

# ***Collaboration for Social Innovation: Developing Social Learning Spaces in the UK Higher Education***

By ***Christos Apostolakis, PhD***

## **Abstract**

This paper concerns initial work on social innovation that investigates the role of collaboration as a catalyst for change applied in the context of social learning spaces in the United Kingdom' higher education. From a policy viewpoint the paper addresses the issue of social technologies as a means of social practice. Secondly, it focuses on the impact a whole system change process can have upon university students and staff in establishing social learning spaces. Thirdly, it tackles leadership and how this can be effectively utilised within the field under consideration.

Reference to specific cases of British Universities regarding use of social learning spaces is made and emphasis is given on the role of collaboration in pursuing innovative ideas. Semi-structured interviews and collection of secondary data are the research methods used. Finally, suggestions on how social learning spaces could be further improved are highlighted.

**KEY WORDS:** *Social Innovation; Collaboration; Social Technologies; Leadership; Whole System Change; Social Learning Spaces; UK Higher Education; Student-centred Experiential Education*

## **1. Introduction**

Innovation can perhaps be defined as “the successful exploitation of new ideas”. It matters as it concerns with delivery of better products and services and, improvement of business (mainly) models (Department of Trade & Industry, 2003). This is the “traditional” definition of innovation though, as a term almost exclusively related to business. For consumers, innovation means higher quality and goods of better value and for businesses it means sustained or improved growth (ibid.). However, in recent years the vision about the supremacy of the market as a leading economic and social institution is losing relevance fitting to an environment that concurrently favours trust, reciprocity and therefore emphasises the necessity for communities, association and networks (Granovetter, 1985; Boyer and Rogers Hollingsworth, 1997). Consequently, the role of voluntary and non-profit organisations in innovation becomes a key component of social and public policy in a series of countries the United Kingdom included (Osborne and Flynn, 1997). It is because of this reason that the need for a more socially acceptable form of innovation, the *social innovation* has come to the fore.

There exist various definitions of social innovation all identified in recent years. According to one of them social innovation refers mainly to:

*new ideas that resolve existing social, cultural, economic and environmental challenges for the benefit of people and planet. A true social innovation is systems-changing – it permanently alters the perceptions, behaviours and structures that previously gave rise to*

*these challenges. Even more simply, a social innovation is an idea that works for the public good*

(Centre of Social Innovation, 2008).

Similarly, Mulgan (2006: 146) suggests that “*social innovation refers to innovative activities and services that are motivated by the goal of meeting a social need and that are predominantly diffused through organisations whose primary purposes are social*”. An example of this role is the impact of social innovation in industrial production and designing (Morelli, 2007). However, there are contributors who argue that social innovation has not been investigated in depth as yet (Moulaert *et al*, 2005). Moreover, it has been argued that social innovation needs a conducive physical environment perhaps because social innovators need actual spaces to get inspired, develop and apply their ideas something that does not happen every time (Centre of Social Innovation, 2008). Considering all the above, Murgan (2006) contends that there are many reasons to argue about the importance of social innovation and its growth in the years to come. This is due to the fact that non-governmental organisations and civil society become more financially viable compared to the past. Furthermore, both developed but also developing countries are increasingly dominated by provision of services rather than manufacturing products and this makes the need of social innovation practices eminent.

The goal of this paper is therefore to shed light in the role of collaboration within the context of social innovation. To a certain degree, it could perhaps count as a developmental paper than anything else. Nevertheless, it offers an informative account of how social innovation can affect the higher education sector, especially the area of social learning spaces in order to support a student-centred experiential education as it functions within the United Kingdom.

## **2. Social Innovation in Higher Education**

### **2.1. Collaboration for Social Innovation**

Social innovation occurs best in environments that favour diversity. It rarely occurs within homogenous structures. It happens in the periphery in which differing approaches go against each other and galvanise new ways of thinking (Centre of Social Innovation, 2008). Furthermore, it is a multidimensional concept that can expand from issues of dynamic interrelationships between organisational restructuring up to its link to political governance (Moulaert *et al*, 2005). In the light of this, three principal dimensions of social innovation occur with which it can have an impact in arenas of social life including the context of higher education:

- *Satisfaction of human needs* that are not currently satisfied either because “not yet” or because “no longer” perceived as important by the state or the market or the third sector;
- *Changes in social relations*, in particular regarding governance that make the satisfaction mentioned above possible but also increase the level of participation by the society;
- *Increase of the socio-political capability and access to resources* that is necessary in order to enhance rights to satisfaction

(Moulaert *et al*, 2005)

Furthermore, it is self-evident that the invention and assimilation of social factors such as the democratic political system affect the behaviour of individuals and groups they belong to. Before innovation began to occur humans had social structures in the form of families, extended families and tribes. This changed with the introduction of civilisation in the 19<sup>th</sup> century whose study has strongly indicated the effect technical and social innovation have had upon human behaviour. To this extent, it could be argued that social innovation is an important determinant of human behaviour (Simms, 2006).

