og Ødegård, 2015.
- <sup>7</sup> Often called “Intrapreneurship” - inventive innovators who choose to introduce or import new useful solutions into the organization they work for.
- <sup>8</sup> L.L. Andersen & al. (ed) 2017. Fuglesang et.al. (red) 2014
- <sup>9</sup> Rønning & Knutagård 2015.
- <sup>10</sup> Vike, 2006.
- <sup>11</sup> Eimhjellen, I. & J. Loga, 2016. Loga, J., 2017. Brøgger, 2017. Gustaven & Kobre, 2012. Kobre et.al. 2017:
- <sup>12</sup> Brøgger 2017 & Kobre et.al. 2017
- <sup>13</sup> A. Røiseland & S.I. Vabo, 2012.
- <sup>14</sup> [www.ks.no/fagomrader/utvikling/innovasjon/samskaping/](http://www.ks.no/fagomrader/utvikling/innovasjon/samskaping/)
- <sup>15</sup> Andersen & Espersen, 2017 A & B, Espersen & Andersen, 2017.
- <sup>16</sup> From Nesta, NEF and The Lab, 2009 and Bovaird, 2006.
- <sup>17</sup> Murray et al. 2010, p. 3
- <sup>18</sup> Vike 2015, Willumsen & Ødegård (ed.), 2015.
- <sup>19</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>20</sup> Ibid, p. 37.
- <sup>21</sup> Kobre et.al. 2012
- <sup>22</sup> Slightly adapted from K. Littleton and N. Mercer 2013.
- <sup>23</sup> Governance International (2012)
- <sup>24</sup> BEPA, 2010, p. 44.
- <sup>25</sup> Vike, 2006. Røiseland & Vabo, 2016. Willumsen & Ødegård, 2015.
- <sup>26</sup> Kroken & Madsen 2012.
- <sup>27</sup> From the poem *Tung tids tale*, written during the German occupation. From collection of poetry Dikt. Aschehoug 1945.
- <sup>28</sup> Catherine Booth (1829-1890) founder of the Salvation Army along with her husband, William Booth. Source: Rønning & Knutagård 2015, p.6.
- <sup>29</sup> Røiseland & Vabo, 2016.
- <sup>30</sup> Carlsen et.al. 2012.
- <sup>31</sup> Carlsen et.al. 2012, Dagestad et.al. 2014, Kaufmann, 2006.
- <sup>32</sup> Littleton & Mercer, 2013.
- <sup>33</sup> Røiseland & Vabo, 2016.
- <sup>34</sup> Kobre 2016.
- <sup>35</sup> Strand (2007), part V, pp. 433-435
- <sup>36</sup> A. Solem & M. Hermundsgård: Fasilitering (2017).
- <sup>37</sup> Nonaka & Konno, 1998.
- <sup>38</sup> Kania & Kramer, 2011.
- <sup>39</sup> Solem & Hermundsgård, 2017
- <sup>40</sup> Martha Maznevski of Ivey Business School (Ontario, Canada) has in her research on global leadership, demonstrated how important repetition and predictability — she calls it the “heart-beat” of the work — that is the basis for innovation and development in collaboration characterized by cultural diversity. The findings are interesting for organization and leadership of multidisciplinary social innovation.
- <sup>41</sup> «Innovasjon i praksis - veien til den andre siden” Sjur Dagestad (ed.), 2014. Innoco. A number of innovation theorists stress the necessity of a “prototype” future – thinking about the future as it might look, creating ideas and energy to create it that way. See e.g. Scharmer 2016.
- <sup>42</sup> Eklund & Langvik 2008, Eklund & Pluta 2015.
- <sup>43</sup> Kobre et.al. 2012.
- <sup>44</sup> Skyttermoen & Vaagaasar 2015, p. 286 ff.
- <sup>45</sup> Howaldt et al. 2014.

