

2019

MASTER THESIS

Memduh Eren GİDERLER



T.C.

ANKARA YILDIRIM BEYAZIT UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

**SOCIAL INNOVATION IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS:
ITS DRIVERS AND CHALLENGES**

A CASE STUDY OF SOCIAL INNOVATION IN TURKEY

THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE

Memduh Eren GİDERLER

THE DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION

ANKARA, 2019

**SOCIAL INNOVATION IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS:
ITS DRIVERS AND CHALLENGES
A CASE STUDY OF SOCIAL INNOVATION IN TURKEY**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES OF
ANKARA YILDIRIM BEYAZIT UNIVERSITY**

BY

MEMDUH EREN GİDERLER

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION**

JUNE 2019

APPROVAL PAGE

Approval of the Institute of Social Sciences

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Seyfullah YILDIRIM

Manager of the Institute

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Prof. Dr. Nilay ALÜFTEKİN SAKARYA

Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özge GÖKBULUT
ÖZDEMİR

Supervisor

Examining Committee Members (first name belongs to the chairperson of the jury and the second name belongs to supervisor)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özge GÖKBULUT ÖZDEMİR (AYBU) -----

Prof. Dr. Nilay ALÜFTEKİN SAKARYA (AYBU) -----

Assoc. Prof. Dr. İrge ŞENER (Cankaya University) -----

PLAGIARISM PAGE

I hereby declare that all information in this thesis has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work; otherwise I accept all legal responsibility.

Memduh Eren GİDERLER

ABSTRACT

Social Innovation in Public Institutions: Its Drivers and Challenges – A Case Study of Social Innovation in Turkey

Giderler, Memduh Eren

Master Thesis, Department of Management and Organization

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özge GÖKBULUT ÖZDEMİR

June 2019, 96 pages

Social innovation and social entrepreneurship are the common denominators in the area of social welfare, which has been increasing in recent times. The attention is focused on corporate social responsibility but the concept social innovation and its distinctions from the corporate social responsibility is still “fuzzy”. Especially, social innovation in public institutes is a field that is not sufficiently studied. This thesis provides comprehensive research on the concept of social innovation and social entrepreneurship, discusses the characteristics of these concepts, which are different from the concept of ‘pure’ technological innovation and corporate social responsibility. This thesis also discusses the ways in which social innovation can contribute to social welfare in the region, country and global scale. In this thesis, public institutions in Turkey will be discussed in the context of different sectors and social innovation capacities by using the case study evaluation form. The qualifications and limitations of public institutions in the field of social innovation will be analysed and compared with qualitative research methods. The thesis contributes to a clear understanding of social innovation that can facilitate the dissemination of knowledge and the development of the research field.

Keywords: social innovation, social entrepreneurship, social value creation, social innovation in public institutions, Turkey

ÖZET

Kamu Kurumlarında Sosyal İnovasyon: Sürükleyiciler ve Engeller Türkiye’de Sosyal İnovasyon Üzerine Vaka Çalışması

Giderler, Memduh Eren

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Yönetim ve Organizasyon Ana Bilim Dalı

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Özge GÖKBULUT ÖZDEMİR

Haziran 2019, 98 sayfa

Sosyal yenilik ve sosyal girişimcilik, sosyal refah alanında son zamanlarda artmakta olan ortak paydalardır. Yazında dikkat çoğunlukla kurumsal sosyal sorumluluğa odaklanmaktadır ancak sosyal inovasyon kavramının kurumsal sosyal sorumluluktan ayrılması hala “bulanık” bir kavram olarak ön plana çıkmaktadır. Özellikle kamu kurumlarında sosyal inovasyon yeterince çalışılmamış bir alandır. Bu tez, sosyal inovasyon ve sosyal girişimcilik kavramı üzerine kapsamlı araştırmalar sunmakta, “saf” teknolojik inovasyon ve kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk kavramından farklı olan bu kavramların özelliklerini tartışmaktadır. Bu tez aynı zamanda, sosyal inovasyonun bölge, ülke ve küresel ölçekte sosyal refaha katkıda bulunma yöntemlerini tartışmaktadır. Bu tez çalışmasında, Türkiye'deki kamu kurumları, vaka çalışması değerlendirme formu kullanılarak farklı sektörler ve sosyal inovasyon kapasiteleri bağlamında tartışılacaktır. Kamu kurumlarının sosyal inovasyon alanındaki nitelikleri ve kısıtlamaları analiz edilecek ve nitel araştırma yöntemleriyle karşılaştırılacaktır. Tez, bilginin yayılmasını ve araştırma alanının geliştirilmesini kolaylaştıracak açık bir sosyal inovasyon anlayışına katkıda bulunur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: sosyal inovasyon, sosyal girişimcilik, sosyal fayda, kamu kurumlarında sosyal inovasyon, Türkiye