To a broader extent, social innovation appears to influence principal functions of the social, political, economic and organisational life of a particular community (Table 1). Two main issues seem to interest regarding the role of social innovation: Firstly, its capacity to implement a set of collaborative arrangements of participants within and/or out organisational or local or regional, etc contexts; Secondly, its ability to prevent or create social exclusion depending on the particular case. Between the two the issue of collaboration is perhaps more important for the establishment or not of social innovation. Damanpour and Schneider (2006) argue that innovation is considered as a source of competitive/collaborative advantage and economic growth, and therefore worthy of study under the today's technological, market and social conditions.

Collaboration constitutes a long-standing term that proved to have been solidly established in areas such as public and strategic management recently. What is collaboration and how it can be defined in an organisational or community context? How is it linked with social innovation? Collaboration can be seen as a useful theoretical mechanism when it is applied to joint activities because it expresses people's aspirations of coming and act together (Apostolakis, 2007a & 2007b). According to Huxham (1996: 7):

“collaboration” is taken to imply a very positive form of working in association with others for some form of mutual benefit...the concern...is ...with collaboration between organisations

Kanter (1994) in her search for collaborative advantage argues that integration in the relationship between collaborative partners involves heavily exchange of joint plans on technical, operational and interpersonal innovation. This is very indicative of the way that social needs are addressed through collaboration amongst different partners e.g. from the private but also the public or the “third” sectors. Some of those issues are addressed in Table 1, regarding for instance the ability of non-traditional actors to contribute to a climate of social innovation.

However, Sink (1996) points out five obstacles that normally occur when collaborative efforts begin to be formed:

- Involving government officials in collaboration is often critical to success but frequently problematic;
- Most collaborations seems to take a sequential or incremental approach which might be proved not enough for cases of emergency, which need “break through” approaches and systemic change – it could be argued that this is a common case in social innovation;

- The change from a betterment to an empowerment collaborative arrangement is a difficult task that involves social learning, building respect and trust, and much risk taking - it could be argued that this frequently applies to social innovation as well;
- A major difficulty in organising collaboration is dealing with individual's egos and personal agendas - it could be argued that this is a common case in social innovation;
- Collaborative groups with members which represent different works and sectors face with real challenges of bringing up those differences.

It could be argued then that social innovation is about human interrelationships and how new ideas can emerge from these, and as such it significantly depends upon collaborative efforts. In this light, collaboration has the theoretical and empirical capacity to “act” as a mechanism for the development of social innovation. Further exploration on this very issue follows in the next paragraphs.

## ***2.2. Impact of Collaboration to Social Innovation***

The impact of collaboration to social innovation is what will interest this section. This seems logical to be available via the development of a model that could illustrate how collaboration is linked with specific elements of social innovation, as it can be seen in Table 2. Looking at the core phases of the social innovation process it can be assumed that people and organisations competently interpret their own lives and resolve issues related to them. Then, they can see how they create new possibilities based on these interpretations (Mulgan, 2006). In this light, collaboration seems as a logical move to be for the development of potential success regarding implementation of innovative ideas. Moreover, collaboration looks as if it is an eminent element for the stage of developing, prototyping and piloting ideas. This is because it can help individuals or organisations to cross the chasm between having a promising idea and to implement this idea as a mainstream product or service, as Mulgan would probably argue. The same assumption applies to the next phase, the assessing, scaling up and diffusing of ideas. As Mulgan argues (2006: 153) taking an idea into practice needs “*skilful strategy and coherent vision, combined with the ability to marshal resources and support and identify the key points of leverage, the weak chinks in opponents’ walls*”. Or it would be possible to identify the possibilities of collaborative arrangements on how to assess and spread useful innovation ideas for the betterment of people’s lives, it could be added. Regarding the last phase of the model, the one of learning and evolving collaboration this can be considered as important in the sense that it helps social innovation to take the form of a process of learning from mistakes. This is due to unintended consequences that may appear and turn expected plans to be not viable any longer.

