

Social Innovation in Policy – EU and Country Level Profiles and Policy Perspectives

Deliverable 2.2 of the project:
'Impact of the **Third Sector as Social Innovation**' (ITSSOIN),
European Commission – 7th Framework Programme

28 February 2015

Deliverable of the FP-7 project:
ITSSOIN (613177)



Suggested citation

Anheier, H. K.; Krlev, G.; Preuss, S.; Mildenerberger, G.; Einarsson, T.; Flening, E. (2015). Social Innovation in Policy. EU and Country Level Profiles and Policy Perspectives. A deliverable of the project: 'Impact of the Third Sector as Social Innovation' (ITSSOIN), European Commission – 7th Framework Programme, Brussels: European Commission, DG Research.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank our partners within the EU-sponsored project 'ITSSOIN – Impact of the Third Sector as Social Innovation' for their expertise and extensive support in preparing this report. The partner network consists of the University of Heidelberg for Germany, VU University Amsterdam and the Netherlands Institute for Social Research for the Netherlands, London School of Economics and Political Science for the UK, Università Commerciale Luigi Bocconi for Italy, Copenhagen Business School for Denmark, ESSEC Business School for France, Masaryk University for the Czech Republic, Universidade da Coruña and Universidad de Oviedo for Spain and the Stockholm School of Economics for Sweden.

Author contributions from each country:

The Czech Republic: Arnerová, Z., Navrátil, J., Pejcal, J., & Vyskočil, M.

Denmark: Figueroa, M.

UK: Bauer, A., & Adelaja, B.

France: André, K., & Lallemand-Stempak, N.

Germany: Krlev, G., Mildenerberger, G., & Preuss, S.

Italy: Ricciuti, E., & Turrini, A.

The Netherlands: Van Den Ouweland, E. (NLNA), De Wit, A. (VUA), & Mensink, W.

Spain: Rey-Garcia, M. (UDC), & Felgueiras, A. (UDC)

Sweden (SIR/SSE): Eriksson, M.

EU: Van Den Ouweland, E. (NLNA), De Wit, A. (VUA), & Mensink, W.

ITSSOIN

ITSSOIN is a research project funded under the European Commission's 7th Framework Programme initiated in response to a call to investigate 'The impact of the third sector on socio-economic development in Europe'. The project represents a research collaboration between 11 European institutions, is led by the University of Heidelberg and runs from 2014-2017.

Date:	28 February 2015
ITSSOIN deliverable no.:	2.2
Authors:	Anheier, H. K.; Krlev, G.; Preuss, S.; Mildenerberger, G.; Einarsson, T.; Flening, E.
Lead partner:	UHEI
Participating partners:	SIR/SSE prepared the data of the analysis and developed the first analysis; the policy analysis on country level has been provided by the respective partners of each country.
Contact person:	Georg Mildenerberger Centre for Social Investment, Heidelberg University georg.mildenerberger@csi.uni-heidelberg.de +49 - (0)6221 - 54119-59

Content

1.	Introduction	4
2.	Methodology.....	6
2.1.	Document selection	6
2.2.	Method	7
2.3.	Analysis.....	8
3.	Qualitative reports for the EU and on country level	8
3.1.	Analysis of EU policies	9
3.2.	Czech Republic	13
3.3.	Denmark.....	15
3.4.	France	17
3.5.	Germany.....	18
3.6.	Italy.....	20
3.7.	The Netherlands	22
3.8.	Spain.....	25
3.9.	Sweden	27
3.10.	UK	28
3.11.	Summing up: Trends in policy documents across countries	31
4.	Results and analysis of the quantitative data.....	32
4.1.	How are social innovations generally described in policy documents?.....	33
4.2.	How are social innovations embedded in the policy documents and how do different types of innovation relate to each other?	34
4.3.	What kinds of contributions are expected from social innovations in policy?	41
4.4.	What function is ascribed to the third sector by policy as regards social innovation?	47
5.	Hypothesis testing.....	51
5.1.	Orientation towards social and economic objectives	52
5.2.	Grassroots or top-down involvement associated with social innovations.....	55
5.3.	Level of social innovation policies	56
5.4.	Social innovativeness ascribed in policies	57
6.	Conclusions	59
7.	Annex	63
7.1.	Guide for the policy analysis	63

1. Introduction

On the basis of a content analysis of policy documents this 'Report on empirical profiles and policy discourses in the ITSSOIN-countries' provides insights in policy discourses on social innovations. Relations of the third sector with state and market actors will be particularly evaluated in order to develop an understanding of the importance and the impacts of the third sector which considers sector relations stated by governmental frameworks.

The policy analysis relates to insights from a previous deliverable of the ITSSOIN-project, the 'Report on the European Social Innovation Policy Framework in Light of Third Sector & Civil Society Actors' (D1.2). This study provided an overview on policy frameworks on the EU and the ITSSOIN countries level which relate the concept of social innovation to the function of the third sector and civic engagement; it showed that on the EU level this relation is mainly established in flagship initiatives and that research on this topic is rare (Eriksson, Einarsson, & Wijkström, 2014). Consequently, this study is one of the first empirical approaches to consider in-depth insights into country specific policy approaches on social innovation.

Another reason why an analysis on social innovations and the third sector cannot concentrate exclusively on the EU level is that the deliverable D1.2 showed that some countries only rarely relate to EU policies. In countries where an implementation of EU policies into domestic policy landscapes can be observed, the application of these policies highly varies across the different countries (Eriksson et al., 2014). Consequently, the following questions are interesting with regard to the policy analysis: How strongly or weakly are social innovation-related EU policies integrated in the analysed ITSSOIN countries? What form do these EU policies take on the respective country level? And (not necessarily connected to the EU policies): What role is attributed to social innovations and the third sector in the respective countries?

To answer the named questions a content analysis of five to nine policy documents on the EU level as well as for all ITSSOIN countries (the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, and the UK) was conducted. Based on the policy screening that was part of D1.2, relevant policy documents were selected. We thereby focused on documents dealing with social innovation and on evaluating the role of the third sector in comparison to actors from other sectors. On the basis of these selection criteria we intend to provide an answer to the following questions: What is the estimation of the innovative capacity of the third sector compared to state and market? Do policies support third sector actors or actors from other sectors?

This interest on policy perspectives on social innovations results from the theoretical embedding of social innovations. It indicated that policies as part of macro level structures influence the social innovativeness of one country (Anheier, Krlev, Preuss, Mildenerger, & Einarsson, 2014c). More specifically it is assumed that policy traditions that can be revealed with the 'Varieties of Capitalism' approach influence the perspective that policy makers in one country have on innovations. The 'Varieties of Capitalism' approach differentiates basically between two types of countries. The first type are liberal market economies (LMEs) where competitive market mechanisms unfold freely and relatively little state influence is given. The second type are corporate market economies (CMEs), which in contrast are more influenced by collaborative and strategic actions and strong state

influence (Hall & Soskice, 2001). Based on this understanding of macro level structures hypotheses have been developed that relate policy traditions of LMEs and CMEs to expectations of how innovation policies are implemented in one country. These hypotheses reflect on the objective of policies (social vs. technological orientation (H3.6)), the approach behind the policy (grass-roots vs. top-down involvement (H3.6b)), and the level the policies will orient on (local vs. national (H3.6c)) (Anheier, Krlev, Preuss, & Mildemberger, 2014a). These hypotheses further include an understanding of policy approaches favouring social innovations, namely those that aim at social policies with a grassroots and more locally oriented approach. Testing the hypothesis on basis of the policy analysis and bringing together the findings for these hypotheses, a last and most central hypothesis can be tested. This is:

‘H3.7: Social innovativeness will be highest, where social innovation is recognized as a distinct and important concept in policy making.’ (Anheier et al., 2014a, p. 18)

The central outcome of the policy analysis will thus be the identification of countries where a stronger innovative capacity can be expected due to policy approaches, and where this capacity is expected to be low.

Just as the media analysis which evaluates images of the third sector conveyed in national media (Norris, 2000), this analysis accordingly reveals discourses that influence or reflect the relation of social innovations and the third sector in policy. It can therefore be understood as an independent analytical step within the ITSSOIN project. It is, however, connected to the central empirical work step: the case studies on social innovations in seven empirical fields¹ across the nine above-named ITSSOIN countries. The expectations on the innovative capacity of countries in regard to policy approaches will serve as a background for the analysis of the case studies and will provide information on social innovation-related policy frameworks in Europe and more specifically in the respective countries in which the case studies are conducted.

The policy analysis itself is designed on the basis of a previous screening of policy discourses published as the ‘Report on the European Social Innovation Policy Framework in Light of Third Sector & Civil Society Actors’. Drawing on insights from this report we identified criteria for the document selection and an analytical framework that has been described in a guide employed by all partners for the analysis. The details of the methodology will be elaborated in the following (chapter 2). The results of the analysis can be presented in two steps. First, the results for each country, which are based on the analysis guide and also reflect the respective countries’ qualitative specifics, will be presented (chapter 3). Since on average only five documents per country are analysed, this procedure ensures empirical openness as to aspects that have not been incorporated in the guide for the analysis. After this brief insight into the specifics of each country, a comparison of the results of the policy analysis across countries will follow (chapter 4). In this quantitative account of policy discourses 53 documents form the basis of the analysis.

¹ The empirical fields investigated within the framework of the ITSSOIN project are: arts & culture, social services, health, environmental sustainability, consumer protection, work integration, and community development. More information on these fields can be found in Anheier et al. (2015).

It draws more explicitly on the systematics of the code book (cf. section 2. Methodology) to allow for comparisons across countries. In this step of the analysis another comparative perspective will be included. In addition to the policy analysis on country level, the same procedure was applied to policy documents on EU level. Comparing policy discourses across the different countries with EU policies not only allows for a cross-country comparison but also for an estimation of the degree to which EU policies influence national policy making. Finally, this analysis allows to test the hypothesis developed for the ITSSOIN project that relate to the policy analysis. This will represent the final analytical step (chapter 5) that reflects on the innovative capacity expected for the analysed countries based on the approach on innovation in country policies. The results for the three analytical steps will be summarized in a final conclusion.

2. Methodology

On the basis of the prior knowledge gained from the policy documents screening in the ‘Report on the European Social Innovation Policy Framework in Light of Third Sector & Civil Society Actors’ (D1.2) (Eriksson et al., 2014) a methodology for the policy analysis has been developed: a guide for all partners providing criteria for the document selection and a methodology for the analysis of the selected documents, a code book with 25 predefined items (A-X) and details for the coding procedure of these items, project partners were asked to provide qualitative reports on country level to take variations of policy frameworks across countries into account. Not only aspects addressed in the code book are of interest here but also those which additionally occur in the countries. This contributes to the empirical openness of the analysis. The following paragraphs explain these four steps of the analysis guide.

2.1.Document selection

The policy analysis focuses on central policy documents that demonstrate the intentions of the government with reference to social innovation, other types of innovation and third sector involvement. The central importance of the selected documents is due to the fact that they are relevant for these three spheres and they can refer to different societal levels, e.g. the national, regional, or local level. The selection of relevant policy documents is based on the knowledge on the policy landscape in each country gained from the screening of policy documents in the ‘Report on the European Social Policy Framework in Light of Third Sector & Civil Society Actors’ (Eriksson et al., 2014). Overall 53 documents are analysed for the time period from 2001 to 2014 with a strong focus on documents published between 2010 and 2014. Thus, the document selection presents insights into current policy discourses on social innovations at country and EU level. As this empirical preparatory revealed that policies are strongly connected to country specifics, the rationales for the document selection will be presented together with the qualitative reports on country results (chapter 3).

However, for all countries an important consideration was the question of how the ‘information range’ can allow for comparable judgements across countries. It has been decided to analyse approximately five major policy documents for each country, i.e. policy strategies or similar documents of 30-50 pages. Partners were free to add one or two additional documents, if these were regarded as useful and indispensable in the specific country context. In cases where only shorter documents were available, more documents

were included in the analysis. Two or three documents of five to ten pages were considered to be an adequate supplement to one major document.

2.2.Method

Another approach to ensure comparability of policies on social innovation and third sector actors across countries was to develop central questions in view of the documents to be analysed. Drawing on these questions, the policy analysis is a structured content analysis of the policy papers following Mayring (Mayring, 2007). Predefined categories referring to these questions were used as a basis for the coding to be performed. This resulted in the coding book which is presented here and was pretested on EU policy documents.

The above mentioned categories have emerged from the ‘Report on the European Social Policy Framework in Light of Third Sector & Civil Society Actors’ (Eriksson et al., 2014) and an iterative process of comments and revisions between the ITSSOIN partners. The resulting list of items and categories, however, was not considered to be conclusive. Therefore, the option to code for ‘other’ was included for all items. Through coding ‘other’ and suggesting to introduce a new code, adaptations and refinements were possible during the analysis procedure. The results of the analysis showed that such refinements were mainly necessary in single countries in order to describe the specific country context in more detail. Additional codes were necessary in regard to the empirical fields which are concerned by the policies. Not only the fields evaluated within the framework of the ITSSOIN project² but also the field of education was addressed in more than one country.

To increase the reliability of the analysis results, 10% of the items were cross-coded to test inter-coder reliability. To account for differences in coding that might occur across countries, each coder kept a logbook where doubts and ambiguities were recorded. These logbooks proved to be valuable for the qualitative country level report, which presented the results of the analysis in connection with the country specific context. The description of the code book and the items considered is as follows:

The code book is structured into seven sections each with a separate focus of analysis. To offer an insight into the coding book the sections and the associated items are briefly described in the following.

It has to be noted that the differentiation of sections implies a shift of focus in the analysis from the policy document to the concept of social innovation as the unit of analysis (sections 2-6). The former is important as an indicator of policy traits (origins, direction, emphasis) which are addressed in section one: ‘Embedding the document’. The latter refers more strongly to the hypotheses proposed with regard to social innovation in the ‘ITSSOIN Hypotheses’ (D1.4) (Anheier et al., 2014a). Items in section two to six address

² The empirical fields that will be examined within the framework of the ITSSOIN project by analysing case studies in these fields are: arts & culture, social services, health, environmental sustainability, finance-related consumer protection, work integration, and community development,

‘the discussion of innovations’ (section 2), ‘the discussion of social innovations in general’ (section 3), ‘social innovations and the third sector’ (section 4), ‘social innovations and organisations’ (section 5), and ‘social innovations and empirical fields’ (section 6). Section 7 has an inclusive function bringing these two levels together by relating social innovations directly to national policy principles, aims and provenience, as well as by relating policy relations to EU agendas. The entire coding book and the guideline for the coding of the specific characteristics can be found in the Annex (cf. section 7.1).

2.3. Analysis

On the basis of the coding book all partners provided an overview of the results of their document analysis in a spreadsheet. This enables a cross-country comparison using all collected data. However, we already know from the pre-scanning of policy documents that the results have to be interpreted in strong connection with the country specific policy landscape. This is also due to the document selection that considers differences in policy frameworks across countries. The same is true for the policy analysis on the EU level. Accordingly, the analysis is conducted in two steps. First, qualitative country reports are provided for the EU and country level to reflect the document selection, result from the coding, and offer interpretations that reflect on the country specific settings that also consider aspects that were not referred to in the provided coding book. As these reports can be quite elaborate and differ in their form, central insights of the country reports are merged by SIR and UHEI and will be presented in the following (chapter 3). Then, drawing on these insights on country level, the results from the coding across countries are analysed and presented in chapter 4.

Guiding questions for both analytical steps were:

- How are social innovations generally described in policy documents?
- How are social innovations embedded in the policy documents and how do different types of innovation relate to each other?
- What kinds of contributions are expected from social innovations in policy?
- What function is ascribed to the third sector by policy as regards social innovation?

Finally, the hypothesis concerning the relations between policy approaches and the expectable innovative capacity in one country will be tested (Anheier et al., 2014a). The hypothesis reflects on the assumptions derived from the ‘Varieties of Capitalism’ approach that corporate market economies (CMEs) are being influenced more strongly by government influences than are liberal market economies (LMEs). LMEs are more embossed by market mechanism (Hall & Soskice, 2001). These thoughts have been transferred into a hypothesis looking at different approaches that policies are likely to have in CMEs and in LMEs in regard to social innovations and the resulting innovative capacity of the analysed countries. The hypothesis will be presented in more detail in section 5 when they are tested drawing on the qualitative country descriptions as well as on the comparison across countries.

3. Qualitative reports for the EU and on country level

The country reports present the first step of the policy analysis. They give insights into the results of the analysis on country level. As D1.2 showed, policy frameworks on social innovations differ, often strongly, between EU level and country level as well as across countries. To account for these differences, an overview on policy frameworks that affect

social innovations on EU level and country level is given. First insights can be gained by the description of the document selection. For the selection insights from the ‘Report on the European Social Policy Framework in Light of Third Sector & Civil Society Actors’ (Eriksson et al., 2014) are reflected. Second, a summary of the qualitative report on EU level and for each country is given. As the EU level is especially interesting for the analysis and provides a comprehensive framework relevant for all member states, this part of analysis is more elaborated than the analysis on country level. It is strongly focused on the described items of the code book. This allows for the second part of analysis, the comparison across countries, with actual policies on social innovations at the EU level. To avoid redundancies between country reports and the following analysis across countries, the country reports are much more summarised and only reflect on those items particularly interesting for the description of the policy frameworks in the respective country. These items are for example those of section 4 in the code book (social innovations and the third sector), since relations between third sector and social innovation are of special interest for the ITSSOIN project. Further country specifics that are not addressed in the code book will be elaborated.

3.1. Analysis of EU policies

3.1.1. Document selection

Trends on EU level regarding social innovations were presented in the first part of the ‘Report on the European Social Innovation Policy Framework in Light of Third Sector & Civil Society Actors’ (D1.2) (Eriksson et al., 2014). According to these insights, the general interest of the EU in social innovations is very visible, but has specific trends. First, EU policies on social innovation are embedded in the EU policy ‘Horizon 2020’ that sets the general direction for research and innovation in the EU and for EU member states (European Commission, 2011b). Accordingly, ‘Horizon 2020’ is a first important document for the policy analysis. Second, many research activities on social innovations have been initiated with EU funding, but only rarely relate to civil society actors and more often to social enterprises and social entrepreneurship. To relate to this insight the ‘Proposal for a regulation on European Social Entrepreneurship Funds’ and the resulting ‘Regulation on European Social Entrepreneurship Funds’ are selected as documents for the analysis (European Commission, 2011c; European Parliament & The Council of the European Union, 2013). Another document that is interesting for the role of the public sector for innovations is the report on ‘The role of public support in the commercialisation of innovations’ (European Commission, 2014). Having selected these four documents, the two most obvious policy documents for a policy analysis interested in social innovation are also included. The ‘Guide to social innovation’ and a report on ‘Social innovation research in the European Union’ contain especially interesting insights for this focus of analysis (European Commission, 2013a, European Commission, 2013b).

Impact assessment of the proposal on ‘Horizon 2020’, the Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (European Commission, 2011b). The aim of the framework ‘Horizon 2020’ is to stimulate research and innovation, since both are considered key engines of productivity and growth.

Proposal for a regulation on European Social Entrepreneurship Funds (European Commission, 2011c). The proposal aims to develop a set of criteria, including financial

transparency and monitoring social impact, for investment funds that want to invest in social businesses.

Guide to social innovation (European Commission, 2013a). The guide describes the concept of social innovation and the way in which public authorities could support social innovation. Furthermore, it provides a guidance on programming social innovation in the Structural Funds.

Regulation on European Social Entrepreneurship Funds (European Parliament & The Council of the European Union, 2013). The 'Proposal for a regulation on European Social Entrepreneurship Funds' has been accepted by the European Parliament and the Council with a few minor changes. Interestingly, the adopted regulation has a stronger emphasis on solving unwanted consequences of the economic crisis by re-integrating disadvantaged groups into labour.

Social innovation research in the European Union. Approaches, findings and future directions (European Commission, 2013b). This report conceptualises social innovation, addresses the theoretical traditions on which social innovation research draws and provides general recommendations and future directions for research on social innovations.

The role of public support in the commercialisation of innovations (European Commission, 2014). This research report describes basic results of a special Eurobarometer survey among businesses.

3.1.2. Qualitative report

Giving a brief qualitative insight into policies analysed on EU level, differentiations can be made in regard to the embedding of social innovations. Social innovations or innovations in general are understood at the EU level as means to solve societal problems. Policies addressing innovation in general understand research and innovation as means for productivity and growth, meaning smart, sustainable, inclusive economic growth and the promotion of innovative businesses as instruments to support this development (European Commission, 2011b, European Commission, 2014).

The support of social entrepreneurship is discussed as an approach that facilitates the development of (innovative) social enterprises aiming more for social than economic gains. These actors are described as actors that are key for the implementation of social innovations on the economic market (European Commission, 2011c; European Parliament & The Council of the European Union, 2013).

Policies referring explicitly to social innovations define the concept and address future perspectives on how to implement the concept in research and practice. A definition of social innovation we already cited as a starting point for the understanding of social innovations in the ITSSOIN project (Anheier et al., 2014b, p. 21) by the European Commission is:

'Social innovation can be defined as the development and implementation of new ideas (products, services and models) to meet social needs and create new social relationships or collaborations. It represents new responses to pressing social demands, which affect the process

of social interactions. It is aimed at improving human well-being. Social innovations are innovations that are social in both their ends and their means. They are innovations that are not only good for society but also enhance individuals' capacity to act' (European Commission, 2013a, p. 6).

The most important aim here is to tackle societal problems, for which social innovations should be supported. In this context, social entrepreneurs and social innovations on the market are again emphasised (European Commission, 2013a, European Commission, 2013b).