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank my supervisor Özge Gökbulut Özdemir for the support, the guidance, and the feedback she has given me throughout my thesis writing. I also wish to thank all the respondents who have been interviewed for this thesis and have contributed with valuable information for my thesis. Finally, I would like to thank my dear family for their support. Without their eternal love and sacrifice, this process would not have been completed.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPROVAL PAGE.....	iii
PLAGIARISM PAGE	iv
ABSTRACT	v
ÖZET	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF TABLES	x
PART I.....	1
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background.....	6
1.2. Aim of the Thesis and Research Questions	9
1.3. Outline of the Thesis.....	10
PART II	11
2. THEORY	11
2.1. Social Innovation	11
2.2. What Is Distinct About Social Innovation?	15
2.3. Social Innovation in the Public Sector.....	15
2.4. Institutionalism in Social Innovation in The Public Sector	17
2.5. Analytical Framework	20
2.5.1. Three Pillars of Institutions.....	21
2.5.2. Legitimacy	24
2.5.3. Wicked Problems	25
PART III.....	26
3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	26
3.1. Research Design	26
3.1.1. Selection of Respondents.....	27
3.2. Data Collection	32
3.2.1. The Interview Process.....	33
3.3. Data Analysis	34
3.3.1. Analytical Framework	35
3.4. Validity, Ethical Considerations and Limitations.....	36
PART IV.....	39

4. RESULTS FROM THE INTERVIEWS.....	39
4.1. Social Innovation in the Public Institutions and Its Importance	39
4.2. Legal Requirements and Standardization	43
4.3. Proof of Entitlement.....	46
4.4. The Actors Work to Support What Leads To Social Innovation.....	48
4.5. Exchanges between Actors and Symbols	54
4.6. Challenges with the Social Innovation in the Public Sector	57
PART V	60
5. ANALYSIS OF THE EMPIRICAL RESULTS.....	60
5.1. Legitimacy	60
5.1.1. Positive Effects on the Society	60
5.1.2. Solution of the Social Problems.....	62
5.1.3. Increasing Social Welfare	64
5.2. The Three Pillars of Institutions	65
5.3. Regulative Pillar	66
5.3.1. Standardized Strategy	66
5.4. Normative Pillar.....	68
5.4.1. Training, Professionalization, and Certification	68
5.5. Cultural-Cognitive Pillar.....	70
5.5.1. Common Understanding	70
5.5.2. Symbols	72
5.6. Wicked Problems	72
5.6.1. Complex to Measure	72
5.6.2. Drain-Pipe Problem	74
5.7. Concluding Remarks.....	75
PART VI.....	76
6. CONCLUSION	76
6.1. Contribution of Thesis	78
6.2. Discussion and Future Research	78
REFERENCES	81
Appendix A – Questionnaire for the Interviewees	93
Ek A1 – Yarı Yapılandırılmış Görüşme Formu / Sosyal İnovasyon ile İlgili Bölüm... 94	
Appendix B – Interviewees	95

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
Table 1. Six Generations of Innovation.....	7
Table 2. Three Pillars of Institutions	23
Table 3. Respondents and the authorities/organizations they work in	28
Table 4. Key codes from the data analysis process and which part of the analytical framework the sections in the empirical chapter belong to	35
Table 5. Quotes from chapter 4.1	41
Table 6. Quotes from chapter 4.2	45
Table 7. Quotes from chapter 4.3	47
Table 8. Social Innovation Projects of the Public Institutions	53
Table 9. Quotes from chapter 4.5	56
Table 10. Quotes from chapter 4.6	59

ABBREVIATIONS

The abbreviations used in this dissertation and their definitions are listed below.