Examining some of the issues that can perhaps influence the social innovation process, social technologies appear to be a distinguishable attribute, which could count as a kind of social practice. For example, the Centre for Neighbourhood Technology in Chicago mobilised its Wireless Community Network in order to help people in the Gulf Region before the local state and government got their acts together in the wake of hurricane Katrina in 2005. Interorganisational collaboration proved to be worthwhile on the occasion

(Shankar, 2008). In another case, Hoover has launched Hoover' Connect, a business networking tool that helps users to become introduced and establish relationships with planned prospects. In essence, this is a social networking tool that promotes the innovative idea of "*searching for connections in common with the people who individuals want to contact or meet*" (Foster, 2008: 127). From a more theoretical perspective, Allee (2006) points out that there are three levels of innovation that are essential for an organisation to respond successfully to change: a) One that has to do with technologies and work practices and focuses on the value of the product that is available (*business innovation*); b) one that moves to knowledge networks and expert collaborative communities (*social innovation*); and c) one that aims at technologies for codifying, organising, and integrating information (*technology innovation*). The second level interests this paper the most, it could be argued!

Whole system change, another noteworthy element of social innovation is an intervention strategy that is designed to bring about significant, accelerated transformation to an organisation. By definition everybody who participates has to agree with going through together. The process respects the various interests of the stakeholders in either small or large groups, in the public or the private sector. Mandated follow up assures that plans are effectively implemented. High involvement brings in unity and enthusiasm to the change experience (Bramson and Buss, 2002; Tarrant, 2007). Tarrant (2007) also argues that a whole system change requires:

1. Leadership commitment and a willingness to go first;
2. Large scale involvement of the organisation who identifies issues and concerns related to the change and who organises it in a way that engages the interests of all stakeholders;
3. A high level of commitment and participation across the organisation;
4. Clearly stated expectations of participants in the process regarding input, decision making, planning and implementation;
5. Large group intervention-working sessions that involve a critical mass (40% - 100%) of the whole organisation;
6. Ongoing forums to engage the organisation in discussing impacts and implementation issues.

Finally, the importance of leadership for social innovation should not be undermined. One of the characteristics of effective leadership is its ability to promote change by creating vision (Kavanagh and Ashkanasy, 2006). In terms of what kind of leadership, this can (amongst others) take the form of a tool in a recursive development of rules and resources within networks in clusters (Sydow *et al*, 2007) or as a mechanism that "*make things happen in collaboration*" (Vangen and Huxham, 2002:2). However, Tierney (2006) emphasises on the today's lack of strong leadership in many organisations referring in particular to non-profit organisations, as a phenomenon that would last for quite a few years.

The impact of collaboration to social innovation is now further considered within the context of higher education in the United Kingdom, in particular with reference to the case of social learning spaces.

### **2.3. Social Learning Spaces as Forms of Social Innovation in the UK Higher Education**

The role of Higher Education in the United Kingdom has been shifted in terms of how education is offered and how the links with its environment have been set in recent years. The author's personal observations and experience as a student first and academic afterwards suggest that during the last ten years or so British higher education has increasingly shifted towards change of two kinds: one that enhances the role of research as a tool not only for more governmental funding but also for changing the manners of education provision. In this respect, conducting research has become as important as provision of teaching; secondly, a move towards a student-centred education based on experiential knowledge and learning methods has increasingly begun to get developed. For this purpose, several educational programmes that focus on how to prepare graduates for the life after studies have been introduced such as student skills, employability, personal development planning and so forth. The aim is to offer them not only the knowledge and experience necessary but also a feeling of dynamism in what they do in order to overcome difficulties especially in the first years after graduation.

In this respect, two key concepts appear to be central for social innovation in higher education: the role of institutions and the process of learning. The emphasis on institutions arises from the realisation that innovation is steadily becoming a social enterprise which occurs, amongst others in the university setting. As for the process of learning, this emerges out of mechanisms through which current higher education learning occurs: learning-by-doing and learning-by-interacting (Wolfe and Gertler, 2002). To this extent, initiatives that could promote this shift have been initiated. For example, an *open innovation* research agenda has been introduced between universities and industry under two avenues of inquiry: first, searching and matching processes preceding university-industry relationships; and secondly investigating the organisation and management of such a collaborative arrangement. The ultimate aim is to identify whether academia is ready to respond to technological or industry needs (Perkmann and Walsh, 2007). Similarly, but at a more international level, the Boyer Commission (2007) strongly indicates that graduates need to benefit from resources that are available. In addition, universities need to be able to give to their students a dimension of knowledge but also experience that is meaningful for their next steps in life. Furthermore, as Salter (2002) contends collaboration is necessary in order for new technologies, networks, management systems and workplace practices to be developed and adopted in the context of institutional learning.