- <sup>46</sup> Hermansen et.al. 2004.
- <sup>47</sup> Christensen 2011.
- <sup>48</sup> Ministries 2018.
- <sup>49</sup> Brøgger, 2017.
- <sup>50</sup> Hulgård, L., & Andersen, L. (2012).
- <sup>51</sup> Copus 2016.
- <sup>52</sup> Defourny, J. & Nyssens, M., (2010). TemaNord 2015.
- <sup>53</sup> Brøgger 2017, Kobro et.al. 2017.
- <sup>54</sup> Eimhjellen & Loga, 2016, Brøgger 2017, Gustaven & Kobro 2012.
- <sup>55</sup> Kobro 1988.
- <sup>56</sup> Finn Ørstavik in Store Norske Leksikon; [www.snl.no/inkubator](http://www.snl.no/inkubator).
- <sup>57</sup> <http://www.denoffentlige.dk/fem-trin-til-samskabelse>
- <sup>58</sup> <https://holbaek.dk/kultur-og-fritid/faellesskab/demokratiexperimentariet/demokratiexperimentariets-erfaringer/>
- <sup>59</sup> BUA is a Norwegian social entrepreneur working to get more children and young people involved in more activity and more varied activity by providing sport- and leisure equipment. [www.bua.io](http://www.bua.io)
- <sup>60</sup> Solmpact is developed by SoCenter, in close collaboration with a number of social entrepreneurs and other collaborators. The tool is under continuous development, available only in Norwegian.
- <sup>61</sup> <https://socentral.no/prosjekter/boost/>
- <sup>62</sup> The Norwegian Government Agency for Financial Management
- <sup>63</sup> The Ministry of Finance circular R-109/14.
- <sup>64</sup> Lindegaard L. et al. 2015. Mötesplats Social Innovation (undated).
- <sup>65</sup> Tortzen (2016)

## References

- Andersen, L. L. & H. H. Espersen (2017)  
*Samskabelse and Samproduktion. Demokratisering eller effektivisering af velfærdsløsninger?* Social Politik 2017, 2, pp. 17-21.
- Andersen, L. L. (2016)  
*Samskabelse, samproduktion og partnerskaber – forskellige forståelser.* Foredrag 25. januar på konferencen Nye velfærdsscenerier – muligheder for inklusion og deltagelse? Samskabelse, samproduktion and partnerskaber. Center for socialt entreprenørskab. Roskilde University.
- Andersen, L. I., M. Gawell, R. Spear (ed) (2017)  
*Social Entrepreneurship and Social Enterprises. Nordic Perspectives.* Routledge
- Andersen, L. L. & H. H. Espersen (2017b)  
Når biblioteker arbejder med samskabelse og samproduktion. In: Laskie, C (Ed): *Biblioteksdidaktik.* Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- Andersen, L.L. & H. H Espersen (2017c)  
Samskabelse, samproduktion og partnerskaber – teoretiske perspektiver. In: (Ed) Socialstyrelsen; Partnerskaber og samarbejder mellem civilsamfund og kommuner. Socialstyrelsen Danmark.
- Andersen, L. L. (2016)  
*Social innovasjon og socialt entreprenørskab.* In R. Posborg, H. Nørrelykke, & H. Antczak (Eds.), *Socialrådgivning og socialt arbejde.* En grundbog. 3. udg (pp. 545–560). København: Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- Andersen, L. L & Espersen, H.H (2017)  
Samskaping og samproduktion. Et effektiviseringsredskab eller en demokratisering av velferds løsninger? I: Social Politik Vol 2, 2017.
- BEPA (2010) Bureau of European Policy Advisers. European Commision. *Empowering people, driving change: Social innovation in the European Union.* Report. p. 44.
- Bovaird, T. (2006)  
*Developing New forms of Partnership With the ' Market ' in the Procurement of Public Services.* Public Administration, March 2006. Volume 84, Issue 1. pp. 81-102.
- Brøgger, B. (2017)  
*Sosialt entreprenørskap i Norge.* Cappelen Akademisk. Oslo
- Carlsen, A, S. Clegg & R. Gjersvik (2012)  
*Idea work: om profesjonell kreativitet.* Cappelen akademisk.
- Christensen, H. (2011)  
Profesjonell yrkesutøver i lærende fellesskap. Bedre skole nr. 3/2011
- Christensen, C.M., J.H. Grossman & J. Hwang (2009)  
The innovator's prescription. A disruptive solution for health care. New York, NY McGraw-Hill.
- Copus, A. (2016)  
*Territorial Social Innovation: Clarification of the concept.* Report from the Nordic Council Working Group on Demography and Welfare.
- 2012, Dagestad S. et.al. (2014)  
*Innovasjon – Veien til den andre siden.* Innoco
- Defourny, J. & Nyssens, M., (2010).  
*Conceptions of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship in Europe and the United states: convergences and differences.* Journal of Social Entrepreneurship, 1 (1), pp. 32–53).
- Departementene (2018)  
Samarbeid om sosialt entreprenørskap. Rapport fra tverrdepartemental arbeidsgruppe.