Social innovations are consequently embedded in a policy discourse on EU level that focuses mainly on economic aspects by subsuming social aspects under an economical logic. Social economy is here an economy in which social gains are more valued than monetary gains. As a subarea of the general innovation strategy 'Horizon 2020', which is economic-oriented, the societal focused approach is more relevant in policies on social innovations where the most important aim is to find new ways to solve societal problems. Nevertheless, the place where these innovations take place is mostly described as the economic market.

Social innovations are mentioned in most policy reports at the EU level, often as well as technological and governance innovation. Only documents on social entrepreneurship refer exclusively to social innovations (European Commission, 2011c; European Parliament & The Council of the European Union, 2013). Another exception is 'The role of public support in the commercialisation of innovations' (European Commission, 2014) that refers to practical aspects of innovations in business firms. It does not refer to social innovations at all and is thus excluded from further analysis. The relation of social innovation to other types of innovation is medium to high in the remaining documents. The overall prominence of the concept is again high to very high in most policies. An exception is the 'Horizon 2010' (European Commission, 2011b), where it is only medium, due to the general fashion in which innovations are discussed.

The objective in the discussion of innovations in general and social innovations in particular is to develop new products and services as well as to initiate new organisational forms and organisational field transformations. Exceptions are documents that relate to social entrepreneurship (European Commission, 2011c; European Parliament & The Council of the European Union, 2013), which only refer to new products and services and research that aims at organisational field transformation only (European Commission, 2013b). The level at which this objective shall be reached is mostly the organisational level, but also the system level (European Commission, 2011b) and the individual level (European Commission, 2013b) are mentioned in single policies. Only the 'Guide to social innovation' mentions all three levels (European Commission, 2013a). The size and maturity of organisations that are seen as especially innovative are always identified in EU policies. In the research-oriented frameworks (European Commission, 2011b, European Commission, 2013b) small and new organisations are focused on, whereas policies on social entrepreneurship and the 'Guide to social innovation' (European Commission, 2011c, European Commission, 2013a; European Parliament & The Council of the European Union, 2013), which are all interested in the practical implementation of innovations, regard big and incumbent organisations as important.

The main level focused on in the occurrence of social innovation is the EU level. Discussions on social innovation are taking place at the EU policy level, but also EU member states play an important role in the implementation of policies. For example, national authorities are responsible for auditing investment funds that obtain the EuSEF label (European Commission, 2011c; European Parliament & The Council of the European Union, 2013). Furthermore, market actors operating in the European internal market are considered to be important drivers of social innovation. However, the national level is mentioned in relation to the EU level in the 'Regulation on European Social Entrepreneurship Funds' (European Commission, 2011c; European Parliament & The Council of the European Union, 2013). It concerns the relation between national and European measures in regard to funds. It is mentioned that the absence of a common framework concerning a European Social Entrepreneurship Fund causes the risk that 'Member States take diverging measures at national level having a direct negative impact on, and creating obstacles to, the good functioning of the internal market, since funds that wish to operate across the Union would be subject to different rules in different Member States' (European Parliament & The Council of the European Union, 2013, p. 18). A more specific focus on social innovation at the national level or the local level only occurs in the mentioning of specific examples of projects such as the 'Social Innovation Camp' and 'La 27e Région'. Furthermore, there are the examples of the civic innovation centre 'Citilab' and a project on managing Structural Funds initiated by 'The Danish Business Authority' (European Commission, 2013a, p. 8).

Reflecting on the main desired outcome of social innovations, a solidarity- and community-driven approach can be differentiated from a second, a technology-driven approach to social innovation policy at the EU level. In regard to solidarity- and community-driven approaches, social cohesion is a central theme in community-driven approaches of EU policies. In the social innovation research in the European Union, social innovation is mentioned as 'responding to the need for cohesion of a particular society' (European Commission, 2011d, p. 16). Here social cohesion is framed as an objective for both public policy and civil society initiatives. In the 'Guide to social innovation' (European Commission, 2013a), it is argued that volunteers can set up their own community groups in order to promote sustainability. They can receive support in order to do so and their services are offered to local authorities. Furthermore, the issue of social exclusion is mentioned. In order to support social inclusion, social cohesion is considered as very important (European Commission, 2013a). The 'Regulation on European Social Entrepreneurship Funds' frames social entrepreneurship as a way to integrate disadvantaged groups in society. While the proposal formulates the goals of social innovation as a broad range of social services (European Commission, 2011c, p. 15), the regulation, as it is ratified by the Parliament and Council, has a stronger emphasis on (re-)integration in the labour market (European Parliament & The Council of the European Union, 2013). In both versions the regulation aims to enhance social inclusion. However, technology plays a role in the material as well. In the Impact Assessment on the proposal on 'Horizon 2020' (European Commission, 2011b), technological innovations are regarded as significant in order to boost future productivity and growth. In the 'Guide to social innovation' (European Commission, 2013a) an example of a combination between social innovation and technological innovation is mentioned. This concerns the example of 'Citilab', a Barcelona-based centre for social and digital innovation that sees itself as 'a centre for civic innovation, using the Internet as a way to innovate more collaboratively integrating the citizen in the core process' (European Commission, 2013a, p. 6).

All these objectives are elaborated by the European Commission or, in one case, by the European Parliament. The documents contain strong references to other Ministries and policy fields that are focused on social innovation as Economy, Labour, Social Affairs, and Research & Innovation. Target fields of social innovations are all ITSSOIN fields except Art & Culture. Every other field is mentioned in at least one document. While three out of five documents do not have one field that can be distinguished as being more important than others, two documents mention social services and work integration as the most relevant field.

At the EU level the main institutional settings for social innovation presented in the policy documents are the market and the state. The market is ascribed a stronger position, being the main institutional setting in all of the five documents, whereas the state is included only in three of the documents. Both the role of service provider and the role of advocate are barely visible in the representation of the third sector. In four of the six documents (European Commission, 2011b, European Commission, 2011c, European Commission, 2014; European Parliament & The Council of the European Union, 2013) no reference is made to the third sector at all. However, in the 'Guide to social innovation' (European Commission, 2013a), the example of the 'Living Lab' in Western Finland is mentioned. The 'Living Lab' is an innovative platform that aims at producing new services for elderly people. This is done in collaboration with various partners, including municipalities, universities, and third sector actors. In this case, the third sector is framed as service provider. In the document, the role of advocate is not visible. In 'Social innovation research in the European Union' (European Commission, 2013b) the third sector is present, but a clear role of service provider or advocate is not recognisable.

Against the background of this analysis at EU level, now qualitative descriptions of the policy discourse on social innovations at country level will be provided.

3.2. Czech Republic

3.2.1. Document selection

Social innovation is a relatively new concept in the policy discourse in the Czech Republic. It is mostly related to operational programmes of the EU (Eriksson et al., 2014, p. 50); this is why a range of national and one regional policy on innovation in general (all but SI) and in one case on social innovation (SI) in particular can be found. The following five policy documents that describe central aspects of the policy discourse on social innovation in the Czech Republic could be identified.

National Innovation Policy of the Czech Republic for 2005 – 2010 (Council for Research, 2005). The document provides the basis for the Czech innovation policy, defines basic concepts and sets the priority lines for a new policy that follows the recommendation of the European institutions. It primarily deals with trade, market competition, and technological innovation, and it also directs Czech innovation policy and how this policy is understood by the government.

National research, development and innovation Policy of the Czech Republic for 2009 - 2015 (Council for Research, 2009). The document refers to EU policies and to social policy and necessary changes of the Czech policy of innovation that relate to them. We

include this document in the sample as the major source of political conception of national research and innovation strategies.

Regional innovation strategy of the capital city Prague (Institute of Planning and City Development of capital city Prague, 2014). The document focuses on the regional strategy of the city of Prague and elaborates on specific parts of the city's strategic development which is related to innovations. We included the document as a unique example of the local policy related to the social innovations.

National innovation strategy of the Czech Republic for 2012 - 2020 (Ministry of Industry and Trade of the Czech Republic, 2011). This is the last strategic document in the field of innovation that was approved by the Czech government and which should serve as a platform for updating the second document. The document is important as the last strategic document of public innovation policy that addresses most recent problems and trends in the field.

Social integration strategy for 2014 - 2020 (Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs of the Czech Republic, 2014). The document represents the strategy of the government for the fields of social inclusion from the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs. It contains the overview of the strategies and tools of the fight against poverty that also include SI. Therefore, this is one of the very first (and few) official government materials using the term 'social innovation', even if it is not exclusively focused on the field of innovations.

3.2.2. Qualitative report summary

Social innovations are, if they are described at all, kept very vague in the policy documents of the Czech Republic. Connections to the third sector or other kinds of innovation cannot be found. The subject is mainly discussed on a national policy level, aiming at the systemic and organisational level with the objective to transform organisational fields. Focussing on technological concepts of innovation, the direction of the wished field transformation is economic growth and increasing the living standards of citizens. The prevailing policy level of authority producing the documents related to innovations is the national level, although a strategic document on innovations in the city of Prague is analysed as well.

The concept of social innovation in the Czech Republic is used in the documents in a general way. Social innovations are only briefly mentioned as something that could be elaborated and researched for policy documents in the future and without any explicit or implicit relation to or implications for contemporary public policies. Accordingly, the coding of items related explicitly to social innovations (items J-X) was not possible for the two documents 'National Innovation Policy of the Czech Republic for 2005 - 2010' (Council for Research, 2005) and 'National research, development and innovation Policy of the Czech Republic for 2009-2015' (Council for Research, 2009). Sometimes the concept of social innovation is used in a footnote only to explain to the reader that the document does not intend to deal with this kind of innovation at all. This led to many empty codes with 'none', or 'none relation' in the remaining documents.

This does also apply for the relation of social innovations to the third sector. Even though the third sector is a relevant institutional setting for social innovations, only in one document a weak relation to social innovations can be found. For this document a less pronounced service provision of the third sector is expressed as well. Otherwise no

relations between third sector or civic engagement to social innovation can be found. The same is true for the function of the third sector as service provider or advocate. Consequently, the role of the third sector as advocate or service provider is of no significance in the analysed policies for the Czech Republic.

Summing up it can be concluded that social innovation is a subject of small to no relevance in the policy discourse of the Czech Republic.

3.3. Denmark

3.3.1. Document selection

The five selected policy documents give insights into the framing terms currently defining the relationship between the public and the third sector in Denmark. The documents give also insights in the evolving framing policy through the examination of two pairs of documents. The first pair considers the content of the Charters (Charter, 2001, Charter, 2013) which regulates the interaction between the state and the volunteer sector. The second pair of documents considers the recommendations report (Udvalget for Socialøkonomiske Viksomheder, 2013) issued by the Committee for social enterprises, and continues with the Government proposal (Danish Government, 2014) which was prepared after the recommendations report and which establishes initiatives in support of social enterprises. The fifth document is the Danish innovation strategy. The documents reflect thus the link between the concept of social innovation and social entrepreneurship found in Denmark and the growing role of the social innovation concept in the discussion of the reform of the welfare society, already discussed as important traits of policy in Denmark (Eriksson et al., 2014, pp. 50f.). In more detail the documents are:

Charter for interaction between the volunteer sector and associations in Denmark and the public sector (Charter, 2001). The document is central for the description of the third sector involvement, the 'Charters' represent the agreement between the Danish Government and some of the national third sector organisations in the social sphere, the Danish Association of Local Authorities and Regions and Local Authorities.

Charter for interaction between the volunteer world and the public sector (Charter, 2013). Renewed charter from 2001, through a process including many more state actors and civil society organisational actors. This document has been selected because it shows the evolution of a policy and the inclusion of different societal levels.

Committee for Social Economic Enterprises (Udvalget for Socialøkonomiske Viksomheder, 2013). The document presents the proposals made by a commission to provide advice for the government on social economic enterprises.

Easier to become a Volunteer in Denmark (Danish Government, 2014). In this document the government formalises its intention in a publication where it highlights 10 initiatives to support social economic enterprises.

Denmark – a nation of solutions. Enhanced cooperation and improved frameworks for innovation in enterprises (Danish Government, 2012). The Danish Innovation policy describes its general approach in regard to innovations by focussing on a number of

innovations, for example: user-driven innovation, open innovation, design innovation, employee-driven innovation, and innovation in the public sector.

3.3.2. Qualitative report summary

Social innovations are only rarely discussed in policy documents in Denmark. They are more often related to in proposals and conferences sponsored by the government. Moreover, the term 'social innovation' is not defined or used directly. Subjects related to 'social' and 'innovation' questions are rather discussed independently and not in connection with each other. Nevertheless, social innovation is present in policy documents by implicit descriptions. Technological and governance innovations play a subordinated role in the context of the analysed policy documents.

The detailed analysis of the documents confirms the first impression of the policy screening (Eriksson et al., 2014, pp. 50f.): At the core of the Danish social national discussion there are at least two major lines of debate in which social innovations are (implicitly) of relevance: on the one hand discourses focus on the welfare reform which, given the trends of fiscal shrinking budgets, aims at ensuring the same level of welfare services at lower costs, on the other hand, there are debates inspired by New Public Management reforms that see the future provision of social services and the questions of economic productivity all resolved in the form of giving support to social entrepreneurship and social economic enterprises.

At the local level, however, many municipalities have enthusiastically taken up the concept of social innovation and have become in the last few years active promoters and supporters of different networks which facilitate further learning and policy and give practical support to the work carried out by volunteers, groups, and associations, in other words, engaging the 'third sector' in concrete and practical ways to implement social innovations. In this context civic engagement is framed as 'volunteerism' that contributes to social cohesion but also as processes that offer potential to local authorities to prevent tax increases. The relation to social innovation is established most explicitly with the expressed idea that volunteering has a great scope for bringing new solutions to the most difficult societal problems. In this context a strong or very strong relation of social innovation to the third sector and civic engagement is coded. Further the function of the third sector as advocate and service provider is explicitly expressed (Charter, 2001, Charter, 2013; Danish Government, 2014). Such relations and functions cannot be detected in documents focussing on innovation in enterprises (Udvalget for Socialøkonomiske Viksomheder, 2013; Danish Government, 2012).

Accordingly, policy discourses on the local level that discuss social innovations strongly connect third sector activity and volunteering with the function of advocate and service provider. On the national level the policy discourse is conducted more in proposals than in elaborated government documents. Thereby, it concentrates on the economisation of the welfare system which implies the need for innovations of social relations. An explicit discussion of social innovations is, however, not existent.

3.5. France

3.5.1. Document selection

Policy screening in France showed that two competing acceptations of social innovation prevail in the sample: first, a solidarity-focused understanding of the concept, connected with civil society, and second, an understanding of social innovations as private initiatives, which focuses more on enterprises. In the sample of analysed policy documents the strongest support for social innovations comes from the social and solidarity economy sector (SSE-sector), the French equivalent for 'third sector'. Indeed, two of the five selected documents are drafted by representatives of the field (AVISE, 2013; CSESS, 2011) and two additional documents acknowledge the existence and utility of the field (Commission sous la présidence d'Anne Lauvergeon, 2013; Gouvernement français LOI, 2014). As CSESS is a government-mandated council which advises public policy on the third sector, three of the selected documents can be understood as policy documents as well as regional policy reports (Région Ile-de-France, 2011). However, in both kinds of documents, when specific social innovations are mentioned, they are often embedded in a regional or local context (Eriksson et al., 2014, pp. 52f.).

Summary Report by the Social Innovation Working Group (CSESS, 2011). Drafted by representatives of the third sector, the document calls for a better public support of social innovations and offers concrete proposals to the government. It confirms that there is a very promising institutional context for social innovation in France, but also that the public sector interest in social innovation compensates a shrinking financial support for the third sector.

Regional actions supporting social innovation (AVISE, 2013). The document accounts for the efforts made by the government of the regions in order to support social innovation. Again, social innovation appears as an opportunity for additional funding and support for the third sector.

Social and Solidarity Economy Act (Gouvernement français LOI, 2014). The act defines the common principles which link together the wide variety of actors and legal structures that compose the Social and Solidarity Economy sector and addresses the role of public policy in promoting and fostering its development.

Innovation 2030 Commission Report (Commission sous la présidence d'Anne Lauvergeon, 2013). This report is drafted by a commission mandated by the Prime Minister to reflect on how to stimulate innovation in the private sector.

Regional Strategy for Economic Development and Innovation (Région Ile-de-France, 2011). The policy document on regional level lays out the strategic plan of the region Île de France (which comprises Paris) for economic development and innovation over the period 2011-2014. It shows to what extent innovation in general and social innovation in particular have become the main focus of the action of the state at the regional and local levels.

3.5.2. Qualitative report summary

Again, in France the definition of the concept of social innovation is rather vague. The 'Social and Solidarity Economy Act' is an exception but the reference to social innovation in this document is very marginal. Hence, if the concept of social innovation has spread to the field of policy making at the local as well as national levels, its recognition is not fully complete yet, as one document refers to social innovation only implicitly by posing the 'social' externalities of innovations as a necessary condition for their success, whereas the others address the topic explicitly. It is to note that other types of innovation (technological or governance innovations) are of little or no relevance in these latter documents. More generally social innovations are understood as drivers of economic growth.

The relation of the third sector or civic engagement to social innovation is not established in the French 'Innovation commission report' and the policy on 'Regional Strategy for Economic Development and Innovation'. Both are policies developed by the government. The three other analysed documents refer more explicitly to social innovations and social economy (AVISE, 2013; CSESS, 2011; Gouvernement français LOI, 2014). They stem from the third sector or are strongly related to it and accordingly describe a strong relation of third sector and innovation. In this context, the function of the third sector as service provider is usually little pronounced and its advocacy role is mentioned only once. Similarly, both roles are strongly connected to market and the state.

Summing up, policy initiatives in France explicitly aim at the implementation of social innovations with the objective to support economic growth. The implementation is focused on the local level, enacted by actors from the market, the state and the third sector, but has not yet been taken up by official government decisions.

3.6. Germany

3.6.1. Document selection

German policies on social innovation are in the responsibility of several ministries, always in dependence of the subject that social innovation is related to. Two central streams of discussion can be identified in regard to the discussed subjects. On the one hand, innovation is connected to technological solutions for societal problems (Eriksson et al., 2014, p. 53). This is reflected in the selected documents on the high-tech strategy for Germany and the programme for regional development in Baden-Württemberg (Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, 2010; Ministerium für Ländlichen Raum und Verbraucherschutz Baden-Württemberg). On the other hand, volunteering and engagement are understood as offering great innovative capacities (Eriksson et al., 2014, p. 53). Accordingly, policies on civic engagement (Deutsche Bundesregierung, 2010; Deutscher Bundestag, 2009) and engagement of enterprises in the form of corporate social responsibility (CSR) are analysed (Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales, 2010):

Report on recommendations of the national CSR forum to the German government (Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales, 2010). Even though there is a national CSR strategy, this document has been chosen instead, because it is more explicitly related to social innovation. The national engagement strategy is content-wise strongly connected to these recommendations. Because of the inter-linkage between both strategies it is still

an important document for the conducted policy analysis, as it describes CSR as desired civic engagement of business firms.

Ideas. Innovation. Growth. High-tech strategy 2020 for Germany (Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, 2010). This document is especially promising in regard to the question as to how technological innovations and social innovations are related, since technological innovations are already identified as a focus in the German innovation discourse.

National strategy for engagement of the German government (Deutsche Bundesregierung, 2010). The national strategy for engagement is included, as it refers to social innovation as important impact of civic engagement and volunteering.

Report on the work of the subcommittee ‘civic engagement’ in the 16th election period (Deutscher Bundestag, 2009). To understand where the above described national strategy framework comes from, the report on civic engagement is included. This document laid the basis for the national strategy for engagement as well as the ‘National CSR Strategy of the German Government’ in 2010. The document refers to the improvement of legal conditions for civic engagement and to parliamentary initiatives and subjects of consultation.

Operational programme of the European funds for regional development (ERDF) in Baden-Württemberg 2014-2020: Innovation and energy transition (Ministerium für Ländlichen Raum und Verbraucherschutz Baden-Württemberg). This document allows for insights on the implementation of the European funds for regional development on regional level. This is interesting in regard to social innovations, because the funds itself refers to them.

3.6.2. Qualitative report summary

Generally, in Germany social innovation is described as a way to find solutions for societal problems. With this vague description the concept is of medium to high prominence in German policies. Only the national engagement strategy frequently relates to this type of innovation. Apart from that, governance innovations and technical innovations are even named more often in the policy documents, which indicates medium prominence. But the meaning ascribed to all types of innovations as technological approaches or ideas to find new ways of governance in society or organisations that add to solve societal problems, shows overall a different picture. Innovations are generally framed as solving societal problems and can hence be understood as social innovations.

Generally, two lines of policy discourses can be found that relate to social innovation. Two of the analysed documents (Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, 2010; Ministerium für Ländlichen Raum und Verbraucherschutz Baden-Württemberg) focus on innovations in economy. The three remaining documents (Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales, 2010; Deutsche Bundesregierung, 2010; Deutscher Bundestag, 2009) concentrate more on the innovative potential assigned to civic engagement.

The analysed economy-centred policy frameworks are focused on the impact of innovation on economic growth mainly through technological innovation. Social innovations are named as well in this context but only brought into focus when referring to general

developments in society. An especially important aspect is the development of environmentally sustainable solutions through technological innovations in economy. These economy-centred policies establish a weak or no link between social innovation and the third sector. In accordance with this, the third sector is not described as service provider in these documents.

Documents concerned with civic engagement are more interested in aspects of solidarity. Interestingly, the report on recommendations of the CSR-forum (Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales, 2010) builds bridges between the economic- and volunteering-focused lines of discussion, since it refers to the civic engagement of business firms as an important form of civic engagement. These documents concentrating on civic engagement describe a strong relation between the third sector and social innovation. The service provision function of the third sector corresponds to this emphasis, because it is pronounced in both documents.