Consequently, new environments for learning are being designed or reshaped in order to respond to an increasing need for changing the pedagogical style, to embrace information technology and adapt to changing numbers of learners (AMA Alexi Marmot Associates, 2006). Social learning spaces, as they are normally called are created in order to "*facilitate the changing pedagogical practices needed to support a mass higher education system with its greater student diversity*" (Temple and Phillipakou, 2007: 4). As Oblinger (2006: 1.2) suggests:

*What we know about how people learn has also changed our ideas about learning space. There is value from bumping into someone and having a casual conversation. There is value from hands-on, active learning as well as from discussion and reflection. There is value in being able to receive immediate support when needed and from being able to integrate multiple activities (such as writing, searching, and computing) to complete a project. And, there is value from learning that occurs in authentic settings, such as an estuary or on a trading floor. How do we turn the entire campus – and many places off campus – into an integrated environment?*

Table 3 replies to some of these valuable points: that social innovation can support the enhancement of a trend for creation of social learning spaces in the UK higher education by using collaboration techniques. This is what section 4 is all about, that it deals with empirical evidence of how is this possible by utilising specific examples of British Universities.

### **3. Research Methodology**

Methodology-wise this paper is based upon primary research of qualitative nature via conduct of semi-structured interviews with university students and members of staff from Bournemouth University between 2005 and 2008. According to Yin (1994) interviewing is one of the most important sources of case study information. This proved to be the case with this paper, as the participant interviewees gave a comprehensive picture of where they wanted the university to be in terms of launching social learning spaces. However, the vast majority of data is based on collection of secondary data. Especially in the case of other British Universities secondary data was a very useful source of information indeed. It incorporated a broad range of reports that referred to each specific case study although the amount of data used for this paper was limited.

## **4. Social Learning Spaces at British Universities - Discussion**

### **4.1. Social Learning Spaces in the United Kingdom**

Social learning spaces in the United Kingdom higher education, as an innovative way of learning have transcended both social and formal learning activities, allowing for informal sharing of ideas and collaborative learning. It has been suggested that an informal and welcoming learning atmosphere can, partly, be cultivated via a strong network of relationships that are supported by the provision of time and space for their development (O’ Donovan *et al*, 2008). In addition, deep approaches to learning pursue an active understanding of knowledge concepts, the relationship between them and an awareness of how to apply them in “real life” (Brett and Nagra, 2005). Moreover, the student characteristics have changed throughout the years, For example, social interaction is a growing part of learning or technology comes as something natural nowadays. This has an impact to learning spaces, as classrooms are not the only form of learning anymore although it is still assumed to be the principal one. However, data suggests that a significant amount of learning activity takes place outside the classroom (Milne, 2006).

Cousin and Deepwell (2005; cited by O’ Donovan *et al*, 2008: 212) concur with this view and point out that “*place, both real and virtual, is fundamental*

*for the emergence of ways of being and coming to know*". It is now acknowledged that the design of learning spaces can have a powerful impact upon student performance and engagement. Therefore, more learning takes place outside the "traditional" classroom and there is an emphasis on collaborative learning, informal learning and network connectivity. This has created a general belief about the importance of social learning space within British Universities – space that can combine social and learning activities along with facilitative technology (Chism, 2006; cited by O' Donovan *et al*, 2008).

#### **4.2. Particular Cases of Social Learning Spaces in the UK**

##### **4.2.1. Computer Rooms in Wolverhampton, West Midlands-England**

The current norms for computer provision in the UK higher education regarding the layout and the manner students can make use of them do not match in many cases with the conditions of deep approaches to learning. For example, the vast majority of "open-access" computer centres are organised as serried ranks of computers which are side-by-side. Or they have library type of restrictions of not eating and drinking. This simply indicates that such a way does not work out as effectively as it should. There have been investigations which suggest that students would prefer to use computers in a collaborative mode for their learning. The University of Wolverhampton in the West Midlands, UK conducted a research aiming to investigate student perceptions about, and use of, computer facilities that are designed to encourage a collaborative approach to computer-based self-study (Brett and Nagra, 2005).

The University provides a social learning space of 24 fixed computers arranged on circular tables and also wireless connections for those who would use a laptop. Additionally, the room has a coffee bar and no restrictions on talking, eating and drinking. The research wanted to identify if by offering self-access computers in such an environment students were supported in using collaborative approaches to their self-directed studies. The research findings indicated the following: observations of the use of computers in the new environment showed that nearly 70% of total use was for study and of this around 17.52% was for collaborative work. This means that more than 25% of the work in the social learning space was collaborative. However, from the people who used computers purely for social reasons – the rest 30% - only 2.11% used them collaboratively (Brett and Nagra, 2005).