- Direktoratet for økonomistyring.  
*Om samfunnsøkonomisk analyse:* <https://dfo.no/fagomr%C3%A5der/utredning/samfunns%C3%B8konomisk-analyse>
- Eimhjellen, I. & J. Loga, (2016).  
*Utvikling av sosialt entreprenørskap i Norge.* Stein Rokkan senter for flerfaglige samfunnsstudier, Uni Research Bergen, Rapport 9 – 2016
- Ekelund, B.Z. & E. Langvik (2008) Diversity Icebreaker. How to manage diversity processes. Oslo: Human Factors Publishing
- Ekelund, B.Z. & E. Langvik (2015) Diversity Icebreaker II. Further perspectives. Oslo: Human Factors Publishing.
- Espersen, H.H. & Andersen L.L. (2017)  
Styring og samarbeide I det boligsosiale arbeide. Om sivilsamfunn, partnerskaper, samproduksjon og samskaping. in: Mazanti, B & Aner, L (Ed) Sosialt arbeid i utsatte boligområder. Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- Finansdepartementet. *Rundskriv R-109/14.*
- Fuglesang, L., R. Rønning and B. Enquist (ed) (2014).  
*Framing Innovation in Public Service Sectors.* Routledge NY.
- Governance International (2012)  
*Co-Production in Health and Social Care - What it is and how to do it.* Birmingham, UK.
- Griecio, C. (2015) Assessing Social Impact of Social Enterprises. Does One Size Really Fit All? Springer Briefs in Business.
- Gustaven K., and L.U. Kibro (2012).  
*Sosialt entreprenørskap som ledd i innsatsen mot fattigdom.* Telemarkforskning. TF-rapport nr. 305. Bø.H. Vike, 2004.
- Hansen, Morten T. (2009) Collaboration. How leaders Avoid The traps, Create Unity, and Reap Big Results. Harvard Business Press.
- Hermanen M., O. Low & V. Petersen (2004)  
Kommunikation and samarbejde: i professionelle relations. Alinea. København.
- Howaldt J., A. Butzin, D. Domanski, C. Kalet (2014)  
*Theoretical approaches to Social Innovation – A critical review.* SI Drive publication.  
[https://www.si-drive.eu/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/D1\\_1-Critical-Literature-Review\\_final.pdf](https://www.si-drive.eu/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/D1_1-Critical-Literature-Review_final.pdf)
- Hulgård, L. & L.L. Andersen (2015)  
*Sosialt entreprenørskap og sosial innovasjon*, kap. 3 i TemaNord (The Nordic Council of Ministers) Sosialt entreprenørskap og sosial innovasjon: Kartlegging av innsatser for sosialt entreprenørskap og sosial innovasjon i Norden. Copenhagen.
- Hulgård, L. & L.L. Andersen (2012) *Sosialt entreprenørskap – velfærdsavvikling eller arenaer for solidaritet?* Dansk Sociologi, 23 (4), 11 – 28.
- Kania & Kramer (2011) *Collective Impact.* Stanford Social Innovation Review Winter 2011.
- Kaufmann, G. (2006)  
*Hva er kreativitet.* Universitetsforlaget
- Kibro L. (1988)  
*Rasjonalitet i velferdsstaten. En analyse av motivering, mål og midler i den frivillige sektor.* Hovedoppgave i Sammenliknende politikk. Universitetet i Bergen.
- Kibro. L., K. Vareide and M. Hatling (2012)  
Suksessrike distriktskommuner - En studie av kjennetegn ved 15 norske distriktskommuner. Telemark Research, TF Report No. 303/2012.

Kobro. L. (2015) *Gjete kongens harer. Kunnskap om å lede kunnskapsarbeidere, med inspirasjon fra Asbjørnsen og Moe*. Nett-tidskrift.

Tekstualitet. <http://www.tekstualitet.no/?p=1711>

Kobro L. (2017) *Sosialt entreprenørskap på norsk – Politisk retorikk eller ny metodikk?*

Stat & Styring 1/2017. L. Kobro 2016

Kobro, L.U., C. Skar, R. Røtnes og F.W. Eggen. (2017) *Statlige rammevilkår på ramme alvor. Sosialt entreprenørskap i norsk offentlig kontekst*. SESAM rapport 1/2017. Skriftserien fra Høgskolen i Sørøst-Norge.