The relation of civic engagement to social innovation is more often of relevance in policy documents in Germany. As CSR activities are understood as civic engagement of corporations, civic engagement is highly related to innovation in all documents except for the high-tech strategy (Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, 2010). The focus on civic engagement in policy frameworks relating to economy is established through the idea that citizen forums can help to create legitimacy for innovative societal changes. This explains at the same time why a similar picture occurs in regard to the advocacy function ascribed to the third sector. The creation of legitimacy in a citizen forum is a description of the advocacy function of the third sector that can be found in a similar way in all documents except for the recommendations on the CSR-strategy (Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales, 2010). This document is concerned with civic engagement of corporations. In this context the advocacy for specific subjects does not appear to be of high relevance.

The vague understanding of social innovations in Germany makes it an underlying but central objective for policies in Germany. This holds even though technological innovation are more pronounced in economic-centred policies and governance innovations are more often implicitly or explicitly described in policies referring to civic engagement. Because the societal impact which innovations have in general is the focus of the policies, social innovation can be described as implicitly but nevertheless highly prominent.

3.7. Italy

3.7.1. Document selection

The policy discourse in Italy does not often address social innovations. More often subjects such as social enterprises or the support of third sector organisations are relevant in a policy context in the current legislative turmoil (Eriksson et al., 2014, p. 54). Knowing that actors from the third sector are allocated new functions, policies on the third sector can be expected to deal with innovations. Based on these insights, six policy papers were identified as relevant for social innovation in Italy. Only one refers explicitly to social innovations in its title (MIUR, 2012). The others relate either to third sector activity, civic engagement, or corporate social responsibility (Camera dei Deputati, 2014; Ministero del Lavoro e delle Politiche Sociali e Ministero dello Sviluppo Economico, 2011; Ministero del

Lavoro e delle Politiche Sociali, 2011). Further two actual legislative decrees are included in the analysis, because they are related to measures for the growth of the country, where 'innovation' (not only social innovation) is mentioned as a motor of growth of the country (Governo Italiano, 2012a, Governo Italiano, 2012b).

Law Proposal – Legislative decree for the reform of third sector, social enterprise and universal civil service (Camera dei Deputati, 2014). This is the first comprehensive law proposal on the reform of third sector (the final law has been foreseen for March 2015). It strongly supports the value of civic engagement for the development of a culture of innovation and explicitly mentions social inclusion and several ITSSOIN fields.

Call to present project ideas for Smart Cities and Communities and Social Innovation (MIUR, 2012). A call to present project ideas from the Italian Ministry of Education, Universities and Research. It is the only document which explicitly focuses on social innovation and mentions several ITSSOIN fields.

Legislative Decree 22 June 2012, n.83: Urgent measures for the growth of the country (Governo Italiano, 2012a). Law currently in place. It has been selected, because it explicitly addresses social innovation (and not only) as a motor for growth and the economic recovery of the country.

Legislative Decree 18 October 2012, n.179: Further urgent measures for the growth of the country (Governo Italiano, 2012b). Law currently in place. This is the second 'step' of the previous law, where innovation is the main focus - though more technological than social innovation in this case. It also contains a whole section of definition of 'innovative start-ups'.

National Action Plan for Corporate Social Responsibility 2012-2014 (Ministero del Lavoro e delle Politiche Sociali e Ministero dello Sviluppo Economico, 2011). This is an action plan for the government to support the voluntary effort of firms in strengthening their CSR measures. Although it is focused on the for profit sector, it contains explicit mentions of the potential of CSR initiatives with regard to social cohesion, sustainability of the social economy, and social innovation.

Italy Plan 2011 – Year of volunteering and active citizenship (Ministero del Lavoro e delle Politiche Sociali, 2011). This government action plan strongly recognises and supports the role of volunteering and civic engagement in contributing to social cohesion, social inclusion, and social innovation.

3.7.2. Qualitative report summary

Policy documents referring to social innovation in Italy mentioned most frequently social and technological innovations. Policies that refer explicitly to social innovations describe technological innovation as a driver of social innovation, and never the opposite. In contrast, two of the analysed documents describe social innovation as a focus of the policy document. (Ministero del Lavoro e delle Politiche Sociali, 2011; MIUR, 2012). Even though this observations show that the concept of social innovation gains momentum in the policy discourse, it has to be described as relatively weakly implemented as an overall theme in all analysed policy documents in Italy. In fact, in Italy there is not an overall, strategic idea of what social innovation is, what it can bring for the country, and how

different policies can help integrating social innovation in different fields, sectors, or contexts.

The descriptions of objectives of innovations often relate to innovations in general and not to social innovations in particular. The goals in most of the documents concern the national context. The main desired outcome of innovation (not necessarily social innovation) is that it acts as a motor of economic growth – and very often coupled with technological innovation, where the references to EU policies and frameworks is often very strong.

The institutional setting of social innovation is generally not specified or left quite vague. Overall, the interrelation between social innovation and third sector is poor. Only the ‘National Plan for the European Year of Volunteering’ (Ministero del Lavoro e delle Politiche Sociali, 2011) refers explicitly to the third sector. Moreover, no mention of social innovation relating to the third sector in any role of advocate or service provider is made. An exception is the ‘National Action Plan for Corporate Social Responsibility 2012-2014’ (Ministero del Lavoro e delle Politiche Sociali e Ministero dello Sviluppo Economico, 2011), where social innovation is specifically mentioned to anticipate the future law on social enterprises and their role as service providers (more than advocates) is anticipated in the text.

Economic growth through technological innovations with support of social innovations is the main objective of Italian policies in the analysed documents. It can be observed that social innovations become more focused on in some policy documents but generally innovation is discussed as a broad subject with no clear distinction between innovation concepts in regard to the objectives of policy programmes. Further the role of the third sector is not addressed explicitly in this context.

3.8. The Netherlands

3.8.1. Document selection

The document selection in the Netherlands draws on nine documents instead of five to six, because several short documents were the most relevant in interpreting social innovation policies.

In the Dutch policy discourse social innovation is most strongly related to either new forms of governance, in which people have to take maximum responsibility for their own lives and surroundings, or to strengthening the knowledge economy. Three of the selected documents reflect policy discourses on new forms of (local) governance and public service provision (Kammerstukken II 2012/13 33 400 VII, no. 79, 2013; Kammerstukken II 2013/14 33 750 VII, no. 53, 2014; Kammerstukken II 2012/13 30 597, no. 296, 2013). A number of other documents approach (social) innovation as a motor for a strong knowledge economy, often in relation to research and science (Kammerstukken II 2010/11, 2011; Kammerstukken II 2011/12, 2012; Kammerstukken II 2011/12 32 253, no. 35, 2012). Two other examples of policy programmes that explicitly aim at enhancing social innovation focus on ways to increase environmentally sustainable choices in the Dutch economy (Kammerstukken II 2012/13 20 487, no. 41, 2013) or to use money from the European Social Fund to encourage innovation in the labour market (Kammerstukken II 2013/14 26 642, no. 128, 2014). Finally, a report from a governmental advisory board is added

(Adviesraad voor het Wetenschaps- en Technologiebeleid, 2014). It is yet uncertain to what extent the content is translated in actual legislation, but it is the most on-topic document from recent years that defines social innovation, relates it to different policy streams and provides suggestions to incorporate it in future policies.

Cabinet opinion on the stimulation of a vital society, the do-democracy (Kammerstukken II 2012/13 33 400 VII, no. 79, 2013). This document is an influential note from the current administration on the 'do-democracy' that sets an agenda for new forms of governance with a large role for active citizens and grassroots organisations.

The power of social innovation (Adviesraad voor het Wetenschaps- en Technologiebeleid, 2014). Aims at enhancing social innovation by using money from the European Social Fund to encourage innovation in the labour market.

Letter from the Prime Minister on the definition of the participation society (Kammerstukken II 2013/14 33 750 VII, no. 53, 2014). It is yet uncertain to what extent the content of the letter translates into actual legislation, but it is the most on-topic document from recent years that defines social innovation, relates it to different policy streams and provides suggestions to incorporate it in future policies.

Reform of long-term support and care (Kammerstukken II 2012/13 30 597, no. 296, 2013). The document does not have a primary focus on innovation but concerns the Social Support Act, which aims to encourage innovative ways of organising social care and social support with increasing responsibility for local governments, the third sector and individual citizens.

Motion introduced by two members of parliament aiming to increase the importance of social innovation in the policy on research and innovation (Kammerstukken II 2010/11, 2011). The motion resulted in some minor changes in existing policy, see below (Kammerstukken II 2011/12 32 253, no. 35, 2012).

Reply of Secretary of State on the motion aiming to increase the importance of social innovation in the policy on research and innovation (Kammerstukken II 2011/12 32 253, no. 35, 2012). This document sees social innovation as a motor for a strong knowledge economy.

Letter of Minister and Secretary of State on the knowledge and innovation contract (Kammerstukken II 2011/12, 2012). This document reflects the broader policy of the first administration of PM Mark Rutte on innovation in the knowledge economy, which mostly focuses on technological innovations but also mentions social innovation.

Knowledge programme on social innovation for a green economy (Kammerstukken II 2012/13 20 487, no. 41, 2013). This document explicitly aims at enhancing social innovation and focus on ways to increase environmentally sustainable choices in the Dutch economy.

Letter of Secretary of State on the implementation of the European Social Fund in the Netherlands (Kammerstukken II 2013/14 26 642, no. 128, 2014). The only official document that explicitly explains the idea of a 'participation society'.

3.8.2. Qualitative report summary

Policy documents found in the Netherlands are mostly proposals to parliament, documentations of parliament debates, or official statements and only rarely government documents. Documents that relate to social innovations show a clear embracement of the concept of social innovation. Often, however, technological innovations are regarded as tools for social innovations. Communication technologies are, for instance, described as tools for people to organise themselves in order to help each other. Other documents focus on technological innovation, which can be supplemented by social innovations.

The policy documents relate to two central subjects that are discussed in regard to social innovation: the transformation of the current welfare state towards a participation society and sustainable economic growth.

The transformation of the welfare state is accompanied by budget cuts. There is a strong political belief that supporting grassroots engagement will facilitate the transformation of the welfare state. Here social innovations that support new solutions for societal problems are of special interest. An active role of citizens and strong communities is regarded as significant for the achievement of social innovations. In this context, there is a strong emphasis on social cohesion as an important condition for active citizenship and strong communities that could produce innovative services. In regard to the welfare system the interrelation of national and local level is of more relevance, since the responsibility in several policy fields is moved from the national to the local level, like in the field of long-term care and social support (Kamerstukken II 2012/13, 30 597, no. 296). In this context volunteers and third sector organisations are understood as service provider rather than as advocates (Adviesraad voor het Wetenschaps- en Technologiebeleid, 2014; Kamerstukken II 2012/13, 33 400 VII, no. 79; Kamerstukken II 2013/14, 33 750 VII, no. 53; Kamerstukken II 2012/13, 30 597, no. 296).

In regard to sustainable economic growth innovative solutions are sought that combine economic growth with environmentally sustainable solutions. There is a strong belief in technological innovations but they can be supported by social innovations. Social innovation is expected to arise from networks and complex collaborations that want to achieve a common civic goal, e.g. educating people about environmental issues (Kamerstukken II 2012/13, 20 487, no. 41). Policies that reflect on social innovations in reference to knowledge-based solutions that aim at improving sustainable economic growth (Kamerstukken II 2010/11, 32 253, no. 30; Kamerstukken II 2011/12, 32 253, no. 35; Kamerstukken II 2011/12, 32 637, no. 32) and the policy on the implementation of the European social funds (Kamerstukken II 2013/14, 26 642, no. 128) find no or weak relations between third sector or civic engagement and social innovation. The policy stream on knowledge and innovation seeks to enhance collaborations between state actors (universities and research institutes) and market actors. The function of the third sector as advocate or service provider is also not relevant here.

Social innovations are of great importance for the policy discourse in the transformation of the welfare state and environmental sustainability in the Netherlands. Their importance is stressed in policies on local citizen participation, welfare state reforms, the knowledge economy, and environmental sustainability. The third sector and volunteering are described as important for innovative processes as well as for their advocacy and service provision functions. They are considered as a part of network structures on the local and

regional levels. Social innovation is focused on especially in the discourse on the welfare state, whereas it is discussed more as a by-product of important technological innovations in regard to environmental sustainability.

3.9. Spain

3.9.1. Document selection

In Spain the concept of social innovations appears occasionally in the policy discourse and is brought into play by relevant stakeholders. Especially relevant is the concept for the development of networks in the Spanish Basque region. Nevertheless, a more general debate on innovations in general that can be related to social innovations on national level has developed in the last years (Eriksson et al., 2014, pp. 55f.). Discourses on innovation in general are often related to science and technology (Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad, 2013a; Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad, 2013b). Further social inclusion is discussed with regard to the European Investment and Structural Funds and the strategies on national level for social services, social inclusion, and work integration (Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e. Igualdad, 2013; Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e. Igualdad, 2014). Explicit references to social innovations are made in the 'Social innovation strategy' in the Spanish Basque region (Innobasque, 2011). The function of social innovations on regional level is further reflected in a document on social innovative initiatives in the Basque region (Gobierno Vasco, 2012).

Social Innovation Strategy. A window of opportunity for Euskadi (Innobasque, 2011). This policy document is relevant to understand how social innovation has been envisioned in the broader context of innovation policies and how related policies have been designed and deployed in the region.

Spanish Strategy for Science, Technology and Innovation 2013-2020 (Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad, 2013a). The perspective does not focus on social welfare but rather on economic competitiveness through enhanced productivity, digital inclusion, and employment.

III Basque Plan for Active Inclusion (2012-2016) (Gobierno Vasco, 2012). It is relevant to understand the context surrounding social innovation pilot initiatives in the Spanish Basque region around the idea of active social inclusion (community development and work integration) and their connection with social enterprises and corporate social responsibility (CSR).

The Promotion of Social Inclusion through the European Investment and Structural Funds (Period 2014-2020). Guide on practical orientations and recommendations (MSSSI, 2014). This document addresses (social) innovation as a critical element of social investment policy, in particular in order to secure the support and effective use of the Structural and Investment Funds.

State Plan for Scientific and Technical Research and Innovation 2013-2016 (Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad, 2013b). This document translates (Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad, 2013a) into strategic objectives for implementation by key agents, including third sector organisations (TSOs), relative to issues such as demographic

change and wellbeing. Once again the perspective focuses on national economic competitiveness.

National Action Plan for Social Inclusion for the Kingdom of Spain (2013-2016) (Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e. Igualdad, 2013). This document explicitly associates the third sector with (social) innovation, in particular at the levels of social inclusion (through work integration) and social services.

3.9.2. Qualitative report summary

A clear and homogeneous definition of social innovation is missing in Spain. Conceptualisations by policy documents are most often implicit rather than explicit. However, social innovation is mostly understood as a systemic phenomenon that is closely intertwined with governance and technological innovations to solve social problems. A social innovation is understood as an innovation that responds to social needs; it is present as a predominant type of innovation in policy documents to which governance and technological innovations are directly or implicitly related.

The idea of social innovation emerged just recently in the national and regional policy landscape of Spain. It is mostly connected to EU policies and funding pursuing social cohesion, competitiveness, and economic growth as well as to regional development policies aiming at innovation in general. Overall, social innovation is consequently understood as a useful tool to achieve social and economic goals in a broader context of societal transformation or as a social transformation by itself, rather than as desirable outcome per se; most intensely in the field of social services and also in the field of social inclusion through work integration, community development, and digital inclusion.

The solution of societal and economic problems through social innovation is the focus of the analysed policy documents in Spain. From the perspective of policy governance and technological innovations these innovations serve as supporting innovative processes for the broad implementation of social solutions and can also be understood as social innovations. For this, process network structures are described as important means. These networks also include innovative third sector actors in regard to the provision of services as well as non-profit-business partnerships in a variety of fields such as work integration.

Third sector organisations, rather than volunteers and other engaged citizens, are perceived as key actors for social innovation to develop. Only MSSSI documents refer to the term 'volunteering' (Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e. Igualdad, 2013; Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e. Igualdad, 2014). Third sector organisations, by contrast, are mentioned in all of the documents, although in one of them they are included under a more general formula referring to the agents involved in innovation, without further specifications. They are generally described as service providers. Despite the fact that most relevant social action third sector organisations in Spain combine service providing and advocacy activities, explicit references to the advocacy role of third sector organisations can only be found in Gobierno Vasco, which values the "knowledge, know-how, and representativeness" of the most vulnerable segments of population (Gobierno Vasco, 2012, p. 70). In two of the documents explicit references to the role of third sector organisations either as service providers or advocates cannot be found.

Altogether Spain gives a strong impression in terms of how the potential and networking capability of the third sector, particularly in collaboration with public and business partners, with regards to social innovation is put forward, even though this development has just recently begun.

3.10. Sweden

3.10.1. Document selection

The discourse of social innovations in Sweden is only just emerging and is mostly introduced to fulfil EU requirements. This might also be due to a change after national elections in autumn 2014. Explicit policy discourses on social innovations cannot be found. Consequently, documents are selected that refer to innovations in general (Finansdepartementet, 2014) or policies and programmes for growth, since they do also refer to innovative activities (Arbetsmarknadsdepartementet, 2014; Näringsdepartementet, 2012, Näringsdepartementet, 2014a, Näringsdepartementet, 2014b).

Proposal for a National Social Fund Programme for Investment in Growth and Employment 2014-2020 (Arbetsmarknadsdepartementet, 2014). This is a proposal for how to invest EU funds to generate jobs and strengthen and develop the national labour market policy. It focuses on accessibility, labour market competence provision, individuals outside of the labour market, and on supporting young people in working or studying.

Committee Directive - Enhanced conditions for entrepreneurship and innovative business (Finansdepartementet, 2014). A committee put in place to investigate how to improve the conditions for starting, developing, and owning firms as well as for fostering entrepreneurship and innovation.

The national innovation strategy (Näringsdepartementet, 2012). This document covers the strategy put forward by the Ministry of Enterprise and Innovation and enacted by the government in 2012.

A national strategy for growth and attractiveness (Näringsdepartementet, 2014a). This document covers a strategy for strengthening innovation, enterprise and entrepreneurship, attractive environments, competence provision, and international cooperation through funding for the municipalities. It also concerns the regional and local levels.

Proposal for a National Regional Fund Programme for Investment in Growth and Employment 2014-2020 (Näringsdepartementet, 2014b). Part of an EU initiative to spur regional growth and innovation in its member states.

3.10.2. Qualitative report summary

In Swedish policy documents it is not clear what social innovation specifically means, how it is related to the rest of the policy content, or how social innovation relates to other kinds of innovation. Mostly, social innovations are named together with other types of innovation (e.g. technological innovations) and are said to be in need of a broad approach to find solutions for explicitly named societal problems. The societal problems themselves

are strongly connected to goals relevant for policies from the EU. In general, the documents give the impression that 'social innovation' must be related to or is interesting, because other countries are interested in it. Consequently, social innovation seems to be a concept that is imported to Sweden from the EU level or from the context of other European countries.

One document presents a view that there is a potential in the concept of social innovations but that it is not very clear how it would be utilised and managed. In the specific strategy document the expression 'challenge-driven innovation' also appears as an additional way to describe how to 'drive innovation in order to meet societal challenges' (Näringsdepartementet, 2012, p. 41). Except for this instance, there seems to be little in the way of explicit expectations of what social innovation should achieve in policy.

Nevertheless, there seems to be a shared view that social innovation is likely to happen at a local level but that national and regional policies are important in order to provide good conditions for innovations. Unsurprisingly, the analysed policies represent the intention of the policy-makers at national level. The state is regarded to be central, enabling an innovation system that will strengthen innovation processes within businesses, public organisations, and civil society organisations.

Civil society is viewed as crucial to achieve a successful development in government innovation strategy documents. This could be interpreted as if the government gives civil society a clear service role. However, it could also manifest the view of civil society as strong when it comes to advocacy; the support from civil society is needed in order not to encounter distracting opposition during the implementation of the strategy. In consequence, only two documents are coded for the item that attribute innovative capacity to civil society (Finansdepartementet, 2014; Näringsdepartementet, 2014b).

Similarly, the relation of the third sector to social innovations is coded as weak or medium for only three of the five documents. More insights can be gained in regard to the function of the third sector. Only in one document it is stated to be of no relevance as advocate or service provider in policy (Finansdepartementet, 2014). All other documents describe this function mostly as more pronounced and for each item once as less pronounced. Given the unspecific way in which social innovation is used in Sweden, it is surprising to find a very clear understanding of the function of the third sector by policy makers in the context of discourses on (social) innovations.

Summing up, the state aims at supporting social innovation by strengthening actors from all sectors. What objective is pursued and how to understand social innovation in the Swedish context is, however, not expressed. It is more the connection to EU and other European countries' policies that seems to be relevant to the policies in Sweden.

3.11. UK

3.11.1. Document selection

Social innovations are an important part of the general programme of the 'Big Society' in the UK (Eriksson et al., 2014, pp. 22ff.). Consequently, frameworks of this policy strategy are analysed (Conservative Party, 2010; HM Government, 2010; House of Commons Public

Administration Select Committee, 2011). Further policies applying the programme to the health sector (Department of Health, 2011, Department of Health, 2012) and social services (Cabinet Office, 2011) are chosen, since they are described as being in special need of innovations. Last, a document on the social investment market (HM Government, 2013) reflects on the function of the third sector and social enterprises the government connects with its aims to achieve innovation.

Big Society not Big Government: Building a Big Society (Conservative Party, 2010). A document which outlines a spectrum of policies that the current PM promised to focus on and which is formally manifested in the so called Coalition Agreement. It is used as an umbrella for different strategies relevant to social innovation and the third sector.

Innovation Health and Wealth, accelerating adoption and diffusion in the NHS (IHW) (Department of Health, 2011). This document outlines how the government sets out to achieve innovation in health care. It is an area that has been strongly public sector led with strong private sector partnerships. The role of the third sector has been a lot less clear and this document was chosen to understand how government views the future role of the different sectors in achieving innovation in health and what likely impacts are on the third sector.