##### **4.2.2. The LearnHigher Centres, England**

Learnhigher is a collaborative Centre of Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL), which includes 16 universities around England and covers twenty learning development areas. It aims to "*share learning development resources, some specifically created, and build an evidence base for understanding the effective use of resources in students' study and in academics' teaching practices*" (Learnhigher CETL, 2007: 1). Within this programme probably the activity with the most impact upon students' lives is the creation of the Learnhigher Centres or Rooms. These rooms are largely used by students and members of staff. They have been designed to pursue a more socially friendly character in learning, the one that goes beyond the narrow perspective of the typical classroom (From the author's observations).



The Learnhigher Centre at Bournemouth University, Dorset was launched in October 2006 and since then has made a significant impact in the university's academic and social life. The room can be booked for a particular activity by students, members of staff but also members of the local community in Dorset, UK. The only restriction is that it should not be booked for purely teaching purposes. The room is booked almost every day for particular events and students can also use it for collaborative and team work when it is free of use. It is never locked during term time and everybody who feels the need can use it. Some of the groups that have been using the room regularly include: The Student Union; the University's International Office; the Aimhigher Group; the Development Education in Dorset group; and several student societies e.g. Business Mania (the Entrepreneurship Society) or Poetry and Culture Society (From the author's observations).

It would be worthwhile to refer at this point to the opinion of a student about the Learnhigher Centre at Bournemouth University. When he was asked about the impact of the centre to student life of the university he replied as it follows:

*Q: Any comment about the space?*

*A: Am, it could be a bit bigger. It's always a bit cramped in a kind of ways so a bit more space would make a bit of change I guess.*

*Q: What students thought about the room? What was the feeling?*

*A: The feeling was that because it's not very much like a lecture-theatre style it makes things more informal; a more informal environment so the ideas can flow; it's more chatty; people feel that they are all related so they can sit back and be involved more as well. So, participation in this way is usually quite good.*

*Q: Has the use of the room made any impact to your work? If you had the same sessions somewhere else would it be the same or the room itself made any difference?*

*A: I guess that could be probably used if you compared when you had more people involved because the lecture rooms we have go like from bottom up, always a hierarchical type of thing whereas there everybody sits at the same level making things easier for people I think...If it had more seats, yeah it creates more interaction between people.*

#### **4.3. Social Learning Spaces in the UK - Discussion**

The list of the case studies is obviously not exhaustive but indicative of how workable social learning spaces can be. What is important at this stage is to examine how much influential social innovation can be in this context. For this research evidence will be tested against the features of Table 3. Regarding the element of generating ideas by understanding needs and identifying potential solutions, it could be argued that social learning spaces is an innovative approach for British universities. They are used in a multi-purpose manner and evidence shows that they can make the difference. It is worth to mention the opinion of a representative from a local community group in Dorset who has been using the Learnhigher Centre at Bournemouth University:

*I think it's the combination of having something slightly more community accessible in an educational setting. So, what I think attracts us to the room is that we can access something at the university, which isn't a more formalised lecture...What it enabled us to do is have flexibility of space more and it means that we can do our activity easier to be honest. Because, for the workshops we run for school students we need flexibility to move chairs, to move tables, to move sort of different activities and you don't get that...In similar rooms you are still piling up, there is still not enough space and in the lecture rooms you don't have this flexibility at all. So for our work we can do more creative activities there.*

With respect to the element of developing, prototyping and piloting new ideas the social learning spaces under consideration have been used as places that can offer learning: by reflection; by doing; and through conversation. According to AMA Alexi Marmot Associates (2006) case study rooms in British business schools are typically designed with u-shaped seating so that students are able to see each other. This provides the tutor with the ability to have a balance of peer-to-peer reviewing of student work. Subsequently, regarding the assessing, scaling up and diffusing good ideas it could be argued that the Learnhigher Centre in Bournemouth offers an immersive type of environment because it allows direct involving by the participants. As a consequence, this allows for the development of a stimulating environment which can promote fruitful sort of action to be followed. In the end, it is flexibility that allows for wider agreement and participation and it seems as if the room inspires it.

To a certain degree, social technologies can support betterment of the conditions offered to students and university staff. For example, the research at Northumbria University mentioned above showed interestingly that students prefer to work with their laptops than using fixed PCs. This shows that wireless technology has reached affordable maturity and it is more flexible compared to PCs – people can have access to the Internet from where they prefer rather than being in a designated room. The latter indicates one of the changes that may happen to universities regarding other things as well such as less use of classrooms, which looks to be the trend in the near future. Finally, the role of leadership towards social innovation becomes vital. There is a certain need for university leadership which can drive change further into creating learning spaces that are flexible and networked combining formal and informal activities. This strongly indicates the establishment of an environment without boundaries in which learning can happen everywhere.