Kroken R. og O.J. Madsen (red) (2016) *Forvaltning av makt og moral i velferdsstaten. Fra sosialt arbeid til «arbeid med deg selv»?* Gyldendal forlag. Oslo

Kroken R. og O.J. Madsen (red) (2016) *Forvaltning av makt og moral i velferdsstaten. Fra sosialt arbeid til “arbeid med deg selv”?* Gyldendal forlag. Oslo

Lindegaard L., P. Thorgaard, M. Wiene (2015) *Kan det betale sig? Sådan måler du social nytteverdi*. Gyldendal Public.

Littleton K, and N. Mercer (2013) *Interthinking. Putting talk to work*. Routledge London and New York.

Loga, J. (2017) *Frivillighet og forretning. En kunnskapsoversikt om nye former for samspill mellom sivilsamfunn og marked*. Senter for forskning på sivilsamfunn og frivillig sector. Rapport 2016:8 Bergen/Oslo

Murray, R., Caulier-Grice, J. and Mulgan, G. (2010). *Ways to design, develop and grow social innovation*. Social Innovator series. NESTA & The Young Foundation.

Maznevski, M.L., (1994) *Understanding Our Differences: Performance in Decision-Making Groups with Diverse Members*. Human relations, May, 47 (5): pp. 531 - 552.

Mötesplats Social Innovation (undated). *Nya Finansieringsformer för Social Innovation. En internationell utblick om impact investments*. Malmö Högskola. Nesta, NEF and The Lab (2009) *The Challenge of Co-Production*. Discussion paper.

Nonaka I., & N. Konno (1998) *The Concept of «Ba»: Building a Foundation for Knowledge Creation*. California Management Review. Vol 40, No. 3. 13 A. Røiseland & S.I. Vabo, (2012). *Styring og samstyring – governance på norsk*. Fagbokforlaget.

Rønning, R. and M. Knutagård (2015) *Innovation in Social Welfare and Human Services*. Routledge NY.

Gunners, T. and A.L. Vaagaasar (2015) *Verdiskapende prosjektledelse*. Cappelen Damm.

A. Solem & M. Hermundsgård (2017) *Fasilitering*. Gyldendal Akademisk.

Scharmer, O. (2016) *Theory U: Leading from the Future as it Emerges*. 2nd Edition. Berrett-Koehler Publishers Inc. Oakland

Strand T. (2007) *Ledesle, organisasjon og kultur*. Fagbokforlaget. Bergen.

TemaNord (2015) *L. Hulgård og L.L. Andersen. Sosialt entreprenørskap og sosial innovasjon, kap. 3 i “Sosialt entreprenørskap og sosial innovasjon: Kartlegging av innsatser for sosialt entreprenør-*

skap og sosial innovasjon i Norden”. TemaNord (The Nordic Council of Ministers), Copenhagen.

Tortzen A. (2016)  
*Samskabelse i kommunale rammer*. PhD afhandling Roskilde Universitet.

Vike, Halvard (2006)  
*Velferd uten grenser. Den norske velferdsstaten ved veiskillet*. Akribe forlag.

Wegener, C. (2012)  
*Public Sector Innovation: Value Creation or Value Loss? Lifelong Learning in Europe*. ELM Magazine Online:  
<http://www.elmmagazine.eu/articles/public-sector-innovation-value-creation-or-value-loss/>  
(Lastet ned 27.1.18)

Willumsen E. og A. Ødegård (red) (2015)  
*Sosial innovasjon – fra politikk til tjenesteutvikling*. Fagbokforlaget. Bergen



**The Norwegian  
Association of Local and  
Regional Authorities (KS)**

Postal address:  
Postbox: 1378 Vika, 0114 Oslo

Visiting address:  
Haakon VII's gt. 9, 0161 Oslo

Tel. 24 13 26 00  
e-mail: [ks@ks.no](mailto:ks@ks.no)  
**Web: [www.ks.no](http://www.ks.no)**



**USN/SESAM**

Postal address:  
University of South-Eastern Norway (USN)  
Post box 235  
3603 Kongsberg  
NORWAY

Switchboard: 31 00 80 00  
General e-mail: [postmottak@usn.no](mailto:postmottak@usn.no)

E-mail International Relations Section:  
[international@usn.no](mailto:international@usn.no)