Innovation, health and wealth, Creating Change IHW One year on (Department of Health, 2012). Update of the above document.

The Coalition: Our programme for government (HM Government, 2010). The document presents the shared policy of the coalition government in regards to the whole spectrum of welfare programmes and is an update of the Conservatives' idea of the 'Big Society' in combination with political ideas and visions from the Liberal Democrats. It was chosen because of the implications stemming from it for third sector activity and social innovation.

Growing the social investment market – 2013 progress update (HM Government, 2013). This document outlines the government plans for funding the third sector and social enterprises. It is a key priority and reflects a change in how the government aims to achieve innovation.

Open public services: white paper (Cabinet Office, 2011). The document discusses the role of public services in achieving innovation; it is a key government document that sets out how the government wants to reform public services so that they achieve social impact; it is explained how public services should be opened up to providers from all sector and has major implications on the future funding situation of third sector in the context of service contracts.

The Big Society: Seventeenth Report of Session 2010-12, Volume I (House of Commons Public Administration Select Committee, 2011). The report aims to assess the implications of the Big Society project, 'Building a Big Society', for the third sector and whether the political commitment of the government to open up services to the third sector is being realised.

3.11.2. Qualitative report summary

A general trend in the UK policy analysis seems to be that the goal of social innovation, as well as other kinds of innovation, is to stimulate growth and bureaucratic efficiency in the face of rising costs and spending cuts. The focus on economic growth can be found in several countries. The concept of the 'Big Society' as a political programme that shifts power from the national to the local level is seen as a social innovation itself. Its implementation, however, has been far from straight forward with the process of decentralisation often being in direct conflict with other political aims (such as efficiency and quality assurance).

Policies concerning social innovation are driven at a national level and usually refer to system-wide innovation that is concerned with transformation of the whole public services sector.

The analysis also brings up that social innovation is discussed in relation to innovative financial tools. These tools, such as social impact bonds, are seen as drivers for social innovation in public sector provision; underlying to this is a belief that innovative public services can be delivered if incentives are set adequately and this is not specific to one sector. Following the understanding of different types of innovation in ITSSOIN, these financial tools are governance innovations, as they are means to implement new ways of governance. These governance innovations are in turn understood as support for social innovations. Consequently, social innovations are a predominant subject in this context.

Further health care is brought up as a specific sector in which policies broadly ignore social innovation. Innovations are more important in regard to quality aspects. In this context technology innovations are seen as most important to improve the health system at reduced costs. Social innovations are ignored in this context.

In most of the policy documents, innovation - in particular in the context of healthcare, as stated above - refers to the provision and commissioning of public services (system level); the split between purchasers and providers and the shift of risk to providers (by commissioning them by outcomes) are seen as key drivers for innovation.

In a current debate on reforms such as those that relate to the 'Big Society' idea and to 'Open Public Services' increasing social innovation is expected by inviting organisations from all sectors to tender for public service contracts, allowing and encouraging new independent institutions to enter the market (examples given include foundation trusts, housing associations, academy schools). An explicit relation of the third sector to social innovation is established in two of the analysed documents in the UK. In regard to civic engagement, a strong to medium relation of civic engagement to social innovation is expressed. In those five of seven documents in which the third sector is mentioned in relation to service provision, its function as service provider is quite pronounced. The advocacy function of the third sector is only described in two of these last described documents. It is accordingly less pronounced. In this context it has to be noted that the third sector, in its role as service provider, is seen to be at risk of losing their ability to be social innovators. It is argued by some stakeholders in the third sector field that the current political agenda creates incentives for third sector organisations to offer services at the lowest possible price and to focus on winning contracts instead of following their missions (House of Commons Public Administration Select Committee, 2011).

The policy in the UK refers very explicitly to social innovations, understanding them as an important means for the planned and already started process of decentralisation. The implementation of new governance mechanisms are undertaken to support social innovations as well as the hope that a network of actors can provide the innovative capacity policy programmes do wish for. The third sector is said to have an important role as service provider in this context, but is discussed as disadvantaged actors in danger of losing this capacity by stakeholders in the current debate.

3.12. Summing up: Trends in policy documents across countries

An estimation of the country reports allows for a first comparative summary. In most countries social innovations are rather new concepts that are recently implemented in policies at the national and regional levels. To account for the current developments in policy, mainly documents from 2010 to 2014 have been included in the analysis. Due to the search for general policy trends all countries provide policies at the national level. Often policies aim explicitly at innovations in general (the Czech Republic and Sweden) or social innovations (France, the Netherlands, Spain, and the UK) on national level. Nevertheless, seven of the nine countries additionally refer to concepts that relate to innovations at the regional or local level (the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and Spain).

Turning to the subjects that are discussed in the documents, often two separate discourses can be observed that are connected to social innovations. On the one hand volunteering and civic engagement are related to questions of solidarity and/or social cohesion. On the other hand questions of economic growth are discussed, often related to the support of social enterprises and/or social entrepreneurship and technological innovations. This divide is visible in Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, and the Netherlands, with variations in the formation of the concrete discourse across countries.

Furthermore, a special focus on the implementation of EU regulations is commented on in the Czech Republic, Spain, and Sweden. Referring to the analysed documents, policy frameworks that implement EU regulations are analysed in Germany, the Netherlands, and Spain. This shows that EU policies affect national policies on social innovation in some cases. It will be hence interesting to evaluate the relation between EU policies and national policies in more detail in a next analytical step.

Finally, the qualitative reports of some countries indicate a strong connection between policies on research and (social) innovation. This already speaks from the titles of many of the analysed documents. This is the case on EU level, for the Czech Republic, the Netherlands, and Spain.

This first impression on policy frameworks in all ITSSOIN countries confirms central findings that have been gathered in the screening of policy analysis in D1.2. The UK seems to have developed a policy framework that relates strongly to social innovations and does thereby integrate the third sector. In the Czech Republic such frameworks are not very elaborated and relations to the third sector are missing. Further, all other countries do create policy frameworks on social innovation and connect those to third sector activity (Eriksson et al., 2014, pp. 57ff.). How this is done varies highly across countries. To allow for more detailed comparisons across countries, now a second step of analysis will be

conducted. By comparing the coding for the predefined items across countries, similarities and differences across country policies become visible.

4. Results and analysis of the quantitative data

The following comparison of the results of the policy analysis across countries allows for quantitative estimations of policy trends. The country reports provided reports on country specifics based on the analysis of five to nine policies and a qualitative description on how the documents are embedded in the national policy discourse. Now the comparison of results for the 24 predefined items (A-X), described in the code book (cf. Annex), draws on 53 documents. Consequently, the reference to the items shows more valid results than on country level where only five documents were coded. Furthermore, this standardised description of results allows for a comparison across countries. Additionally, differences and similarities of policies on country level in comparison with EU policies will be addressed to account for the influence policies at the EU level have on country discourses on social innovations.

The analysis of the respective items is conducted by answering the same guiding questions that formed the basis for the summary of the country reports.

- How are social innovations generally described in policy documents?
- How are social innovations embedded in the policy documents and how do different types of innovation relate to each other?
- What kinds of contributions is expected from social innovations in policy?
- What function is ascribed to the third sector by policy as regards social innovation?

In this analysis it will be evaluated how the analysed country policies refer to social innovations. What differences and similarities can be found? Moreover, the comparison of country level results with EU level results shows if an adoption of EU policies on country level has taken place. Especially interesting will be the question, whether differences in extent and/or form of the adoption of EU policies can be found.

Before turning to these questions, some general results for the analysed documents can be presented relating to section 1 of the code book (embedding the document) to give an in-depth impression of the empirical body. A large majority (57 %) of the analysed policy documents are government documents defined as reports or statements issued by ministries or administrations (item E). 87 % of these government documents are published by national authorities (item F), while some of the published documents (17 %) are proposals to parliament or the elected body.

Table 1. Overview results for item E) Type of document and item F) Policy level of publishing authority

Item EU level Country	Item E) Type of document	F) Policy level of publishing authority
Czech Republic	Only government documents	Mainly national authority; one document from local authority
Denmark	Government documents, official statements and government sponsored conference	National authority only
France	Government documents and proposals to elected parliament	Three documents form national authority; one from regional local authority
Germany	Government documents and proposals to elected parliament	Mainly national authority; one document from federal authority
Italy	Mainly government documents, legislations and proposals to elected parliament	National authority only
The Netherlands	Mainly proposals to elected parliament, also: documentations of parliament debates, government documents and official statements	National authority only
Spain	Mainly government documents, also one 'other' document	Mainly National authority; two documents from regional authority
Sweden	Mainly government documents, also one instruction to departments	National authority only
UK	Mainly government documents, also one government sponsored conference	National authority only
EU	Mainly governments documents or documents similar in official status; two research reports	EU authorities

4.1. How are social innovations generally described in policy documents?

Due to the selection of documents related to this concept, social innovations are in some constellation and degree referred to in 81 % of all selected documents. Even more interesting than the number of documents referring to social innovations is the way social innovations are addressed. Many documents refer to innovations in general without explicitly mentioning if social, technological, or governmental innovations are addressed. If innovations are not differentiated as social, technological, or social innovations, a tendency to discuss social innovation implicitly can be seen in all countries and at the EU level. Even if definitions of the concept are given, they are only vague. In some countries (Denmark, France, Italy, Spain, and the UK) the description that in general innovations are supposed to solve societal problems can be understood as a reference to social innovations. In all other countries (Czech Republic, Germany, the Netherlands, and

Sweden) and on EU level social innovations are, implicitly or explicitly, defined. They are mostly understood as ways to find solutions for societal problems.

The most pressing societal problem for policy makers seems to be the missing economic growth, since this is expressed to be the main desired outcome in nearly all countries. Another aim that frequently arises is the enhancement of social cohesion. This general impression from the country reports can be supported by results on the predefined item V 'Main desired outcome of social innovation' in section 4.3. It is already mentioned here, because this vague understanding of social innovations as well as the focus on economic growth and social cohesion is in accordance with the understanding of social innovations in EU policies (cf. chapter 3.1.2). The definition of social innovation in the 'Guide to social innovation' (European Commission, 2013a) cited above refers to a similar vague understanding of social innovations. It describes them as solutions to meet social needs and ways to find responses to social demands. This finding suggests that national policies are formulated in accordance with EU policies on social innovations. In the Czech Republic, Italy, Spain, and Sweden this reference is made explicitly.

Additionally, economic growth and social cohesion have been identified as important objectives on EU level. Even though a strong focus is on social cohesion, the 'Guide to social innovation' (European Commission, 2013a) also relates to a responsible economic practice, and the European framework on research and innovation 'Horizon 2020' (European Commission, 2011a) is focused on economic growth (cf. chapter 3.1.2). Similar observations have already been made on country level. Especially interesting is the observation that the function of social innovations is described differently on country level when economy-related subjects are discussed and when the focus is on social cohesion. This can be observed in Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, and the Netherlands.

The approaches in policy on social innovations at country level focus mostly, in accordance to the adopted EU policies, on solidarity or community as well as on economy. On the basis of these insights, the analysis turns now to the reflection of the results of the quantitative data analysis.

4.2. How are social innovations embedded in the policy documents and how do different types of innovation relate to each other?

To reflect on the embedding of social innovations in policy, first of all the differentiation of the three predefined innovational types (item G) in the documents has to be considered. The examined documents distinguish between technological, governance, and social innovations. 71 % of the analysed documents from the country level refer to social innovation. Cases in which a document discusses all three forms are more common. This applies to 25 % of the documents. Discrepancies are observable in France, the Netherlands, and Spain, where social innovation is the only type of innovation found in two or three of the analysed documents. Overall, 18 % of the selection deals exclusively with social innovations. Especially interesting is the policy in Denmark which does not refer to the notion of 'social innovation' explicitly, but describes developments that could nonetheless be understood as social innovations. Governance and technological innovations are mostly named together with social innovations (the Czech Republic, the Netherlands, Spain, and Sweden). Only in the UK there is a stronger focus on governance innovation than on technological innovation. Technological innovations are only rarely mentioned (in 2 out of 7 documents). However, the main focus, and even more important than government

innovations in the UK, are financial innovations in response to cuts in public spending, in particular those concerned with mobilising financial means from private donors. Policy documents in Germany and Italy mostly mention technological and social innovations and less often governance innovations.

Table 2. Overview results for item G) Type of innovation

Item EU level Country	Item G) Type of innovation
Czech republic	All types
Denmark	All types, focus on social innovations
France	All types, focus on social innovations
Germany	All types, focus on social innovations and technological innovations
Italy	All types, focus on social innovations and technological innovations
The Netherlands	All types
Spain	All types
Sweden	All types
UK	All types, focus on social innovations and governance innovations
EU	All types , partly focus on social innovations

To qualify the significance of social innovations in the document, not only the focus on the type of innovation compared to technological and governance innovation is important. Furthermore, the relation between social innovation and other types of innovation (J) and the prominence of social innovations as an overall theme (K) has to be considered.

The Czech Republic and France report no or weak relations between social and other types of innovation. In Sweden this relation is weak to medium. In the UK it is weak to high, whereas it is medium in most documents in Germany. In Denmark the relation is somewhat high, although there is no direct identification of social or other types of innovation. Instead, new solutions are emphasised which are special because they contribute to social cohesion and therefore give a solid community basis to the social economy that supports market opportunities for the private sector and serves as catalyser for other forms of state-private partnerships and other innovation in the public sector. Only the Netherlands and Spain report high relations. In Italy the interesting result is that the relation is either high or weak, depending on the policy document. It is high in documents where technological innovation is mentioned as a driver for social innovation. For example, scientific research and innovative methods for technology transfer are mentioned as necessary to face societal challenges (MIUR, 2012) and to favour entrepreneurship (Governo Italiano, 2012a). It is low and social innovation is the exclusive focus in documents which mostly refer to the sphere of civic engagement and social cohesion (Ministero del Lavoro e delle Politiche Sociale e Ministero dello Sviluppo Economico, 2011; Ministero del Lavoro e delle Politiche Sociali, 2011). The Netherlands elaborate on the high relation between social and technological innovation. This relation differs in its quality in regard to the line of policy. Dutch documents that focus on environmental sustainability tend to stress the importance of technological innovation and regard social innovations as complementary. In Spain the relation of social

innovations and other types of innovation is consistent: governance innovations, and technological innovations are perceived as processes that support the establishment of social innovations in a feedback loop where social problems require a mix of the three tools in order to be solved.

Even though the objects of innovation and the main levels of the effect of those innovations are, for both the EU and its Member States, quite diverse, we can see an overall weak link between social innovation and other kinds of innovation, with Spain, Italy, and the Netherlands being an exception. However, the high relation to social innovations is not always consistent, as in Spain and the Netherlands, but differs in regard to the discussed subject, like in Italy. The overall weak relation between social innovation and other types of innovation accords with the vague definition of social innovation. Since innovations are often described in a general way and social innovations are not clearly defined, a differentiation between social, technological, and governance innovations is often missing; in turn, this is why from the policy perspective an explicit link between these concepts is not necessary.

Table 3. Overview results for item J) Relation of SI to other types of innovation

Item	Item J) Relation of SI to other types of innovation
EU level	
Country	
Czech republic	No to weak relation
Denmark	High to medium
France	No to weak relation
Germany	Medium to weak relation
Italy	Weak or high
The Netherlands	High
Spain	High
Sweden	Weak to medium
UK	Weak to high
EU	Medium to high

The prominence of social innovations as an overall theme (item K) is high or very high in most documents in Denmark, France, the Netherlands, and Spain. In these countries social innovation is most often referred to as only type of innovation; in the Netherlands and Spain it is additionally described as innovation that is superior to other types of innovation in the sense that governance and technological innovations support the establishment of social innovation. In the Netherlands this only applies to some documents. Policies on environmental sustainability relate stronger to technological innovations.

In the UK the prominence is mostly medium, but some documents are also coded as high and some as weak prominence. The concept is consequently well implemented in the policy discourse but not as prominent as in the previous named countries. For Germany the prominence of social innovations is weak to high. Given that the qualitative report describes a general understanding of innovation as way to solve societal problems, the

overall prominence is understood as high. In Sweden the prominence of social innovations is coded medium to weak. In regard to the qualitative report, which stresses the unspecific use of the concept, the general prominence is estimated as weak, together with policy discourses in the Czech Republic.

An exception is again Italy where the prominence of social innovation in the policy documents contrasts between very high or weak. Two of the six analysed documents (Ministero del Lavoro e delle Politiche Sociali, 2011; MIUR, 2012) are said to focus on social innovations, whereas the other four describe technological innovations as central. Accordingly, in Italy technological innovations are of more importance in the policy discourse than social innovations. This estimation is even stronger for the Czech Republic where technological innovations are more important for the current policy discourse that focuses on economic growth rather than on social innovation. In contrast, social innovations are mentioned only in one document to specify that the presented policy framework does NOT refer to social innovations.

In EU policies a high overall prominence of the social innovation subject can be observed and social innovation is also consistently present, together with several cases of technological and governance innovation, however, social innovation is less highly linked to these other types of innovations. Similarly, the link between social innovations and other types of innovation is mostly weak in the analysed countries, but an overall prominence of social innovations can be found in the five countries Denmark, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and Spain. In Spain and France this applies on national and regional levels, although national policies are yet to be implemented or are still to be planned. In all other countries the prominence of SI is weak or medium.

Table 4. Overview results for item K) Prominence of SI as an overall theme

Item	K) Prominence of SI as an overall theme
EU level Country	
Czech Republic	weak
Denmark	high to very high in proposals
France	high to very high
Germany	medium to high
Italy	very high or weak
The Netherlands	high to very high
Spain	high to very high
Sweden	weak
UK	medium
EU	high to very high

Considering the impact that is associated by policy makers with innovations, the question arises as to which level innovations should affect (H), as to what the object of the innovation is (I), and as to what main level should be affected by social innovation (item L).

Interestingly, when it comes to the question of what level innovations are discussed at (item H), the EU is more concerned with the organisational level and to some extent with the individual level, while a majority (65 %) of the EU members states' documents is placed on the system level.³ Nevertheless, the organisational and individual level are referred to in a high number of policy documents, which becomes visible by the fact that in most cases not only one but two or three codes were assigned to one document. For 25 % of the country level documents all the levels are seen as relevant when approaching innovation. An exception is Denmark. In Denmark the individual and organisational level are, in accordance with EU policies, focused on. For other countries no focal point can be identified.

Policies at country level are generally also quite diverse in what is seen as the object of innovation (item I). Nevertheless, the countries can be classified in three groups in regard to the innovation object. Countries in the first group, Spain, Sweden, and Denmark, report on a focus on product, service, and process innovations in the policy documents. A special emphasis on innovations in the form of field transformations can be detected in the Netherlands, the UK, and Germany. Policies in this second group seem to focus more on the transformation of organisational fields than on products or services. This is especially accentuated in the qualitative report from Germany; it specifies that product, service, process, and organisational form transformations are mostly described as a means for field transformation in the policy documents. The third group includes countries where all innovation objects appear to be relevant. These countries are the Czech Republic, France, and Italy. For Italy it has to be noted that in three out of six analysed documents a specification of the innovation object could not be found. This can be explained by the vague and general usage of the concept by policy makers. The first group accords the most with the policy frameworks found at the EU level. The policy documents analysed at the EU level see a broad range of objects of innovation, where products and services stand out as objects of innovation but processes and organisational form and field transformation is also present.

The analysed documents referring to the EU level regard the EU itself as the main level affected by social innovation (item L), while the documents on the country level discuss a mix of all levels. Especially for France, Germany, Spain, and Sweden no focus on one level is visible; in the case of Sweden, in four out of six documents the lack of focus on one distinct level is due to the fact that the level affected by social innovations cannot be identified. Differences can be seen in the documents from Italy, the Czech Republic, and the Netherlands, which can be classified as a second group in which the documents mainly discuss the national level. The Netherlands can be assigned to this group, even though the focus is weaker, as only two documents refer exclusively to the national level and all other may affect additionally the federal and the local level. Another tendency can be found in Denmark and the UK where the national and the local level are mostly addressed. This is especially clear in Denmark where four out of five documents are coded in this way. In the UK in most of the documents the focus is on either the national or the local level. When

³ Please note that the system level is described on an abstract level in the code book. Consequently, it can refer to different scales. In France the focus is, for example, on innovations in territories, whereas in Germany 'system' refers to organisational fields.

evaluating the results on the country level, altogether a mix of levels affected by social innovations can be detected, with a slight focus on the national level.

Resuming the results for the last three items, it is difficult to draw a clear picture. It is always a mix of different levels on which innovations are seen and objects that should result from social innovations. Also the main level affected by social innovations varies. Across countries a slight focus can be detected, indicating that at the national level social innovations are seen as affecting the system level and aim either at field transformations or at the development of products, services, and processes. In regard to the main level affected by social innovations, the national level is focused more often than the regional or the local level.

Table 5. Overview results for item H) Level of innovation, item I) Innovation objects, and item L) Main level affected by social innovation

Item EU level Country	H) Level of innovation	I) Innovation objects	L) Main level affected by social innovation
Czech republic	All levels	All innovation objects	National level
Denmark	Organisational and individual level	Focus on product, service, and process	National and local level
France	All levels	All innovation objects	All levels
Germany	All levels	Transformation of organisational fields	All levels
Italy	All levels	All innovation objects	National level
The Netherlands	All levels	Transformation of organisational fields	National level
Spain	All levels	Focus on product, service, and process	All levels
Sweden	All levels	Focus on product, service, and process	All levels
UK	All levels	Transformation of organisational fields	National and local level
EU	Organisational and individual level	Products and services as well as/or new organisational form and transformation of organisational fields	EU level; national and local level

If EU documents relate to the size (item R) and the maturity of an organisation (item S) in regard to social innovations, they are mostly concerned with new and small organisations. This can be found in three of six documents, whereas two documents do not reflect on any relations between organisational particularities and social innovation.