## **5. Concluding Remarks**

This paper is an initial effort to understand and interpret ways with which social innovation can impact on social learning spaces in the United Kingdom higher education. It is also understood that collaboration can be used here as a theoretical mechanism that promotes and enhances social innovation. Empirical evidence from British Universities has showed that social learning spaces increasingly work in many ways in favour of students as pioneers of social innovation. Three key learning styles can be suggested that apply to social learning spaces: learning by reflection; learning by doing; and

learning through conversation. In addition, seven types of such spaces could be identified: group teaching/learning; simulated environments; immersive environments; peer-to-peer and social learning; clusters; individual learning; and external spaces (AMA Alexi Marmot Associates, 2006).

However, absence of sustained and systematically provided analysis on social innovation is a point that needs consideration. In particular lack of knowledge is something that makes the situation harder to see where the main issues lie. It is estimated that practice on social innovation remains roughly at the point where sciences were about a century ago. Nevertheless, this tends to change as more systematic approaches bring on more solutions (Mulgan, 2006).

This is potentially good news for such a sensitive sector like higher education. Higher education needs to make changes in order to prepare graduates for the sort of life they would wish to have. Expanding social learning spaces from an experimental to a steadier and more sustained level seems one of the steps that has been taken. Because as Lomas and Oblinger (2006: 5.11) put it:

*Students are changing, technologies are changing, and learning spaces are changing. Students will use the spaces that best suit their needs. By examining students' habits and use patterns and then creating spaces that meet their needs, we have an opportunity to make our institutions more student-centred and appealing.*

## **6. References**

Allee, V (2006) "Collaboration, innovation, and value creation in a global telecom" *The Learning Organisation*, Vol. 13, No. 6, pp. 569-578

AMA Alexi Marmot Associates (2006) *Spaces for learning: a review of learning spaces in further and higher education* (Report produced for the Scottish Funding Council)

Apostolakis, C (2003) "Evaluating the Quality of Inter-organisational Relationships: Does One plus One Equal Only Two?" in P. Hibbert, ed., *Co-creating Emergent Insight: Multi-organisational Partnerships, Alliances and Networks*. Glasgow: Graduate School of Business, University of Strathclyde

Apostolakis, C (2007a) *Partnerships and Strategy: Collaboration for Urban Regeneration in England* (Unpublished PhD thesis)

Apostolakis, C (2007b) "Strategy for Collaboration: An Operational Framework for Local Strategic Partnerships", in *British Academy of Management Conference Proceedings 2007*. Coventry: Warwick Business School, University of Warwick, UK

Boyer R & Rogers Hollingsworth, J (1997) "From national embeddedness to spatial and institutional nestedness" in J. Rogers Hollingsworth", ed, *Contemporary Capitalism – The Embeddedness of Institutions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Bramson, R A & Buss T (2002) "Methods for Whole System Change in Public Organisations and Communities: An Overview of the Issues" *Public Organisation Review: A Global Journal*, Vol. 2, pp. 211-221

Brett, P & Nagra, J (2005) "An investigation into students' use of a computer-based social learning space: lessons for facilitating collaborative approaches to learning" *British Journal of Educational Technology*, Vol. 36, No. 2, pp. 281-292

Centre of Social Innovation (2008) *About Social Innovation* [Available from the Internet – accessed on 01 June 2008] <URL: <http://www.socialinnovation.ca/about/social-innovation>>

Damanpour, F & Schneider, M (2006) "Phases of the adoption of Innovation in Organisations: Effects of Environment, Organisation and Top Managers" *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 215-236

Department of Trade & Industry (2003) *Innovation Report: Competing in the Global Economy- Overview*. London: DTI

Foster, A (2008) "What's new – A round-up of new products and initiatives" *Business Information Review*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 127-138

Granovetter, M (1985) "Economic action and social structure: a theory of embeddedness", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 91, No. 3, pp. 481-510

Himmelman, A T (1996) "On the Theory and Practice of Transformational Collaboration: From Social Service to Social Justice" in C. Huxham, ed, *Creating Collaborative Advantage* London: SAGE Publications Ltd

Huxham, C (1996) "Collaboration and Collaborative Advantage" in C. Huxham, ed, *Creating Collaborative Advantage* London: SAGE Publications Ltd