Documents from most of the analysed countries (Czech Republic, Italy, Spain, the Netherlands, the UK, and France) reported no relation between size/maturity of organisations and innovation. In the Netherlands and France this picture is divided: in the case of France, half of the analysed documents report no relations and half of the documents describe small and new organisations, and in the case of the Netherlands half

of the analysed documents report no relations and half of the documents describe small and new as well as big and mature organisations as central for innovative processes. Similarly, two of the nine analysed documents from the UK find big and small organisations relevant for innovations. In contrast, policy documents from Denmark do not refer to the size of organisations but regard new as well as mature organisations as relevant actors for innovation processes. In documents from Germany, small organisations are highlighted as especially innovative but the maturity of organisations is not referred to.

In Sweden, less than half of the documents are coded for these items, because they are written on a very general level and do accordingly not allow for an estimation of organisational specific in regard to social innovation. Sweden is consequently excluded from the analysis of these items.

In conclusion, it can be stated that organisational characteristics are only rarely integrated in policies on social innovations. On the country level, if such characteristics are reflected, the size or the age of an organisation are not described as traits making an organisation more or less innovative. Similarly, at the EU level in most documents no relations are found in this respect. Only two documents describe small and new organisations as especially innovative organisational forms.

Table 6. Overview results for item H) Level of innovation, item I) Innovation objects, and item L) Main level affected by social innovation

Item EU level Country	R) Size of organisation	S) Maturity of organisation
Czech republic	No relation	No relation
Denmark	No on relation	New and incumbent organisations
France	No relation/small organisations	No relation/new organisations
Germany	Small organisations	No relation
Italy	No relation	No relation
The Netherlands	No relation/small and big organisations	No relation/new and incumbent organisations
Spain	No relation	No relation
Sweden	No relation/small and big organisations	-
UK	No relation	No relation
EU	No relation or small organisations	No relation or new organisations

Based on these results a general estimation of the embedding of social innovations in policy documents across countries proves to be difficult. Social innovations are mostly referred to in connection with government and technological innovations. This is also because the concept is not used in a differentiated way in policy documents. Accordingly, the relation of social innovations to other types of innovations is rather weak. However the overall prominence, even though only referred to implicitly in some documents, is high in more than half of the analysed countries, namely in Denmark, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and Spain. In the UK it is medium whereas it is low in the remaining countries Czech Republic, Italy, and Sweden. In accordance with the broad approach to

social innovations, the individual, organisational, and system level are seen as important 'places' of social innovations, with a slight focus on the system level across the examined countries. An exception are policy documents from Denmark, where only the organisational and the system level are related to - similar to the EU level documents, where the organisational level is focused on. The main level affected by social innovations differs a little less. Even though all levels are named in most countries, a slight focus on the national level can be detected for the Czech Republic, Denmark, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, and the UK. Further, in regard to the innovation objects some tendencies can be found. Even though the Czech Republic, France, and Italy relate to all objects, in the Netherlands, the UK, and Germany organisational field transformations are focused on. In contrast, in Spain, Sweden, Denmark, and at the EU level it is more the development of products, services, and processes that is thought to be the result of social innovations. Peculiarities of the innovative capacity of organisational forms regarding age or size are rarely described. Only four countries refer to these aspects at all. But here, as well as on the EU level, no expectations as to organisational forms and their innovative capacity can be detected.

Knowing that the concept of social innovations is quite new to most countries and their policy makers, this diversity is not surprising. Moreover, it supports the first impression of a vague and unspecific understanding of social innovations, which mostly appear in connection with other types of innovation. Relating this to the expected effect social innovations are supposed to have, these expectations can be described as rather high. Innovations are said to occur on all levels (individual, organisational, or system level) and to concern either the local, regional, and national level or to influence at least the national level. This broad range of opportunities is, however, not connected to specifications on organisations that are especially equipped to fulfil the desired developments. Based on this, it will be interesting to see whether the expectations transported in the policy documents in regard to social innovations are more precise in regard to the context they are related to.

4.3. What kinds of contributions are expected from social innovations in policy?

To evaluate the contributions and expectations in the policy documents referring to social innovations a consideration of the target fields that it is aimed at and the specification of the most relevant target field gives an insight into the empirical focus of policies. Further, the main desired outcome is described. An evaluation of the ministries and policy fields focusing on social innovation allows for an estimation of the actors that formulate these expectations. Finally, the degree of reference to the EU level reflects the relation between social innovation-related country policies and the EU policies.

Estimating empirical fields is an attempt to find out whether one of the defined ITSSOIN fields is of special relevance in the policy of any of the countries. The ITSSOIN fields are: 'social services', 'health', 'community development', 'work integration', 'environmental sustainability', 'consumer protection', 'arts & culture'. Additionally, partners were encouraged to establish new fields if policy documents referred to other empirical contexts.

In most of the countries the documents demonstrate a mix of all fields. Exceptions are documents from Sweden and the Netherlands where no reference to consumer protection is found, documents from the UK naming all fields except 'arts & culture', and documents

from Spain in which none of the two fields ('consumer protection' or 'arts & culture') is mentioned. Similarly, at the EU level all fields except 'arts & culture' and 'environmental sustainability' are named. The fields 'arts & culture' and 'consumer protection' seem to be slightly less relevant in policies on social innovation than most of the other fields evaluated in the ITSSOIN project.

The coding allowed to add other empirical fields named in the documents. The only relevant field that emerged was the field of education, since it was mentioned in the documents of more than one country. The 'Guide to social innovation' (European Commission, 2013a) on the EU level as well as the document 'Regional actions to support social innovation' in France (AVISE, 2013) refer to the field of education as a target field of social innovation. In Germany, the three policy documents that refer to engagement (Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales, 2010; Deutsche Bundesregierung, 2010; Deutscher Bundestag, 2009) describe the field of education as an important target for social innovations. As it is not the most relevant target field in any of the documents, it is named here for the sake of completeness.

A more focused description can be given in regard to the most relevant target fields (item U). This reveals interesting tendencies of the empirical focus in social innovations policies. Policy makers in the Czech Republic, Denmark, and the UK are especially concerned with the fields of social services and health. In Spain, the field of social services, but not the field of health, is central to policies. Additionally, in Denmark and Spain, 'work integration' is focused on. 'Environmental sustainability' is central in Germany, whereas policies in France rather focus on 'community development'. Both of these fields are especially relevant in the Netherlands as well.

The evaluation of the most relevant target field in Sweden is particularly difficult, since social innovation is generally little emphasised in the policy documents. The field of work integration is identified as the most important field, which can be explained by the origin of the analysed policies stemming from the Ministry of Enterprise and Innovation, and the Ministry of Employment. On EU level on central target field can be identified.

Summing up, 'social services' and 'health' are mostly referred to. 'Work integration', 'community development' and 'environmental sustainability' also gain some attention on the country level, whereas 'consumer protection in finance' and 'arts & culture' are only of marginal interest for policy makers.

Table 6. Overview results for item T) Target fields and item U) Most relevant target field of social innovation

Item EU level Country	T) Target fields of social innovation	U) Most relevant target field of social innovation (specification)
Czech republic	Social services, health, work integration	Social services, health
Denmark	All fields	Work integration, health, social services
France	All fields	Community development
Germany	All fields	Environmental sustainability
Italy	-	-
The Netherlands	All fields except consumer protection	Community development and environmental sustainability
Spain	All fields except consumer protection and arts & and culture	Social services, work integration
Sweden	All fields except consumer protection	Work integration
UK	All fields except arts & and culture	Social services, health
EU	All fields except environmental sustainability and arts & culture	-

Turning to the ministries that focus on social innovation in the policy documents, a similar picture becomes visible. When examining the tendencies in ministries which engage in policies on social innovations, only in Spain a clear pattern can be observed. In Spain, only the ministries responsible for issues of economy social affairs are named as relevant for the policy frameworks on social innovations. In France, Germany, and Italy quite weak tendencies are discernible. In France, mostly the ministries dealing with economical and of environmental issues are considered to be relevant for the analysed policies. In Italy, the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs is mentioned. However, as only half of the six analysed documents are coded, this interpretation has to be treated with some caution. In Germany, ‘only’ three ministries are named, i.e. the ministries responsible for labour and social affairs, for education, and for family affairs. Interestingly, only in Denmark the ministry responsible for family affairs is of relevance in this context. The ministries dealing with family issues are not involved in the analysed documents concerned with social innovation in any other country.

In Denmark, the Netherlands, and the UK almost all ministries predefined in the code book are coded as being related to social innovation. In the Netherlands, additionally the ministries responsible for finance, justice, and health and welfare issues are mentioned. The diversity of responsible ministries in the UK is most evident. In addition to five of the eight predefined ministries (ministries responsible for culture, environment, and family

affairs are not mentioned), ten further political institutions are specified,⁴ often for more than one document. In the Czech Republic and Sweden less than half of the documents are coded, which explains why an evaluation of a country trend is not conducted.

Social innovation is thus a relevant theme for a huge variety of policy makers in a country. Changing the perspective and comparing tendencies across countries, one ministry stands out despite the described variety. In all countries except Germany the ministries responsible for economy are engaged in questions regarding social innovations. Further, in the documents from all countries the ministries responsible for economy, labour, and/or social affairs are mentioned at least once. A similar division of competencies regarding social innovations can be found on the EU level. Here, economy, labour, social affairs, and research and innovation are the policy fields which focus on social innovation. Social innovation is of interest for a high number of policy areas, but especially for the creation of innovative economic policies. Further, in the policy fields concerning labour and social affairs a special interest in social innovation can be found.⁵

Table 8. Overview results for item W) Ministry/policy fields focusing on social innovation

Item EU level Country	W) Ministry/policy fields focusing on social innovation
Czech republic	Economy, labour, social affairs, engagement
Denmark	All ministries
France	Economy, environment
Germany	Labour and social affairs, education, families
Italy	Labour, social affairs
The Netherlands	All ministries; high number of additional ministries
Spain	Economy, social affairs
Sweden	All ministries except family
UK	All ministries except culture, environment, and family; high number of additional ministries
EU	Economy, labour, social affairs

⁴ The named political institutions are: Department of Health, Office for Life Sciences, Department for Business, Innovation & Skills, Department for International Development, Department for Communities and Local Government, Cabinet Office, Department for Transport, Whitehall Departments, and Ministry of Justice.

⁵ The connection between innovation and research can also be found in the Czech Republic, the Netherlands, and Spain, which is visible in the title of the analysed documents. Further Italy refers to research as being important for technological innovations, which can in turn be a resource to face societal challenges. The research focus of the EU is thus punctually integrated in innovation policies on country level. However it seems to be not strongly connected to social innovations, as research is neither mentioned as empirical field that social innovation policies focus on, nor does this subject come up otherwise related to social innovations.

Regarding the reference of the analysed documents to EU policies (item X) a mixed result occurs. For Germany, Spain, and Sweden, and with some caution for Italy altogether a strong relation to EU policies can be stated. In Italy, this relation depends on the discussed subject. Two policy documents in Italy that report on growth measures relate to EU policies in a medium way; the remaining three documents which follow the description in the qualitative report on economic growth are very strongly connected to this international EU level. Similarly, some policy discourses in the Netherlands and Denmark are strongly connected to EU policies: In Denmark, related documents focus on volunteering, whereas in the Netherlands they discuss the implementation of European social funds and report on the knowledge on social innovations. Overall, this connection is for both countries rather weak than strong, which can also be said for France. In the UK, no such relation to EU policies can be found in any but one document, whereas in the case of the Czech Republic a weak to strong relation is coded for three documents. According to these results, on the country level EU policies influence policy decisions (except for the three last-mentioned countries) on social innovations at least with reference to some subjects.

Table 9. Overview results for item X) Reference to EU

Item EU level Country	X) Reference to EU
Czech republic	Weak to strong
Denmark	Subject related weak or strong
France	Medium to weak
Germany	Strong
Italy	Subject related weak or strong
The Netherlands	Subject related weak or strong
Spain	Strong
Sweden	Strong
UK	None to medium
EU	Strong to other EU policies

Among the country-level documents, the main desired outcome(s) (item V) is/are diverse: the items ‘motor for growth’, ‘social cohesion’ and/or the ‘reshaping of responsible economic practices’ are mentioned in some combination in one third of the policy documents in each country. The two items ‘motor of growth’ and ‘reshaping of economic practice’ can be interpreted as an economic focus of social innovation policies. In Denmark, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden, Spain, and the UK both codes are given. Still, an interpretation of these results as an economic focus can only be applied to the UK, where social innovations are seen as a motor for growth in five out of seven documents. In all other countries the coding ‘social cohesion’ and ‘preservation/renewal/fortification of values’ are equally often given. This focus can be interpreted as consistent with the community-driven approach described as a policy focus on the EU level.

Further, in the case of France this perspective shows that the economic focus is particularly strong, as three of five examined documents are coded with one of these codes, whereas a fourth document refers to ‘preservation/renewal/fortification of values’. As the last document only refers to innovations in general, no specification could be given.

In the Netherlands, two other outcomes are of special interest; two documents concentrate on the research on social innovations. In these documents newly developed codes reflect the wish to ‘increase the importance of social innovation in policy on research’.

Another interesting observation is that in Germany environmental sustainability is not relevant as a most desired outcome, although it is the most relevant target field in the analysed policy documents.

Lastly, the item ‘auxiliary to other types of innovation’ is coded once in Italy, once in Germany, and once in the UK. It is consequently of some relevance but not central to policy makers in these countries. Along with ‘environmental sustainability’ it is clearly of less importance as a main desired outcome than economic and community-oriented goals. This country-level result strongly accords with EU policies which mostly refer to community-driven approaches, however, with a strong reference to an economic logic (cf. section 3.1.2). For the Czech Republic and Sweden no interpretation of results is possible, because less than half of documents are coded for this item.

Table 10. Overview results for item V) Main desired outcome(s) of social innovation

Item EU level Country	V) Main desired outcome(s) of social innovation
Czech Republic	-
Denmark	Economic as well as community-driven objectives
France	Economic focus
Germany	Economic as well as community-driven objectives + innovation
Italy	Economic as well as community-driven objectives + innovation
The Netherlands	Economic as well as community-driven objectives; + research and environmental sustainability
Spain	Economic as well as community-driven objectives
Sweden	-
UK	Economic as well as community-driven objectives+ innovation
EU	Economic as well as community-driven objectives

Although a high variety of empirical fields addressed in the policies is visible, some tendencies in regard to outcomes and policy contexts can be found in the discourse on social innovation. The fields ‘social services’ and ‘health’ receive most attention by policy makers on the country level, whereas ‘consumer protection in finance’ and ‘arts & culture’ are only of marginal interest. The main desired outcome for all fields is the support of a growing but at the same time responsible economy, on the one hand, and the enforcement of social cohesion and value orientation in society on the other. Both outcomes accord strongly with the two approaches identified as central for EU policies on social innovation:

the economic and the community-oriented approach. At the country as well as at the EU level the ministries mostly engaged with these subjects are those responsible for economy, labour, and social affairs. These similarities between the country level and the EU level in regard to outcome and embedding in the political landscape already indicate the last item analysed in this section: strong reference to the EU level in country-level policies can be found in all countries, except for France and the UK. However, this strong reference can in most countries only be found in some documents or in relation to specific subjects. This can explain why the embedding of social innovations described in section 4.2 shows great differences across countries. This indicates that the general idea of social innovation, in all its vagueness, as described in section 4.1, can be translated in similar expectations by policy makers responsible for the same policy fields. The more detailed embedding and discussion on social innovations in relation to other types of innovation (section 4.2) do not specify this outline but stay similarly broad and general. This is due to the high expectations connected with social innovations, also described in section 4.2. On the basis of these insights, a particularly interesting question for the analysis of the third sector function with reference to social innovations is whether this function is described in a similar general way or whether specific roles and expectations become discernible.

4.4. What function is ascribed to the third sector by policy as regards social innovation?

The function the third sector has in the establishment of social innovations, as ascribed by policy documents, is evaluated by reference to the institutional setting in which social innovations can be found. Based on this, the relation of social innovations to the third sector and to civic engagement is measured. Further, the role the third sector has for policy makers, either that of a service provider or that of an advocate, is discussed. These items have already been discussed in some detail as to the country level; therefore, only a brief summary across countries and a comparison with the EU level is given.

At the EU level the main institutional settings for social innovation presented in the policy documents are the market and the state; the market takes a stronger position, as it is the main institutional setting in all of the five examined documents. The state is included in three of the documents. The third sector is mentioned in the two documents where all three settings can be found; in these two documents a medium-strength relation between social innovation and the third sector can be observed. In the other three documents no such relation is stated. Almost the same applies to the relation between social innovation and civic engagement; it is medium-strong in an additional document where the third sector is not seen as a setting for social innovation. In the documents analysed with reference to the EU neither the role of service provider nor advocate can be detected.

As to policy documents at the country level, a clear trend is the estimation of a cross-sectoral activity context for the implementation for social innovations. In France and Spain all sectors and in Germany all sectors except the informal sector are stated as relevant institutional setting for social innovations in most documents. With reference to Sweden and the Czech Republic this statement has to be treated with some caution, since only two of three documents refer to social innovations and are hence analysed for this item. Italy has to be excluded from the analysis because only two of six documents have been coded due to the general nature of the discussion on social innovations from Italy. Measurable exceptions are Denmark, Italy, and the UK. While in Denmark the third sector is clearly focused on as an institutional setting for social innovations, with only one coding

for market and state, the opposite is true for the UK. Here, the third sector is coded only once and the attention of policies is more on market and state. A slight focus on the market and the state can also be found in the Netherlands, where four documents relate exclusively to these sectors and five documents consider all sectors. Further, in France research and university are stated in one document as being important for social innovations.⁶

The identification of one sector as the most important setting of social innovations is not possible, because it is a mix of sectors where social innovations are said to occur. Mostly, all sectors are described as important, with the UK and the Netherlands which rather focus, in accordance with the EU perspective, on the market and the state. The only exception is Denmark where policies find the third sector especially relevant for social innovations.

Table 11. Overview results for item M) Institutional setting of social innovation

Item EU level Country	M) Institutional setting of social innovation
Czech republic	(all sectors)
Denmark	focus third sector
France	all sectors + research
Germany	all sectors
Italy	-
The Netherlands	focus market and state
Spain	all sectors
Sweden	(all sectors)
UK	focus market and state
EU	focus market and state

As to the relation of social innovations to the third sector and civic engagement, only a very weak relation to the third sector can be found in the Czech Republic, and except for one document no such relation is detected in Italy. With regard to civic engagement, in policies from the Czech Republic no such relation can be observed, whereas in Italy only two documents relate to civic engagement and its relation to social innovations, however, they do this strongly (Camera dei Deputati, 2014; Ministero del Lavoro e delle Politiche

⁶ In addition to the Czech Republic, Italy, the Netherlands, and Spain, France is the fifth country referring to research as an important factor for innovations. These references seem to occur mostly with regard to innovations in general, e.g. in policy documents referring to research and innovation in their title, and only punctually occur in direct reference to social innovations. This can be concluded from the fact that the subject did not come up often in the analysis, even though it was open for additional coding of aspects relating to social innovation. However, a more explicit inclusion of research in further empirical studies is advised for, as this would in more detail reveal the relation policy makers establish between research and innovation.

Sociali, 2011). This result is not surprising in view of the low overall relevance of social innovations in the Czech Republic and the unspecific usage of the notion in Italy, as described in the qualitative country reports. Accordingly, a relation of social innovations to specific sectors is rare and, in the case of Italy, not always consistent in the way the policy refers to the third sector. Similarly, only a weak relation to the third sector can be found in Sweden.

Some similarities between Italy and the UK can be found, as the UK also relates social innovation more strongly to civic engagement than to the third sector. In the UK, the concept of the ‘Big Society’ as a society shaped by the citizens is very strong in policy. Even though the term itself is recently less often used, this idea persists in diverse policies. The innovative capacity of the more institutionalised third sector is brought into focus by policy makers in France and Spain. In the remaining countries Denmark, Germany, and the Netherlands, the hope of policy makers lies in both forms of participation. However, in Germany and the Netherlands this hope is stronger, as these countries’ policies are similar to the community approach on the EU level; in policies with a focus on economy this relation is seen as less pronounced.

Table 12. Overview results for item N) Relation of social innovation to the third sector and item O) Relation of social innovation to volunteering or civic engagement

Item	N) Relation of social innovation to the third sector	O) Relation of social innovation to volunteering or civic engagement
EU level Country		
Czech Republic	No relation or medium	No relation
Denmark	Strong to very strong	Strong to very strong
France	Strong to very strong	No relation
Germany	Strong to weak	Strong
Italy	No relation, very strong relation in one document	No relation, very strong relation in two documents
The Netherlands	Strong to weak	Very strong to weak
Spain	Strong	Strong
Sweden	Weak to medium	-
UK	Weak to strong	Strong
EU	No or medium relation	No or medium relation

Denmark and Sweden report on a strong role of the third sector as both an advocate and service provider. In regard to social innovations this can be connected to an exceptional importance of the third sector in Danish policies; in Sweden this function is to be understood rather as complementary to activities of the market and the state, which are described as equally innovative. The third sector’s service provision function is also emphasised in all remaining countries, except for the Czech Republic and Italy in these countries the unspecific discussion on innovation processes makes it difficult to attribute a distinct function to the third sector or to discern a relation between the third sector and civic engagement. In Germany and the Netherlands the description of the role of the third sector depends on the discussed subject; although the third sector’s function as service provider is pronounced in the policy discourses on community-oriented matters, it is of no

relevance in regard to economy in both countries. In the Netherlands the same applies to the understanding of the third sector as advocate; here, advocacy is only pronounced in regard to economy and environmental sustainability but not in reference to community. In addition to Denmark and Sweden which have already been mentioned as countries where the third sector’s advocacy role is reflected in policy, this function is also described in Germany, regardless of the discussed subject. The remaining five countries (Czech Republic, France, Italy, Spain, and the UK) describe no such role.