Kanter, R M (1994) "Collaborative Advantage: Successful partnerships manage the relationship, not just the deal" *Harvard Business Review*, July-August, pp. 96-108

Kavanagh, M H & Ashkanasy N M (2006) "The Impact of Leadership and Change Management Strategy on Organisational Culture and Individual Acceptance of Change during a Merger" *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 17, pp. 81-103

Learnhigher Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (2007) *Second annual self-evaluation report*, July

Lomas, C & Oblinger, D G (2006) "Student Practices and Their Impact on Learning Spaces" in D G Oblinger, ed, *Learning Spaces*. E-book: Educause [Available from the Internet – accessed on 12 June 2008] <URL: <http://www.educause.edu/learningspaces>>

- Milne, A J (2006) "Designing Blended Learning Space to the Student Experience" in D G Oblinger, ed, *Learning Spaces*. E-book: Educause [Available from the Internet – accessed on 12 June 2008] <URL: <http://www.educause.edu/learningspaces>>
- Morelli, N (2007) "Social Innovation and New Industrial Contexts: Can Designers 'Industrialise' Socially Responsible Solutions?" *Design Issues* Vol. 23, No. 4, autumn, pp. 3-21
- Moulaert, F, Martinelli, F, Swyngedouw, E & Gonzalez, S (2005) "Towards Alternative Model(s) of Local Innovation", *Urban Studies*, Vol. 42, No. 11, October, pp. 1969-1990
- Mulgan, G (2006) "The Process of Social Innovation" *Innovations*, spring 2006, pp. 145-162
- Mumford, M D (2000) "Managing Creative People: Strategies and Tactics for Innovation" *Human Resources Management Review*, Vol. 10, pp. 313-355
- Oblinger, D G (2006) "Space as a Change Agent" in D G Oblinger, ed, *Learning Spaces*. E-book: Educause [Available from the Internet – accessed on 12 June 2008] <URL: <http://www.educause.edu/learningspaces>>
- O' Donovan, B, Price, M & Rust, C (2008) "Developing student understanding of assessment standards: a nested hierarchy of approaches" *Teaching in Higher Education*, Vol. 13, No. 2, April, pp. 205-217
- Osborne, S P & Flynn N (1997) "Managing the Innovative Capacity of Voluntary and Non-Profit Organizations in the Provision of Public Services", *Public Money & Management*, Vol. 17, No. 4, pp. 31-39
- Perkmann, M & Walsh, K (2007) "University-industry relationships and open innovation: towards a research agenda" *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol. 9, No. 4, pp. 259-280
- Pittaway, L, Robertson, M, Munir, K, Denyer, D & Neely, A (2004) "Networking and innovation: a systematic review of the evidence" *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol. 5/6, No. 3&4, pp. 137-168
- Salter, L (2002) "Institutional Learning in Standards Setting" in M S Gertler, ed, *Innovation and Social Learning: Institutional Adaptation in an Era of Technological Change*. Gordonsville: Palgrave MacMillan
- Schaeffer, PV & Loveridge, S (2002) "Toward an understanding of types of public-private cooperation" *Public Performance & Management Review*, Vol. 26, No. 2, December 2002, pp. 169-189
- Schumpeter, J A (1976, 5<sup>th</sup> ed) *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. London: Allen and Unwin

Shankar, K (2008) "Wind, Water, and Wi-Fi: New Trends in Community Informatics and Disaster Management" *The Information Society*, Vol. 24, pp. 116-120

Simms, J R (2006) "Technical and Social Innovation Determinants of Behaviour", *Systems Research and Behavioural Science*, Vol. 23, pp. 383-393

Sink, D (1996) "Five Obstacles to Community-Based Collaboration and Some Thoughts on Overcoming them" " in C. Huxham, ed, *Creating Collaborative Advantage* London: SAGE Publications Ltd

Sydow, J, Lerch, F, Huxham, C & Hilbert, P (2007) "Leadership and clusters...or clusters of leadership" (Paper presented at the British Academy of Management Conference, University of Warwick, UK, September 2007)

Tarrant, L (2007) *Whole System Change: You Can Do It a Drop at a Time* [Available from the Internet – accessed on 01 June 2008] <URL: <http://www.speaking.com/speakers/lindatarrant.html> >

Temple, P with the assistance of Phillipakou, O (2007) *Learning spaces for the 21<sup>st</sup> century* (Report produced for Higher Education Academy)

The Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University (2007) *Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America's Research Universities*

Tierney, T J (2006) "The Leadership Deficit" *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, summer, pp.26-35

Vangen, S & Huxham, C (2002) "Enacting Leadership for Collaborative Advantage" (Paper no. 2002-02 published in the Working Paper Series of the University of Strathclyde, Graduate School of Business, Glasgow, UK)