Table 13. Overview results for item P) Third sector as service provider and item Q) Third sector as advocate

Item EU level Country	P) Third sector as service provider	Q) Third sector as advocate
Czech Republic	Not pronounced	Not pronounced
Denmark	Pronounced	Pronounced
France	Pronounced	Not pronounced
Germany	pronounced depending on subject	Pronounced
Italy	Not pronounced	Not pronounced
The Netherlands	pronounced depending on subject	pronounced depending on subject
Spain	Pronounced	Not pronounced
Sweden	Pronounced	Pronounced
UK	Pronounced	Not pronounced
EU	Not pronounced	Not pronounced

On the basis of these insights differences in the function ascribed to the third sector across countries can be detected. The third sector and civic engagement as an activity belonging to the third sector is of no special importance for policies on social innovation in the Czech Republic, Italy, and Sweden; no relation between social innovation and the third sector can be observed and the third sector is not described as an important institutional setting. Moreover, in the Czech Republic and Italy the function as service provider or advocate is not specified for the third sector.

Some relevance of the third sector for social innovations can be found in France, Spain, Germany, the Netherlands, and the UK. As to the UK this statement has to be treated with some caution, as only civic engagement is understood as innovative, but market and state are described as important institutional setting of social innovations. Insights on the function of the third sector are missing. In Germany and the Netherlands the importance of the third sector depends on the subject discussed in the policies. In regard to the community approach the third sector as well as civic engagement are regarded as innovative, an observation that also applies to the third sector as a relevant setting for innovations and to the function of the third sector as service provider and advocate. Policy discourses on other subjects do not indicate any relevance of the third sector as an innovative sector with specific functions. In France and Italy the significance of the third sector is that of an innovative sector which provides services in a setting where also

market and state are ascribed innovative capacity. In this context civic engagement and the third sector’s advocacy function is of no importance.

A description of an especially innovative capacity of the third sector is only found in policy documents in Denmark. The third sector is the most important setting for social innovations and it is, along with civic engagement, strongly related to social innovations. At the same time its function as service provider and advocate is more pronounced. This pronounced function can also be found in Sweden where it is described for a third sector that is not perceived as innovative.

Based in the findings of the policy analysis on country level (cf. section 3) and across countries (cf. section 4), the hypothesis on the impact of policy traditions on the approach of policies on social innovations can be tested. These have been developed in the paper ‘ITSSOIN hypothesis’ of the project (Anheier et al., 2014a).

5. Hypothesis testing

The policy analysis was conducted with the aim to bring policy approaches in the analysed countries on social innovations into accord with policy traditions identified through classifications following the ‘Varieties of Capitalism’ approach. Basically, this approach states that a differentiation can be made between corporate market economies (CMEs) that are dominated by state regulations, and liberal market economies (LMEs) where mechanism of free market activities prevail (Hall & Soskice, 2001). This approach has been underpinned by further empirical studies, finding countries that cannot be classified as pure LMEs but have distinct control mechanism implemented by the state. These are understood as LME-like countries. Lastly, countries experiencing substantial changes in their country structure, for example post-socialist countries, can be found. Since they are difficult to categorise, they are described as hybrid countries in turmoil (Schneider & Paunescu, 2012). The countries evaluated within the framework of the ITSSOIN research have been applied to these types in the paper describing the theoretical foundation of the project as follows (Anheier et al., 2014c):

Table 14. State versus market dominance

State (-dominated)			Market(-dominated)
Incremental Innovation			Radical Innovation
←			→
CME	Hybrids	LME-like	LME
Germany, France	Italy, Czech Republic	Spain, The Netherlands, Sweden	Denmark, United Kingdom

(cf. Anheier et al., 2014c. Based on Hall & Soskice, 2001; Schneider & Paunescu, 2012)

On the basis of these insights four hypotheses were formulated which refer to the implementation of the concept of social innovations in national policies in regard to the objective of policies (social vs. technological orientation), the approach behind the policy (grass-roots vs. top-down involvement), the level the policies will orient on (local vs. national), and Social innovativeness will be highest where social innovation is recognised as a distinct and the impact of the importance of the concept in policy making in general.

(Anheier et al., 2014a). These hypotheses (H3.6, H3.6b, H3.6c, and H3.7) will be evaluated in accordance with the presented findings.

5.1. Orientation towards social and economic objectives

Due to the strong influence of market actors in LMEs and state dominance in CMEs the first hypothesis to be tested in regard to the policy analysis is:

'H3.6: Social innovation policies in CME countries will be more social policy-directed, whereas social innovation policies in LME countries will be directed by the traditions of technological innovation policies.' (Anheier et al., 2014a, p. 18)

This hypothesis is difficult to evaluate, because the analysed policy documents generally do not differentiate between different types of innovations. Even though social innovations are often not defined or only described as solutions for societal problems, a further clear distinction between social innovation and other types of innovation is often missing (cf. section 4.1). However, an observation from literature on innovation can help to evaluate the assumption. The literature shows that technological innovations are often related to economic objectives (Fligstein, 2006; Ramstad, 2009). In contrast, social innovations aim at solving social needs (Borzaga & Bodini, 2012; Howaldt & Schwarz, 2010). This accords with the two central objectives of social cohesion and economic growth found in the analysed policies (section 4.3). Adding these insights on the main desired outcome of social innovations to the analysis will thus help to identify the focus of country policies, even though they often simultaneously refer to all types of innovations.

According to the 'Varieties of Capitalism' approach, Denmark and the UK are expected to focus especially on technological innovation and economy, whereas Germany and France are expected to concentrate on social innovations and social cohesion.

For Denmark and the UK such a focus on technological innovations cannot be found. In Denmark documents are analysed that can be best described as proposals for the implementation of social innovations, which, however, do not mention the notion directly. They relate to welfare reforms and new forms of public management in social services. In this context, technological innovations are not relevant. Similarly, the analysed documents in the UK, which are related to the concept of 'Big Society' as well as to health and social services, do not relate to technological innovations. Moreover, governance innovation and financial innovations are central in the discourse. However, both types of innovations are supported with the hope for economic benefits in the field of health and social services. A hope that is also formulated in Denmark where this is stronger related to reshaping a responsible economic practice, which is equally important to social cohesion. In both countries technological innovations are of little relevance, whereas new approaches in social policies (e.g. health and social services) are central. In Denmark the intention is to reform social policies in order to enhance social cohesion and affordable social and health services, whereas in the UK the financial goal is more important.

In Germany and France a focus on social policies is expected which does not relate to technological innovations. This can only be found in the analysed documents only to a limited extent. In France the analysed statements and proposals focus on social innovations in view of the objective of economic growth. In Germany a connection between technological innovation and economy can be found in half of the analysed

documents. The other half of the documents refer to civic engagement and to the type of social policies predicted in the hypothesis, however, mostly in reference to governance innovations. In these documents the objective is stronger related to social cohesion, but at the same time an economic orientation can be predicted. Instead of a social policy orientation both CME countries show a strong focus on economic questions in policies referring to social innovations. In Germany the contrast to the hypothesis is especially high on the one hand, as this is also related to technological innovations, a policy approach predicted for LME countries. On the other hand this applies to Germany with some restrictions, since a second policy discourse, which is taking place independently from the economy-oriented one, concentrates on civic engagement and social policies.

Further insights can be gained when reflecting on the types of LME-like and hybrid countries that are not explicitly integrated in the hypothesis. Countries perceived as LME-like countries are understood as providing a context especially in favour of social innovations, because state regulations refrain the otherwise liberal participation opportunities to a moderate extent (Anheier et al., 2014c). If and how a focus on social policies or on technological innovations is observable in the policies of the Netherlands, Spain, and Sweden, all classified as LME-like, will be reflected in the following paragraphs.

In Spain social innovations are, in accordance with the expected support for social innovations, highly prominent in the evaluated policies. Not only is a separate policy for social innovations established, but also further technological and governance innovations are described as supporting the establishment of social innovations. The focus is thereby stronger on economic growth than on social cohesion.

In the Netherlands social innovation has some significance as well, but the focus on innovations changes (as in Germany) in accordance with the discussed subject. Policies relating to civic engagement and the establishment of a do-democracy relate to technological as well as to social innovations. Thereby, technological innovations are described as supporting social innovations. In contrast, if changes in the direction of an environmental sustainable economy are reflected, social innovations are rather seen as supporting technological innovations. The main desired outcome is, as in most of the other countries, the improvement of the economic situation as well as the enhancement of social cohesion.

Sweden forms the greatest contrast to these countries. In Sweden social innovations are not mentioned and innovations are only described in a vague and general way and are aiming at the adaptations of EU policies. Concrete insights into aims and objectives related to social innovations can hence not be observed. Sweden is thus most similar to hybrid countries which are expected to be in general turmoil and can therefore provide no reliable background for innovations (Anheier et al., 2014c).

For the hybrid countries analysed in the policy analysis, in Italy and the Czech Republic a strong focus on technological innovations can be found. From the policy perspective of these countries technological innovations can be understood as drivers of social innovation which in turn support economic growth. This holds although social cohesion is another goal pursued by social innovations in Italy and despite missing codes in the Czech Republic, which is due to the qualitative field descriptions (cf. section 3.2.2; 3.6.2).

Relating these insights to the findings for CME and LME countries and to the hypothesis H3.6 hybrid countries accord most strongly with the expectations formulated for LME countries. Without a strong focus on social innovations, the aim to develop structures typical for LME countries seems to be central. This is an especially interesting observation given the finding that LME and CME countries implement the concept of social innovations more in contrast to rather than in accordance with the hypothesis. While the UK and Denmark focus on social policies, namely health care and social services and their affordability, France and Germany refer to innovations (in the case of Germany also to specifically to technological innovations) and their impact on improving the national economy. Social innovations seem thus to be used as a new political concept which helps to strengthen policy perspectives otherwise disregarded in the general policy approach of a country. However, this is not done exclusively, since a second policy stream in accordance with the hypothesis exists in Germany. Further, in the UK the implementation of new financial tools as governance innovations and the establishment of more service provider in health and social services introduce in fact liberal steering mechanism in the health and social services sector. In the UK social policies are in effect brought into accord with liberal market economies.

LME-like countries are most diverse in their implementation of social innovations in policy, which is an assumption formulated for hybrid countries. The Netherlands implement social innovations policies, in a similar ways to Germany, in two separate policy streams. One is related to the do-democracy and social cohesion and the other concentrates on environmental sustainability and technological innovations. As expected for hybrid countries, Sweden (a LME-like country itself) does not refer strongly to social innovations. The last LME-like country on the sample, Spain, relates strongly to social innovations, with a strong focus on economic objectives that is also related to technological innovations which are said to support social innovations rather points to the expectations assumed for LME countries.

Trying to find conformity in these various policy approaches, the implementation of innovative policy approaches with the concept of social innovations sums up these findings best. This is most visible with regard to H3.6 in LME countries that implement social innovation policies, contrasting the expectation of a technological focus. For policy makers this does not conflict with the implementation of policies on traditional policy objectives. Taking Germany as an example of a CME country, technological as well as social oriented innovation policies are implemented in one country. The most important objective in this context is mostly to secure an economic solution for the problem discussed in the policy. This holds for both social and technological oriented policies. Especially LME countries (UK and Denmark) are using this to frame social policies in accordance with an economical logic, which confirms the outcome of the policy with in effect liberal market mechanisms of LME countries. The concept of social innovation is used here to frame the suggested policy as an improvement for society as it provides solutions for societal problems. The innovative application of innovation policies does thus not necessarily imply a renunciation of policy traditions. It is more a way to frame the given policy objectives in a positive way; namely as a way to find solutions for societal problems.

5.2. Grassroots or top-down involvement associated with social innovations

The second hypothesis relating to policies draws on the exceptions in regard to the degree in which participation is supported by policy makers. In CMEs, i.e. more state-dominated countries, the approach to social innovation is expected to be more participative than in LME countries. Policy makers in LMEs are seen as more likely to execute directedness and control. We hence assume:

'H3.6b: Social innovation policies in CMEs will focus on grassroots involvement, whereas social innovation policies in LME countries will be more top-down.' (Anheier et al., 2014a, p. 18)

Hypothesis H3.6b can be tested in regard to several items. Indicators are: the institutional setting where social innovations are described to take place (item M), the relation of social innovations to the third sector (item N) and to civic engagement (item O). As to the institutional setting, a focus on the state as an initiator of social innovations can be understood as top-down approach of policies, whereas the naming of all sectors and a focus on third sector activities hint at grassroots involvement. That civic engagement is to be understood as participative is clear, since it can be described as grassroots engagement by civil actors. But also the third sector is known for its huge opportunities for participation in associations and clubs, where participation is much more possible than in business firms or state institutions (Evers, Ewert, & Brandsen, 2014; The Young Foundation, 2012).

The thus measured indicators for a focus on grassroots involvement in social innovations by policy makers support the hypothesis for the CME countries Germany and France. In both countries all sectors are described as institutional setting of social innovations and the relation of social innovations and the third sector is strong. Additionally, in Germany civic engagement is brought strongly into relation with social innovations, which is not the case in France. Overall, both countries show an understanding of social innovations that indicates the support of grassroots involvement to foster social innovations.

The top-down approach of the LME countries UK and Denmark is not so clearly discernible. In the UK the most relevant institutional settings named for social innovations are market and state, with a slight focus on the state. Social innovations are not related to the third sector, but civic engagement is strongly related to social innovations. Generally, for the UK the assumed top-down approach can be confirmed, however, the strong connection between civic engagement and social innovations softens this perspective. In contrast, in Denmark social innovations are said to take place mainly in the third sector which is understood, along with civic engagement, as strongly related to social innovations. Summing up, in comparison with German or French policies Danish policies show even stronger indications of a focus on grassroots involvement in regard to social innovations.

Regarding LME-like and hybrid countries again grassroots involvement is focused on by policy makers, but not always consistently in regard to the measured items.

In Spanish policies, also an LME-like context, only the third sector is described as a social innovative setting. This indicator of grassroots involvement is in contrast with a lacking or weak reference to the third sector and civic engagement. As third sector organisations can also operate as highly institutionalised organisations, top-down involvement can be described for Spain

As a LME-like country the Netherlands focus on market and state as setting of social innovations. However, at the same time the third sector and civic engagement are said to be highly related to social innovations. Given the described strong focus on grassroots involvement in the country report (cf. section 3.7) altogether policies thus describe grassroots involvement in policies referring to social innovations. However the strong focus on state and market in regard to social innovations leads to the question, if the implementation of policies in practice will still reflect this conceptual approach.

As to actor involvement, all other countries present a divided picture showing results expected for CME and LME countries. The Czech Republic and Italy, both hybrid countries, and Sweden as a LME-like country, refer to all sectors as settings where social innovations can happen. But the third sector or civic engagement are not referred to as relevant for social innovations. However, this can be understood as grassroots involvement anticipated in policies for these countries. But this understanding is described with some caution, as the policy approach to social innovations is sometimes difficult to evaluate. For Sweden and Italy it is for example stated, that it was difficult to make the said evaluations of the policies, because descriptions of social innovations were rather vague and general.

Summing up, countries of all the types defined by the ‘Varieties of Capitalism’ approach can be described as countries where grassroots involvement is supported by policies as a means of social innovations. This applies to France, Germany, Denmark, the Czech Republic, Italy, the Netherlands, and Sweden. However, LME and LME-like countries are also found to apply top-down policies, as it is the case in the UK and in Spain. Still, it has to be noted that all of them show indicators for grassroots involvement. Thus, grassroots involvement is, to some extent, a part of policy approaches in all countries, whereas top-down developments are rather seldom. Related literature has shown that the grassroots involvement supports social innovations (Evers et al., 2014; The Young Foundation, 2012) and it can be assumed that policy makers take this knowledge into account and implement social innovation policies accordingly.

In view of this focus it is surprising that third sector activities and civic engagement are considered relatively seldom. This can be understood as ignorance as to third sector activities, which was also detected in the media analysis (Norris, 2000). This holds as a general observation, even though some relevance is ascribed to the third sector and/or civic engagement in France, Spain, Germany, the Netherlands, and the UK. This is because the focus on the third sector is either related to specific subjects or to a similarly high degree to market and state. The only exception is Denmark where the third sector is described as being especially innovative.

Grassroots involvement is not equally strongly expressed on the EU level where mostly market and state are named as institutional settings for social innovations, and neither the third sector nor civic engagement were mentioned as being highly related to social innovations and civic engagement.

5.3. Level of social innovation policies

In accordance with the assumption of grassroots vs. top-down involvement in social innovation policies, the main level affected by social innovations is expected to differ in policies of CME and LME countries:

'H3.6c: Social innovation policies in CME countries will be more locally- oriented, whereas social innovation policies in LME countries will be more nationally- oriented.' (Anheier et al., 2014a, p. 18)

This hypothesis can be evaluated referring to item L that indicates the main level affected by social innovations from the perspective of the policy documents. The analysis across countries showed that mostly a mix of levels is coded for and accordingly interactions between national, regional, and national levels seems to be the dominant policy approach in regard to social innovations. Here it became already visible that no results for Sweden are available, because descriptions of innovative processes were too general to relate them to any level (cf. section 4.2).

This focus on interactions between levels is most visible in the CME countries France and Germany. In these countries all levels are said to be affected by social innovations, in France with some focus on the local level. In the LME countries UK and Denmark the expected focus on the national level can be found, but it is in both cases complemented by a similar strong focus on the local level. This can be understood as an approach to keep a national steering of social innovation policies in place but also to account for the strong interrelations between actors and levels known to support innovations by assigning some innovative capacity to the local level. This also accords to the findings in H3.6b, that showed considerations of grassroots involvement in all policies, even in those of the UK, the country with most top-down oriented innovation policies.

The strong focus on the national level can be found in the hybrid countries Italy and Czech Republic and some focus can be observed in the LME-like Netherlands. In the hybrid countries the focus on the national level is easily explained by the need for a central steering mechanism in a context of turmoil.

Altogether, the hypothesis has to be rejected, as not the orientation on one level but the connection between levels is a general trend in innovation policies. As CMEs are said to favour corporate policy approaches hypothesis H3.6c can be reformulated based on this insights as follows:

'H3.6cII: Social innovation policies in CME countries will address multiple levels, whereas social innovation policies in LME countries will be more nationally- oriented.'

This is confirmed by the findings, as the reference to all levels is strongest in CME countries. In contrast, LME countries only refer to the national and the local level. Even though concessions to the cross-sector orientation in innovation policies are made, policy makers are trying to keep the number of involved levels low. This does confirm hypothesis H3.6cII at least partly.

5.4.Social innovativeness ascribed in policies

H3.7: Social innovativeness will be highest where social innovation is recognized as a distinct and important concept in policy making.

This last hypothesis can only be tested on the basis of the case studies that can show the social innovative capacity across countries. However, an estimation of the recognition of social innovations in country policies can be given based on the results for the prominence of social innovations as an overall theme (item K).

The reflection of both items in the cross-country comparison (section 4.2) has already shown that the prominence of social innovations is high to very high in Denmark, France, Germany, Spain, and the Netherlands. For the UK medium prominence of social innovations was stated. An overall weak prominence can be stated for Sweden, the Czech Republic, and Italy. A particularly interesting observation for the two hybrid countries Italy and Czech Republic is that technological innovations and economic growth are more prominent. Nevertheless, in Italy two of the six analysed documents (Ministero del Lavoro e delle Politiche Sociali, 2011; MIUR, 2012) are said to focus on social innovations.

In accordance with H3.7 the policy analysis indicates the degree of social innovativeness as follows:

Table 15. Expected social innovativeness in ITSSOIN countries resulting from the policy analysis

Expected social innovativeness	Country
High	Denmark
	France
	Spain
	The Netherlands
	Germany
Medium	UK
Low	Czech Republic
	Italy
	Sweden

This differentiation is supported by insights from the test of the former hypotheses. In regard to H3.6, H3.6b, and H3.6c results for the Czech Republic, Italy and Sweden were quite similar. Especially the Czech Republic and Italy were most technological innovation oriented (H3.6) and focused on national level (H3.6c). Both findings were expected for LME countries, but did apply more strongly to these hybrid countries. A comparatively stronger orientation towards social policies for all other countries also implies more affiliation for social innovations, as argued in the review on innovation literature (Anheier et al., 2014b).

In regard to actor involvement, all countries showed signs of support for grassroots involvement. This has already been identified as a setting and has been described in innovation literature as supportive for innovations (Anheier et al., 2014b). Additionally, this knowledge is offered as an explanation for the implementation of grassroots involvement in all analysed policies. However, comparing countries with high and low recognition of social innovations as central concept another aspect becomes visible: neither in the Czech Republic nor Italy and Sweden did refer to the third sector or civic engagement in relation to social innovations. Such a connection can be found in all other countries. This is an especially interesting finding in face of the central assumption of ITSSOIN saying that especially third sector activity can foster social innovation. Even though policies do not focus on this sector activity strongly in innovation policies, as

shown in section 4.4, they do so more often in policies with high overall prominence on the third sector.

Whether social innovativeness really is highest in these countries will be tested on the basis of case studies (for the nine analysed countries) on social innovations in the empirical fields ‘arts & culture’, ‘social services’, ‘health’, ‘environmental sustainability’, ‘consumer protection in finance’, ‘work integration’, and ‘community development’.

6. Conclusions

The policy analysis shows some variation in the policy approaches on social innovations across countries, however, it allows for some general conclusions. The analysis was based on the pre-study included in the ‘Report on the European social innovation policy framework in light of third sector and civil society actors’ (Eriksson et al., 2014). Consequently, the aim of this second step was to provide a more detailed insight in innovation policy across countries. As a means of analysis a code book with 25 predefined items has been developed to allow for an in-depth but somewhat standardised analysis of country specific policies on social innovations. To keep this analysis empirically open to aspects unaccounted for in the items, new codes could be developed and included in the code book throughout the course of the analysis.

In a first step of the analysis a qualitative description of the policy analysis on the country and EU level confirms insights from the ‘Report on the European social innovation policy framework in light of third sector and civil society actors’ (Eriksson et al., 2014). A high diversity of policies on social innovations could be observed after the detailed analysis of the country level was conducted. However, comparisons across countries showed some similarities despite of these variations which became especially visible in relation to policies on EU level.

Generally, social innovations are approaches by policy makers from various perspectives, of a general and vague nature, and refer to a high number of subjects. This makes a generalisation of results difficult. However, in some respect trends and tendencies could nevertheless be found. First, a broad range of ministries develop policies concerning innovations in general or social innovations in particular at the country as well as at the EU level. But across countries it can be found that it is especially often ministries responsible for economy, labour, and social affairs on the national level that engage in these policies. According to the interests of ministries dealing with labour and social affairs the empirical fields of ‘social services’ and ‘healthcare’ are primarily focused on in the policies, followed by ‘work integration’ and ‘community development’.

The interest associated with social innovations is also similar across countries: on the EU level as well as on the country level the main desired outcome of social innovations is a growing economy that, however, takes account of a responsible practice and the enhancement of social cohesion and value orientation in society. These strong similarities between policy makers and general interests across countries can be explained with a reference of country-level policies to the EU level. This is strongly expatiated at least in some of the analysed documents for most countries.

Moreover, this very broadly formulated interest accords with the vague understanding of ‘social innovation’. Social innovations are often not defined or only described as solutions

for societal problems. Further, there are frequently no clear distinctions to other types of innovation, which explains the weak relation to other types of innovation. Accounting for the implicit references to social innovations, the prominence of social innovation as an overall theme is strong in more than half of the analysed countries (Denmark, France, Germany, Spain, and the Netherlands). Only in the UK it is medium and it is weak in the Czech Republic, Italy, and Sweden.

The qualitative country reports show that social innovations are a new topic in most countries. In some countries it was quite difficult to find social innovation-related policy documents. It can be concluded from this findings that the general attention in politics for social innovation is relatively low. Policy makers who refer to social innovations frame, despite the lack of attention to social innovations, social innovation policies in a quite ambitious way. The formulated expectations are social innovations on individual, organisational, and system level that affect the local, regional, and the national level of a country. Only in regard to the objects these social innovations are expected to have some slight tendencies can be found. In the Netherlands, the UK, and Germany organisational field transformations are central, whereas in Spain, Sweden, Denmark, and on the EU level the development of products, services, and processes is of greater importance. Only in the Czech Republic, France, and Italy all objects are equally relevant for policy makers. Altogether, policy makers in all countries see a high range of possible effects that social innovations can have. How and by whom these expectations can be fulfilled remains an open question. The analysis of organisational forms especially equipped to foster social innovations, for instance, did not provide any results. In most policy documents such relations between organisations and social innovations were not elaborated on.

From the perspective of policy makers the role of the third sector is also of no special importance. Assuming that the third sector can initiate social innovations to a certain degree is a central assumption for the ITSSOIN project and is based on several indicators arising from the conducted research. This is not reflected on in policies on social innovations. In the Czech Republic, Italy, and Sweden the third sector is neither especially mentioned as a setting for social innovations nor are the third sector or civic engagement strongly related to social innovations. In France, Spain, Germany, the Netherlands, and the UK some relevance is ascribed to the third sector, but this is either related to specific subjects or to a similarly high degree to market and state. Only in Denmark the third sector is described as especially innovative.

Similarly, the function of the third sector as service provider and advocate is not perceived in policies. The assumption that third sector organisations can initiate social innovations, which is particularly due to their role as service providers or advocates, is of special interest for the ITSSOIN project. In the Czech Republic, Italy, or the UK these third sector functions are not pronounced. In France and Spain only the third sector' service provision function is reflected, whereas in Germany and the Netherlands this function depends on the subject discussed in policy. Only in Denmark both functions are strongly pronounced.

The similarities between country and EU level policies found in regard to general objectives of innovation policies consequently dissolve when focussing in more detail on the implementation of these policies on country level. The different perspectives of policy makers and the variety of subjects they refer are unsurprisingly leading to variations between policies on country level. However, general tendencies across countries can be

detected when testing the hypotheses referring to policies in regard to theoretical reflections.

Drawing on the presented insights these hypotheses can only partly be supported. This is due to the fact that social innovation policies are implemented on the one hand in a rather similar way across countries and on the other hand display approaches differing from the assumed ways to tackle innovation policies.

Strongest is the similarity of policy approaches in regard to the addressed grassroots involvement. This is prevalent in policies for all countries, regardless of their policy traditions as LME or CME. However especially in the UK a more top-down oriented approach can be found in innovation policies, as expected for LME countries. This is however relativized by the emphasis of civic engagement as being important for social innovations.

Different approaches can be found in regard to the objectives addressed by types of innovation and the level addressed in policies.

This is most visible in regard to the level addressed in policies. They do not refer to either local levels or national levels. Rather the difference has to be made between the reference to multiple or single levels. CMEs can be expected to address multiple levels, as this implies collaboration between levels which fits with the corporate nature of CMEs. LMEs, that are also expected to favour top-down steering, can in contrast be expected to focus on one level only, especially the national level. The hypothesis thus refined can be partly confirmed, as CMEs do refer to multiple levels and LMEs focus on the national level especially. However, LME countries seem to account for a nature of innovations to bridge across levels that can be found in literature (Anheier et al., 2014b) by also addressing the local level to the same extend as the national level.

Due to the general level of discussion, H3.6 has been tested not only in reference to social and technological innovations. Instead, social policies in connection to social innovations as well as technological innovations relating to economy have been referred to, as this relation has been found as typical in literature (Anheier et al., 2014b). Even though distinct results cannot be found, some tendencies are rendered visible. Especially LME countries use the concept of social innovations to address social policies and hence address objectives otherwise not in the traditional focus of liberal market economies (LMEs). But social innovations can also be applied to implement both, policies traditionally focused and traditionally not focused in a country. The best example is Germany that one the one hand implements the expected social policies with a social innovation focus for corporate market economies (CMEs). On the other hand economic policies with technological innovation are developed that also refer to social innovations. Independent of the focus the policies take, social innovations are thus used by policy makers in an innovative way in the given context. The concept is thereby used, in the described vague and general fashion, to legitimize policies as approaches to find solutions for societal problems.

The last hypothesis refers to the expectation of a greater social innovative capacity in countries where social innovation exists as a distinct and elaborated concept. As social innovations are discussed in all countries in a vague and general fashion, this hypothesis

can only be tested in regard to a relative distinction of the concept. This has been conducted with reference to the overall prominence of social innovations in country policies. Drawing on these findings, social innovations can be expected to a higher degree in Denmark, France, Germany, Spain, and the Netherlands than in the Czech Republic, Italy, and Sweden, as has already been presented above. In these three countries the overall prominence of social innovations is weak and the vague and general approach towards social innovations is especially elaborated in country reports. The UK is expected to provide a medium innovative context, in accordance to the measured overall prominence.

Relating these findings to the case study, a work that will be conducted in a next empirical step in the ITSSOIN project, can reveal if these expectations are met. Case studies on social innovations in the empirical fields 'arts & culture', 'social services', 'health', 'environmental sustainability', 'consumer protection', 'work integration', and 'community development' across the nine analysed countries will be conducted. They illustrate the capacity to implement social innovations in relation to country specifics, including policy, media and citizen perspectives (Bekkers & Brink Lund, 2014). Comparing these findings with and across countries can then show if the expected likelihood of social innovations across countries can be confirmed.

7. Annex

7.1. Guide for the policy analysis

Introduction

This paper contains a framework for the policy analysis to be conducted for the deliverable D2.2. The first step is to make a selection of the most relevant policy documents on the basis of the screening of the policy landscape of the third sector in D1.2. The next step is to conduct a document analysis.

Central questions to be answered are:

1. How are social innovations generally discussed in policy documents? (e.g., what aims are ascribed to SI; what are the conditional factors of SI, ...)
2. How do policy documents embed social innovations? (e.g., how is SI linked to other types of innovation?)
3. What contributions do policy makers expect from social innovations?
4. What function is ascribed to the third sector by policy in regard to social innovation?

Thereby, the analysis is moving from the policy document as the unit of analysis (especially section 1) to the social innovation as the unit of analysis (sections 2-6). The former is important as an indicator of policy traits (origins, direction, emphasis), the latter too, but even more so with regard to the hypotheses that are proposed with regard to social innovation in D1.4 (to be revised). Section 7 has an inclusive function, bringing these two levels together by relating social innovations directly to national policy principles/aims and provenience as well as policy relations to EU agendas.

Selection of policy documents

Drawing on the insights from the first overview on policy streams given in the deliverable D1.2, this policy analysis, D2.2, is limited to central policy documents that demonstrate the intentions of the government with reference to social innovation, other sorts of innovation and third sector involvement. The central importance of the selected documents is due to the fact that they are relevant for these three spheres. In general the selected documents can refer to different societal levels, e.g., the national, regional, or local level.

In general we should aim at keeping the ‘information range’ considered for making the judgement comparable across countries. About five major policy documents shall be analysed in each country (meaning policy strategies or similar documents of 30 - 50 pages). If you think some more would be useful and indispensable, feel free to include 1-2 additional documents, but we should not extend the analysis so far as to expand the range of included documents too far. In cases where only shorter documents are available, the number of documents can generally be higher. E.g. 2-3 documents of 5-10 pages can complement one major document. This can, for instance, be a proposal to parliament/elected body, an instruction to departments/bodies/agencies, or an official statement/declaration of intent (see item E for potential document types). All teams should include a brief rationale of why specific documents have been chosen.

Methodology

The policy analysis is a structured content analysis of the policy papers following Mayring (2007). Central questions are formulated in view of the documents to be analysed. Predefined categories that refer to these questions will be used in the coding to be performed. This results in the coding book which is presented here and has been pretested on an EU policy paper (specifics and screenshot see below).

The categories below have emerged from D1.2 and an iterative process of comments and revisions between the ITSSOIN partners. It is not conclusive and may be subject to change even during the analysis. Further adaptations and refinements might be the result.

Although the focus, types of documents, and the range of items differ, the policy analysis shares a lot of commonalities with the media analysis (D2.3) to be conducted by all in parallel to this policy analysis. In the following it will become evident that the presentation, items and instructions are very similar to of the media analysis. Some of the following passages can literally be copied from the media analysis, as they apply likewise here. Therefore, we would like to thank Anker Brink Lund for having developed and provided the previous template and thereby inspired the policy analysis.

In accordance with the media analysis **we require 10 % of the items to be cross-coded in order to measure inter-coder reliability**. Coders should also keep an individual logbook (preferably in English) where all doubts and ambiguities can be addressed, especially coding problems that may result in biases or misinterpretations. These logs can also be valuable for further ITSSOIN research. Accordingly, coders should be encouraged to take notes of general trends, examples of particular interest related to future case studies, national peculiarities, and the like.

Furthermore, we **recommend using qualitative data analysis software** such as MaxQDA, Atlas.ti or NVIVO. The following items can be integrated as codes into the software. Text passages that contain information relevant for making judgements can be allocated to these codes. As codes can be transferred into a spreadsheet, the quantification of the analysis is simplified by the use of such software.

For an example of how the data extraction to an Excel file can look like, please see the third file that accompanies this guide in addition to the Excel and atlas.ti coding schemes: *"ITSSOIN_extract coding_example_EU document_20141008"*.

Your individual inputs will be collected and merged by SIR in collaboration with UHEI as per your inputs on the policy screening of D1.2. In the following you find a list of items that we would like to consider and some explanation as to what they point at. They are structured in seven sections, each having a separate focus of analysis. Please note that for items A-D it does not make sense to incorporate them in the data analysis software. But as you will finally export the performed coding to a spreadsheet, the information on items A-D can be added there.

Please be aware that the items in sections 4-7 refer explicitly to social innovations. Some of the selected documents will only refer to other types of innovations. **In these cases the analysis can only be conducted for sections 1-3.** We think that this procedure will still produce interesting insights. For instance, unawareness or ignorance of social

innovation in a national innovation strategy would underline the lack of presence of the theme in national policy.

Code book

1) Embedding the document

A) Country of origin

- 1 = The Czech Republic
- 2 = Denmark
- 3 = France
- 4 = Germany
- 5 = Italy
- 6 = The Netherlands
- 7 = Spain
- 8 = Sweden
- 9 = United Kingdom
- 10 = EU
- 11 = Other

Dimension (A) should be self-evident and can be pre-programmed and kept constant in each country data base.

B) Unique item number

- CZ[unique number of policy document] = The Czech Republic
- DK[unique number of policy document] = Denmark
- FR[unique number of policy document] = France
- DE[unique number of policy document] = Germany
- IT[unique number of policy document] = Italy
- NL[unique number of policy document] = The Netherlands
- ES[unique number of policy document] = Spain
- SE[unique number of policy document] = Sweden
- GB[unique number of policy document] = United Kingdom
- EU[unique number of policy document] = EU
- 11 [unique number of policy document]= Other

Each policy item should be given a unique catalogue number, the main purpose of which is to help the coders keep track of their work as well as providing a way of cleansing the database of repeated items. The item number should consist of two parts: the acronym of the country and a running number for each document.

C) Reference (APA-format)

Please provide the reference of the document, formatted in APA style, suited for reference list, for example:

Cabinet Office (2010). Positive for Youth - A new approach to cross-government policy for young people aged 13 to 19. Cabinet Office and Department for Education, London.

Proposition (2004). Aktiebolag med särskild vinstutdelningsbegränsning. Retrieved from:
http://www.riksdagen.se/sv/Dokument-Lagar/Forslag/Propositioner-och-skrivelser/Aktiebolag-med-sarskild-vinstu_GS03178/. Accessed May 17, 2014.

D) Document title

Please provide a translation of the document title in English. This helps the further analysis.

E) Type of document

- 1 = Legislation
- 2 = Government document (outlining a policy strategy, for instance)
- 3 = Press release
- 4 = Proposal to parliament/elected body
- 5 = Instruction to departments/bodies/agencies
- 6 = Official statements /declaration of intent
- 7 = Documentation of a parliamentary debate
- 8 = Government-sponsored conference reports dedicated to themes of relevance
- 9 = Other

To account for the source that is analysed, the type of the policy document is identified. Government documents are reports or statements stemming from ministries or the administration. Press releases issued by the same institutions are coded separately. Proposals to parliaments/elected bodies are made by third parties (e.g. ministers, official advisory boards, and private lobby groups) and instructions to departments/bodies/agencies can be found in some countries. Further debates of the parliament can also be of interest as well as conference reports.

F) Policy level of publishing authority

- 1 = National authority
- 2 = Federal/regional authority
- 3 = Local authority
- 9 = Other

To account for the level at which policy makers address (social) innovation, the differentiation of government units should be made.

2) The discussion of innovations

G) Type of Innovation

- 1 = Social Innovation
- 2 = Technological Innovation
- 3 = Governance Innovation
- 9 = Other Innovation

Dimension G identifies what types of innovation are referred to in policy documents. This gives an overview of the relevance of each type of innovation. As types of innovation might differ in countries, we only gave the three above-mentioned examples. As there might be a multitude of other types of innovations, this item is coded inductively. Suggestions for further codes are welcomed. Therefore, please code each type of innovation following the notions that are used in the documents. If other expressions occur, please establish a new code for this and translate it into English. Here an example of your coding is of special importance for a cross-country

comparison of the codes and potentially the establishment of a new coding category which we will perform in view of the range of codes across countries. This excludes the possibility of omitted variables. However, please refrain from making too fine-grained differentiations and make use of the existing ones as well as possible. You will recognise that this refers back to the types of innovation discussed in D1.1, which provides some grounding reference. Please also mind the levels of innovation objects that are differentiated below. Please keep these different categories/layers separate. A multiple answer entry is possible and probably mostly necessary.

H) Level of innovation

- 1 = Individual
- 2 = Organisation
- 3 = System
- 9 = Other

The rationale behind the level of innovation is to show where innovations take place or are expected to take place. Are they established by individuals or single actors? Or are they taking place at the organisational level? Another possibility is that innovations occur on the system level. A multiple answer entry is possible.

I) Innovation objects

- 1 = Product
- 2 = Service
- 3 = Process
- 4 = Organisational form
- 5 = Organisational field transformation
- 9 = Other

To account for the object the innovation refers to, a differentiation has to be made. Is the innovation a product or service? Does it affect a process? Innovation can also be present in organisational transformation and therefore have an organisational form. Or can it refer to shifts changing a whole organisational field? A multiple answer entry is possible.

3) The discussion on (social) innovations and interrelations

J) Relation of social innovation to other types of innovation

- 1 = None
- 2 = Weak
- 3 = Medium
- 4 = High
- 5 = Very high
- 9 = Other

This is to qualify the relation of social innovation to other innovations. 'None' is to be chosen if one single type of innovation is mentioned in absolute isolation. The relation is weak if a connection between social innovation and another type of innovation is mentioned in one context but no mutual dependence is assumed. The relation is medium if such dependence is assumed, but only indirectly. A high relation exists if social innovation and the other innovation are described as interdependent. The relation is very strong if social innovation and the other innovation are described as only existent in direct mutual relation.

As it is important to know to which type of innovation this relation exists, please explain this in your written analysis and prove this with a quote.

K) Prominence of social innovation as overall theme

- 1 = None
- 2 = Weak
- 3 = Medium
- 4 = High
- 5 = Very high
- 9 = Other

The prominence of social innovation as an overall theme can be concluded from the previous dimensions. If it is not mentioned at all it has no prominence. The prominence is weak if it is less often or as often mentioned as other types of innovation and has a weak relation to other types of innovation. If social innovation is mentioned less often or as often as other types of innovations and has a weak relation to these, its prominence is medium. The prominence of social innovation is high, as soon as it is mentioned more often than other types of innovation. It is very high if it has additionally a high relation to other forms of innovations. This shows a high general innovative potential that is assigned to social innovation.

L) Main level affected by social innovation

- 1 = National
- 2 = Federal/regional
- 3 = Local
- 9 = Other

Differentiating the level at which the policy document identifies innovations: Does innovation primarily affect the national, federal, regional, or local level? A multiple answer entry is possible.

4) Social innovations and the third sector

M) Institutional setting of social innovation

- 1 = Third Sector
- 2 = Market
- 3 = State
- 4 = Informal
- 9 = Other

To describe the institutional setting of the innovation, the societal spheres of third sector, market, state, and the informal sector are differentiated. The question is where it does occur (or where it is assumed to occur) and what types of actors are primarily involved. The setting of actors with no specific organisational form, such as social movements, is informal. A multiple answer entry is possible.

N) Relation of social innovation to the third sector

- 1 = None
- 2 = Weak
- 3 = Medium
- 4 = Strong
- 5 = Very strong
- 9 = Other

With this dimension we want to identify how strongly social innovations are connected to the third sector by policies (used to qualify the general identification of actors). If social innovation is only related to firms or state actors, no relation to the third sector is established. A weak relation exists in cases where third sector organisations are said to influence social innovations in some way. It is medium if third sector organisations are seen as influencing social innovations in a similar way as actors from other sectors. A strong relation exists when third sector organisations are stated to be of special importance to social innovations. It is very strong if policies state third sector organisations as the most important actor of social innovation.

O) Relation of social innovation to volunteering or civic engagement

- 1 = None
- 2 = Weak
- 3 = Medium
- 4 = Strong
- 5 = Very strong
- 9 = Other

With this dimension we want to identify how strongly social innovations are seen as influenced by volunteering and civic engagement. If no volunteering is mentioned there is no relation. A weak relation exists in cases where volunteering and civic engagement are said to influence social innovations in some way. If it is medium volunteering and civic engagement are seen as influencing social innovations among other actors. A strong relation exists when volunteering and civic engagement are stated to be of special importance to social innovations. It is very strong if policies state volunteering and civic engagement as the most important influence on social innovation.

P) Third sector as service provider

- 1 = None
- 2 = Service provision less pronounced
- 3 = Service provision more pronounced
- 9 = Other

In policies where the third sector is mentioned as a social innovation actor, it is interesting to analyse the role that the sector is expected to have. The service provision role can be considered as more pronounced, e.g. if third sector actors are expected to deliver social innovations in terms of new welfare solutions in society. The service role can be considered less pronounced if the sector is, for instance, expected to support (not directly perform) social innovation.

Q) Third sector as advocate

- 1 = None
- 2 = Advocacy less pronounced
- 3 = Advocacy more pronounced
- 9 = Other

Similarly, policy documents can stress the advocacy function in relation to social innovations. A less pronounced advocacy function is assumed, for example if social innovations are said to influence the preservation of norms and values. It is more pronounced if it said to actively influence a process of actualising or redefining norms and values or articulating societal critique.

5) Social innovation and organisations

R) Size of organisation

- 1 = No relation of innovation to size
- 2 = Small organisations
- 3 = Big organisations
- 9 = Other

Are small or big organisations focused on by policy in relation to social innovation?

S) Maturity of organisation (within organisational field)

- 1= No relation of innovation to maturity
- 2= New organisations
- 3= Incumbent organisations
- 9= Other

Not only the size but also for how long the organisation has been operating in the field is said to be of relevance to social innovation. The question is if policies are focused on organisations new to the environment they are operating in (start-ups, individual social entrepreneurs BUT also older organisations that move into a new field of activity). Or are incumbent organisations addressed, which are well established in their field?