Wolfe, D A & Gertler, M S (2002) "Innovation and Social Learning: an Introduction" in M S Gertler, ed, *Innovation and Social Learning: Institutional Adaptation in an Era of Technological Change*. Gordonsville: Palgrave MacMillan

Yin, R. (1994, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition) *Case study research – Design and methods* SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks

## TABLES

**Table 1:** Theoretical elements useful for analysing social innovation dynamics  
– Extracted and adapted from Moulaert *et al*, 2005: pp. 1980-1981

<b>Dimensions</b>	<b>Civil society neighbourhoods</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
<i>Territory, population and development planning</i>	Processes against social exclusion and segregated neighbourhoods, although boundaries between social environments	Social innovation is not a predictable dimension but a multifaceted search for mechanisms
<i>Satisfaction of human needs – Strategies to meet them</i>	Complementary arrangement between welfare state and community, participatory democracy and, social capital building	Involvement of non-traditional actors in governance who create opportunities for innovation
<i>Human, organisational and financial resources</i>	Mobilisation of creative and productive resources within communities	Governance of network resources might help to mobilise initiatives, if appropriate relevant qualities exist
<i>Organisational and institutional dynamics – civil society</i>	Reordering of governance structures, as an opportunity window	Involvement of non-traditional actors in governance – Challenging established practices
<i>Constraints on development</i>	Social fragmentation and social exclusion may reproduce in community and governance	Locally appeared histories and cultures can be empowering but also disempowering

**Table 2:** Elements that define the impact of Collaboration to Social Innovation – Adjusting the model by Mulgan, 2006

<b>Impact of Collaboration to Social Innovation</b>	
<b><i>A. Core Phases of Social Innovation Process</i></b>	<b><i>Indicators</i></b>
<i>Generating ideas by understanding needs and identifying potential solutions</i>	Collaboration as a tool for identifying ideas of a human or organisational need – this is tied to new possibilities which cultivate social innovation
<i>Developing, prototyping, and piloting ideas</i>	Crossing the “chasm” of passing from being promising ideas to becoming mainstream products or services by using collaborative efforts
<i>Assessing, scaling up and diffusing good ideas</i>	Proving an idea in practice and making it grown, replicated, adapted or franchised – Communication is considered as very important
<i>Learning and evolving</i>	Learning and adaptation can turn social innovation being different from what was anticipated - Collaborative efforts can prove to be important at this stage
<b><i>B. Important Issues of Social Innovation Process</i></b>	<b><i>Indicators</i></b>
<i>Social technologies as social practice responsive to individual and organisational conditions</i>	Social technologies can play an important role in bettering individuals’ or organisational life as part of a collaboration process
<i>The impact of a whole system change process</i>	Need for change that reflects a flexible, participative and engaging approach in a system of interconnected groups, communities or organisations
<i>Leadership and how it can contribute in achieving social innovation</i>	Leaders should be competent and trained on how to transform their partner individuals or organisations in achieving social innovation



**Table 3:** Interpreting social innovation in the context of social learning spaces

<b>Social Innovation for Social Learning Spaces</b>	
<b><i>A. Core Phases of Social Innovation Process</i></b>	<b><i>Indicators</i></b>
<i>Generating ideas by understanding needs and identifying potential solutions</i>	Social learning spaces is an innovative respond to changing technological and pedagogical needs in the UK Higher Education
<i>Developing, prototyping, and piloting ideas</i>	Three key learning styles can be suggested that apply to social learning spaces: learning by reflection; learning by doing; and learning through conversation (AMA Alexi Marmot Associates, 2006)
<i>Assessing, scaling up and diffusing good ideas</i>	Seven types of social spaces could be identified: group teaching/learning; simulated environments; immersive environments; peer-to-peer and social learning; clusters; individual learning; and external spaces (AMA Alexi Marmot Associates, 2006)
<i>Learning and evolving</i>	Analysing the process of change towards social learning spaces and emphasising the need for collective agreement and action
<b><i>B. Important Issues of Social Innovation Process</i></b>	<b><i>Indicators</i></b>
<i>Social technologies as social practice responsive to individual and organisational conditions</i>	Social technologies can play an important role in bettering social learning spaces e.g. by expanding e-learning and m-learning
<i>The impact of a whole system change process</i>	Need to reflect on crucial future whole system change in higher education e.g. the relatively fewer seats in lecture rooms
<i>Leadership and how it can contribute in achieving social innovation</i>	Driving change in an entrepreneurial and flexible way