6) Social innovation and empirical fields

T) Target fields of social innovation (overview)

- 1 = Social services
- 2 = Health
- 3 = Community development
- 4 = Work integration
- 5 = Environmental sustainability
- 6 = Consumer protection
- 7 = Arts & culture
- 9 = No ITSSOIN field mentioned (education, sports, etc.)

Having identified the provenance of a policy document, its target field is of interest too, which addresses the central point of the ITSSOIN case study analysis: civil society fields (to be analysed in WP 4-7). These fields should also be coded, if they are only addressed indirectly. Not all policy items, however, relate to these fields. However, coders should look carefully for topical content related to fields 1-7 and only use 9 if none of these topics are referred to in the

slightest way. Some documents may frame more than one of the ITSSOIN fields, e.g., social service and health tend to overlap. Therefore, a multiple answer entry is possible.

For definitions of the fields the International Classification of Non-profit Organisations (ICNPO) by Salamon and Anheier is used (Salamon and Anheier, 1992). According to this classification the fields can be described as follows:

The field of social services contains organisations and institutions providing human and social services to a community or target population.

The field of health consists of organisations that engage in health-related activities providing healthcare, general and specialised services, administration of healthcare services, and health support services.

The field of community development is characterised by community and neighbourhood organisations: organisations working towards improving the quality of life within communities or neighbourhoods, for example, squatters associations, local development organisations, or poor people's co-operatives.

This field as well as the field of work integration is embedded in the ICNOP group 'Development and housing' that describes organisations which promote programmes and provide services to help improve communities and the economic and social wellbeing of society. The field of work integration contains actors and embeds actions that support work integration of those who are disadvantaged in the job market.

The field of environmental sustainability includes organisations promoting and providing services in environmental conservation, pollution control and prevention, environmental education and health, and animal protection.

According to the ICNPO classification, the field of consumer protection in finance can be identified as a field belonging to the group of law, advocacy, and politics. Accordingly, organisations of this field promote, regulate, and safeguard business, professional, and labour interests with a special focus on consumer protection in finance.

The field of culture and arts refers to organisations and activities in general and specialised fields of culture. These can be very diverse. To give just some examples, this can be connected to media and communication, visual arts, architecture, ceramic art, performing arts, or museums (cf. Salamon and Anheier, 1992, p. 289ff.)⁷.

U) Most relevant target field of social innovation (specification)

- 1 = Social services
- 2 = Health
- 3 = Community development
- 4 = Work integration
- 5 = Environmental sustainability
- 6 = Consumer protection
- 7 = Arts & culture
- 9 = No ITSSOIN field mentioned

After identifying the target fields relevant for social innovation, a qualification of the most important field is needed. This can be done by the number of times a field is addressed,

⁷ For more detailed descriptions please see: Salamon, L., & Anheier, H. (1992). In search of the non-profit sector II. The problem of classification. *Voluntas* 3(3), 267-309.

but additional qualitative criteria might be used for this decision. Please provide a description of this decision process in your written analysis.

7) Social innovation and policy

V) Main desired outcome(s) of social innovation

- 1 = Motor for growth
- 2 = Auxiliary to other types of innovation (e.g. technological)
- 3 = Social cohesion
- 4 = Preservation/renewal/fortification of values
- 5 = Reshaping responsible economic practice
- 6 = Environmental sustainability
- 9 = Other

Social innovation can be seen as a motor of growth (desired outcome), e.g., for the economy or for other sectors. It can also be understood as auxiliary to other types of innovation, for instance when the implementation of technical innovation is described as dependent on previous/concurrent social innovation. Another desired outcome is social cohesion. It refers to practices in society that indicate social cohesion or to the wish that social cohesion be enacted. This is for example the case when social innovations support integration. The impact of social innovations on values can also be expected in policy. This is a more abstract relation to social innovation, as it relates stronger to a general acceptance of values (trust, believe, etc.) in society. It can either affect the preservation, the renewal, or the consolidation of values. Moreover, the reshaping of economic practice with regards to responsible acting or environmental sustainability is connected with social innovations. As this dimension can lead to a multitude of answers, the establishment of new categories might be necessary. Therefore, please do not hesitate to redefine findings that must be coded as “Others” by establishing new categories. This allows for an open data collection process. Additionally, a multiple answer entry is possible.

W) Ministry/policy field focusing on social innovation

- 1 = Economy
- 2 = Labour
- 3 = Social Affairs
- 4 = Education
- 5 = Culture
- 6 = Environment
- 7 = Family
- 8 = Engagement/Civil society
- 9 = Other

To find out from which policy fields documents emerge, their origin is of interest. As items, ministries' areas of responsibility are selected which are self-evident. The option “other” might be useful here. If policy documents repeatedly emerge from policy fields not mentioned above, please do not hesitate do define these. This is to guarantee an open approach on data. A multiple answer entry is possible.

X) Reference to EU

- 1 = None
- 2 = Weak
- 3 = Medium
- 4 = Strong
- 5 = Very strong
- 9 = Other

The influence of EU policies and institutions on the national level is especially interesting in regard to the policy recommendations ITSSOIN will give throughout the project. Therefore, the explicit reference to EU policies or institutions in national policy documents is of interest here. If the EU is not mentioned at all, there is no reference. The references are weak where the EU is mentioned but not directly related to policy decisions. The references are medium where the relation to the EU influences the policy but is not central to it. If the policy paper justifies core political decisions by relating to the EU, the reference is strong. The reference is very strong if the EU is named as the cause for developing the policy stream.

Qualitative Analysis

We would like to ask all partners to provide an overview of the results of their document analysis in a spreadsheet (ideally generated from the coding structure built in the qualitative data analysis software). This enables a cross-country comparison with all collected data.

Additionally, we would like to ask for a descriptive analysis of the results for your country. All of this will flow into the deliverable D2.2 'Profiles and policy perspectives' as an input for the country specific analysis. Therefore, we would like you to provide us with well-argued reports that contain:

- First, a short description of the document selection and an explanation as to how and why the documents are relevant to the national (social) innovation policy.
- Second, a written interpretation of the results across items, covering the focuses and developments of the policy discourse (potentially also evolutions over time).
- Third, a (separate) short description of aspects that were not taken into account in the provided template for analysis. Please describe in detail (in those cases where you regard this as vital to the analysis) when you had to code "other" and how the coded passage still relates to the analysis, and integrate it in the interpretation of the analysis results.

In general, we would like you to provide a descriptive policy analysis that focuses, similarly to the media analysis, on the following questions:

Q1: What are major trends in the material that may be of interest for ITSSOIN partners?

Q2: Are there other matters encountered in the material that may be of relevance in the comparison of the data?

Drawing on first observations from the description of country specific policy streams (D1.2) we more specifically ask coders to reflect on the following relations. On the basis of

a cross-national synthesis of the data we intend to build classifications or spectra of country contexts in regard to the following (tentative) relations:

- Embracement vs. ignorance/dismissal of social innovation
- Solidarity-/community-driven vs. technology-driven approach to social innovation policy
- Service provision vs. advocacy: which dimension is more important for third sector involvement in social innovation? (if connection between third sector and social innovation is stated at all, otherwise stating and interpreting this very absence is important)
- Grassroots vs. central steering of policies
- Local vs. national level focus in the occurrence of social innovation

Additionally, references to country specific research (scholarly publications) on policy related to the third sector and social innovation would be of interest (complementing those contained in D1.2 or the other ITSSOIN documents of, including D1.1 and others).

References

- Adviesraad voor het Wetenschaps- en Technologiebeleid. (2014). *De kracht van sociale innovatie*. The Hague.
- Anheier, H. K., Krlev, G., Preuss, S., & Mildenerger, G. (2014a). *ITSSOIN Hypotheses*. A deliverable of the project: 'Impact of the Third Sector as Social Innovation' (ITSSOIN), European Commission – 7th Framework Programme. Brussels.
- Anheier, H. K., Krlev, G., Preuss, S., Mildenerger, G., Bekkers, R., Mensink, W., ... (2014b). *Social Innovation as Impact of the Third Sector*. A deliverable of the project: "Impact of the Third Sector as Social Innovation" (ITSSOIN), European Commission - 7th Framework Programme. Brussels.
- Anheier, H. K., Krlev, G., Preuss, S., Mildenerger, G., & Einarsson, T. (2014c). *Theory and Empirical Capturing of the Third Sector at the Macro Level*. A deliverable of the project: 'Impact of the Third Sector as Social Innovation' (ITSSOIN), European Commission – 7th Framework Programme. Brussels.
- Anheier, H. K., Krlev, G., Preuss, S., Mildenerger, G., Einarsson, T., & Flening, E. (2015). *Social Innovation in Policy: EU and Country Level Profiles and Policy Perspectives*. A deliverable of the project: 'Impact of the Third Sector as Social Innovation' (ITSSOIN), European Commission - 7th Framework Programme. Brussels.
- Arbetsmarknadsdepartementet. (2014). *Förslag till nationellt socialfondsprogram för investeringar i tillväxt och sysselsättning 2014-2020*. Stockholm.
- AVISE. (2013). *Les actions de soutien à l'innovation sociale en Région*. Retrieved from http://www.avise.org/sites/default/files/atoms/files/20140204/201311_Avise_Panorama_ISRegion.pdf
- Bekkers, R. & Brink Lund, A. (2014). *Perceptions of the Third Sector*. A deliverable of the project: 'Impact of the Third Sector as Social Innovation' (ITSSOIN), European Commission – 7th Framework Programme. Brussels.
- Borzaga, C. & Bodini, R. (2012). *What to make of Social Innovation?: Towards a Framework for Policy Development*. Euricse Working Paper (No. 36).
- Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales. (2010). *Empfehlungsbericht des Nationalen CSR-Forums an die Bundesregierung*. Bonn. Retrieved from http://www.bmas.de/portal/47230/property=pdf/a397_csr_empfehlungsbericht.pdf
- Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung. (2010). *Ideen.Innovationen.Wachstum: Hightech-Strategie 2020 für Deutschland*. Bonn. Retrieved from www.bmbf.de
- Cabinet Office. (2011). *Open public services: white paper*. London.
- Camera dei Deputati. (2014). *Disegno di legge: Delega al governo per la riforma del terzo settore, dell'impresa sociale e per la disciplina del servizio civile universale*. Rom.
- Charter. (2001). *Arbejdesgruppen Medlemmer: Charter for samspillet mellem det frivillige Danmark/Foreningsdanmark og det offentlige*. Retrieved from <http://www.frivilligraadet.dk/sites/default/files/udgivelser/Charter.pdf>

- Charter. (2013). *Arbejdesgruppen for Fornyelsen af Frivillighedschartret: Charter for samspillet mellem det frivillige Verden og det offentlige*. Retrieved from <http://www.frivilligcharter.dk/sites/default/files/attachments/Frivillighedscharter.pdf>
- Commission sous la présidence d'Anne Lauvergeon. (2013). *Un principe et sept ambitions pour l'innovation*. Retrieved from http://innovation-2030.entreprises.gouv.fr/pdf/Rapport_Innovation_BDV4.pdf
- Conservative Party. (2010). *Big Society not Big Government: Building a Big Society*. London.
- Council for Research, D. a. I. (2005). *Národní inovační politika České republiky na léta 2005 - 2010: [National Innovation Policy of the Czech Republic for 2005 - 2010]*. Retrieved from <http://www.vyzkum.cz/FrontClanek.aspx?idsekce=14459>
- Council for Research, D. a. I. (2009). *Národní politika výzkumu, vývoje a inovací České republiky na léta 2009-2015: [National research, development and innovation Policy of the Czech Republic for 2009-2015]*. Retrieved from <http://www.vyzkum.cz/FrontClanek.aspx?idsekce=532844&ad=1&attid=680526>
- CSESS. (2011). *Rapport de synthèse du Groupe de travail Innovation Sociale*. Retrieved from http://www.lelabo-ess.org/IMG/pdf/GT_IS_CSESS_dec2011.pdf
- Danish Government. (2012). *Danmark – Løsningernes land: Styrket samarbejde og bedre rammer for innovation i virksomhederne 2012/2013* (No. 12). Retrieved from www.fivu.dk
- Danish Government. (2014). *Lettere at være Frivillig i Danmark. 2013/14* (No. 39). Retrieved from www.sm.dk
- Department of Health. (2011). *Innovation Health and Wealth, accelerating adoption and diffusion in the NHS (IHW)*. London.
- Department of Health. (2012). *Innovation, health and wealth, Creating Change IHW: One year on*. London.
- Deutsche Bundesregierung. (2010). *Nationale Engagementstrategie der Bundesregierung*. Retrieved from http://www.berlin.de/imperia/md/content/buergeraktiv/nationale_20engagementstrategie_10_10_06.pdf?start&ts=1296658019&file=nationale_20engagementstrategie_10_10_06.pdf
- Deutscher Bundestag. (2009). *Bericht über die Arbeit des Unterausschusses „Bürgerschaftliches Engagement“ in der 16. Wahlperiode*. UA-Drs. 16/88. Retrieved from http://www.aktive-buergerschaft.de/fp_files/StudienBerichte/bg_abschlussbericht_2009.pdf
- Eriksson, M., Einarsson, T., & Wijkström, F. (2014). *Report on the European Social Innovation Policy Framework in Light of Third Sector and Civil Society actors*. A deliverable of the project: 'Impact of the Third Sector as Social Innovation' (ITSSOIN), European Commission – 7th Framework Programme. Brussels.
- European Commission. (2011a). *Commission staff working paper impact assessment: Accompanying the Communication from the Commission 'Horizon 2020'*. The Framework Programme for Research and Innovation. Brussels. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/pdf/proposals/horizon_2020_impact_assessment_report.pdf#view=fit&pagemode=none

- European Commission. (2011b). *Impact assessment of the proposal on "Horizon 2020": The Framework Programme for Research and Innovation*. Brussels.
- European Commission. (2011c). *Proposal for a regulation of the European parliament and of the Council on European Social Entrepreneurship Funds*. Brussels.
- European Commission. (2011d). *Research on Social Innovation: Inventory of Projects funded under the EU Research Framework Programmes*.
- European Commission. (2013a). *Guide to Social Innovation*. Brussels. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/presenta/social_innovation/social_innovation_2013.pdf
- European Commission. (2013b). *Social innovation research in the European Union: Approaches, findings and future directions*. Brussels.
- European Commission. (2014). *The role of public support in the commercialisation of innovations* (Flash Eurobarometer No. 394). Brussels.
- European Parliament & The Council of the European Union. (2013). *Regulation on European Social Entrepreneurship Funds*. Brussels.
- Evers, A., Ewert, B., & Brandsen, T. (2014). *Social Innovations for Social Cohesion: Transnational Patterns and Approaches from 20 European Cities*. Retrieved from <http://www.wilcoproject.eu/downloads/WILCO-project-eReader.pdf>
- Finansdepartementet. (2014). *Förbättrat klimat för entreprenörskap och innovativt företagande*. Retrieved from <http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/18212/a/237875>
- Fligstein, N. (2006). Senes Making and the Emergence of a New Form of Market Governance: The Case of the European Defense Industry. *American Behavioral Scientist*, (49), 949–960.
- Gobierno Vasco. (2012). *III Plan Vasco de Inclusión Activa (2012-2016)*. Retrieved from http://www.gizartelan.ejgv.euskadi.net/contenidos/informacion/6199/es_2284/adjuntos/plan_inclusion.pdf
- Gouvernement français LOI. (2014). *Relative à l'économie sociale et solidaire* (No. 2014-856). Retrieved from <http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000029313296&categorieLien=id>
- Governo Italiano. (2012a). *Decreto legge 22 giugno 2012: Misure urgenti per la crescita del paese* (No. 83).
- Governo Italiano. (2012b). *Decreto legge 18 ottobre 2012: Ulteriori misure urgenti per la crescita del paese* (No. 179).
- Hall, P. A., & Soskice, D. W. (Eds.). (2001). *Varieties of Capitalism.: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.worldcat.org/oclc/46969900>
- HM Government. (2010). *The Coalition: Our programme for government*. London.
- HM Government. (2013). *Growing the social investment market: 2013 progress update*. London.

- House of Commons Public Administration Select Committee. (2011). *The Big Society: Seventeenth Report of Session 2010-12*. Volume I. Retrieved from <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmpubadm/902/902.pdf> Accessed 2/12/14
- Howaldt, J., & Schwarz, M. (2010). *'Soziale Innovation' im Fokus: Skizze eines gesellschaftstheoretisch inspirierten Forschungskonzepts* (1st ed.). Bielefeld.
- Innobasque. (2011). *Estrategia de Innovación Social: Una ventana de oportunidad para Euskadi*. Retrieved from <http://www.innobasque.com/home.aspx?tabid=1058&idElementoBiblioteca=130>
- Institute of Planning and City Development of capital city Prague. (2014). *Regionální inovační strategie hlavního města Prahy: [Regional innovation strategy of capital city Prague]*. Retrieved from http://www.rishmp.cz/public/67/a5/75/1907046_526968_Priloha_c_1_k_usneseni_Zastupitelstva_HMP__Regionalni_inovacni_strategie_hl_m_Prahy.pdf
- Kammerstukken. II 2010/11, 32 253, no. 30.
- Kammerstukken. II 2011/12, 32 253, no. 35.
- Kammerstukken. II 2011/12, 32 637, no. 32.
- Kammerstukken. II 2012/13, 20 487, no. 41: *Kennisprogramma Duurzaam Dóór - "sociale innovatie voor een groene economie"*.
- Kammerstukken. II 2012/13, 30 597, no. 296: *Hervorming van de langdurige ondersteuning en zorg*.
- Kammerstukken. II 2012/13, 33 400 VII, no. 79: *Kabinetsstandpunt Stimulering van een vitale samenleving, de doe-democratie*.
- Kammerstukken. II 2013/14, 26 642, no. 128.
- Kammerstukken. II 2013/14, 33 750 VII, no. 53.
- Mayring, P. (2007). *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse* (9th ed.). Weinheim/Basel: Beltz.
- Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad. (2013a). *Estrategia Española de Ciencia y Tecnología y de Innovación 2013-2020*. Retrieved from http://www.idi.mineco.gob.es/stfls/MICINN/Investigacion/FICHEROS/Estrategia_espanola_ciencia_tecnologia_innovacion.pdf
- Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad. (2013b). *Plan Estatal de Investigación Científica y Técnica y de Innovación 2013-2016*. Retrieved from http://www.idi.mineco.gob.es/stfls/MICINN/Investigacion/FICHEROS/Plan_Estatal_Inves_cientifica_tecnica_innovacion.pdf
- Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e. Igualdad. (2013). *Plan Nacional de Acción para la Inclusión Social del Reino de España 2013-2016*. Retrieved from http://www.msssi.gob.es/ssi/familiasInfancia/inclusionSocial/docs/PlanNacionalAccionInclusionSocial_2013_2016.pdf
- Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e. Igualdad. (2014). *La Promoción de la Inclusión Social a través de los Fondos Estructurales y de Inversión de la UE (Período 2014-2020): Guía de orientaciones y recomendaciones prácticas*. Retrieved from

- http://www.msssi.gob.es/destacados/docs/Guia_Inclusion_social_y_Fondos_estructurales.pdf
- Ministerium für Ländlichen Raum und Verbraucherschutz Baden-Württemberg. *Operationelles Programm des Europäischen Fonds für regionale Entwicklung (EFRE) in Baden-Württemberg 2014-2020: Innovation und Energiewende*. Stuttgart.
- Ministero del Lavoro e delle Politiche Sociali e Ministero dello Sviluppo Economico. (2011). *Piano d'Azione Nazionale sulla Responsabilità Sociale di Impresa 2012-2014*.
- Ministero del Lavoro e delle Politiche Sociali. (2011). *Piano Italia Documento di indirizzo 2011: Anno Europeo delle Attività Di Volontariato che promuovono la cittadinanza attiva*.
- Ministry of Industry and Trade of the Czech Republic. (2011). *Národní inovační strategie České republiky na léta 2012 – 2020: [National innovation strategy of the Czech Republic for 2012-2020]*. Retrieved from <http://www.mpo.cz/dokument91200.html>
- Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs of the Czech Republic. (2014). *Strategie sociálního začleňování 2014 – 2020: [Social integration strategy for 2014-2020]*. Retrieved from http://www.mpsv.cz/files/clanky/17082/strategie_soc_zaclenovani_2014-20.pdf
- MIUR. (2012). *Avviso per la presentazione di idee progettuali per Smart Cities and Communities and Social Innovation* (No. 391/Ric).
- Näringsdepartementet. (2012). *Den nationella innovationsstrategin*. Stockholm.
- Näringsdepartementet. (2014a). *En nationell strategi för regional tillväxt och attraktionskraft 2014-2020*. Stockholm.
- Näringsdepartementet. (2014b). *Förslag till Nationellt regionalfondsprogram för investeringar i tillväxt och sysselsättning 2014-2020*. Stockholm.
- Norris, P. (2000). *Political Communications in Postindustrial Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ramstad, E. (2009). Expanding Innovation System and Policy: An Organisational Perspective. *Policy Studies*, 30(5), 533–553.
- Région Ile-de-France. (2011). *Stratégie régionale de développement économique et d'innovation: SRDEI 2011-2014*. Retrieved from http://www.iledefrance.fr/sites/default/files/srdei_publication.pdf
- Schneider, M., & Paunescu, M. (2012). Changing Varieties of Capitalism and revealed Comparative Advantages from 1990 to 2005: A Test of the Hall and Soskice Claims. *Socio-Economic Review*, 10(4), 731–753.
- The Young Foundation. (2012). *Social Innovation Overview - Part I: Defining social innovation: A Deliverable to the Project "The theoretical, empirical and policy foundations for building social innovation in Europe"* (DG Research). Brussels.