Abbreviations	Definitions
APSII	Australian Public Sector Innovation Indicators
BSc	Balanced Scorecard
EC	European Commission
EPSIS	European Public Sector Innovation Scoreboard
EU	European Union
KYK	Higher Education Student Loan and Housing Board
MEB	Ministry of National Education
MÜSIAD	Independent Industrialists and Businessmen Association
OASIS	Ongoing Assessment of Social Impact
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PSIA	Poverty and Social Impact Analysis
R & D	Research and Development
RCTs	Randomized Control Trials
SBD	Strategy and Budget Directorate
SCBA	Social Cost Benefit Analysis
SIN	System Integration and Networks
SROI	Social Return on Investment
SRS	Social Reporting Standard
TBB	General Secretariat of the Union of Municipalities of Turkey
TBL	Triple Bottom Line
TBMM	Grand National Assembly of Turkey
TDZ	Technology Development Zone

Abbreviations

Definitions

TEPSIE	Theoretical, Empirical and Policy Foundations for Building Social Innovation in Europe
TOBB	Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey
TÜBİTAK	General Secretariat of the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey
TURKSAT	Turkish Statistical Institute
TÜSİAD	Turkish Industry and Business Association
UYAP	The National Judicial Network Information System
YÖK	Council of Higher Education

PART I

1. INTRODUCTION

This introduction chapter begins with the definition of important terms in these fields, together with the definition of entrepreneurship, innovation, social entrepreneurship, social innovation, and social innovation in the public sector (public social innovation) and the definitions of differences between the concepts of innovation and entrepreneurship. After the introduction part, there is a background description of social innovation in the public sector, followed by the aim of the thesis and research questions. The chapter ends with a description of the outline of the thesis.

In the 21st century there are progresses and developments in technological developments, in the income obtained, in the opportunities and capabilities, in the quality of life, in the average life expectancy, in communication and transportation, and in many other important and inclusive sectors and variables. While such developments and progresses are taking place at an irresistible rate and power in almost the whole world, such developments and progresses bring with them some social problems. In other words, technological developments and advances, which emerge as a result of an innovative research and working infrastructure, bring about the social problems that are expected to be solved through innovative methods. Therefore, these developments that can contribute to the social life as a result of the innovations carried out by the entrepreneurs and carry out innovative operations and activities and that can arise in the product, service and process phases and the social problems encountered as a result of these should be considered as a flow.

Drucker (2002) claims that innovation is the main tool of the entrepreneur. So, it is logical to explain entrepreneurship term before clearing out the term innovation. Entrepreneurship is not a new concept and there are quite different perspectives on the concept of

entrepreneurship. Although there are many different perspectives on the concept of entrepreneurship, it is appropriate to say that there is a conceptual consensus. In other words, the question that aims to clear who is the entrepreneur can be explained by passing through the filter of many researchers that have studies on entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurial function, by passing through the many researchers, can be described as exploitation of opportunities in order to produce new products, provide new services, or creating and using new production processes that did not previously exist (Shane, & Venkataraman, 2000; Townsend, & Hart, 2008; Ormiston, & Seymour, 2011). To make it clear, the entrepreneur, who carries out or implements entrepreneurial activity or function, does not only reveal a new product in contrast to the general opinion or view. In addition, he or she may provide a new service, or introduce a new process or process mechanism in the presentation or delivery of the product or service offered. In short, entrepreneurial function can be handled as an organization creation process instead of a new single product or service. In order to conceptualize the term entrepreneurship –the entrepreneurial function-, this process can be analysed “as a discovery of opportunities and the subsequent creation of new economic activity, often via the creation of a new organization” (Reynolds et al., 2005).

In the literature, there are some classifications to analyse entrepreneurship to clarify the term more comprehensively and clearly. In other words, while analysing the term entrepreneurship there is a systematic way to understand what are the systematic characteristics of entrepreneurship with the terms capitalist and manager (Cuervo, Ribiero, & Roig, 2007). While an entrepreneur accept risks, capitalist and manager are aversion to risk-taking. Additionally, capitalist assesses the alternatives and manager is a rational decision-maker. On the other hand, an entrepreneur uses intuition, explores new businesses and initiates new ways of acting. In short, an entrepreneur always identifies business opportunities and he or she is a creator of a new enterprise (Leibstein, 1979). It will be not surprising that the entrepreneur who accepts risks has the right to have profit as well.

As Drucker (2002) claims that innovation is the tool of an entrepreneur it would make sense to explain and focus on the term innovation in this part of the introduction chapter. Before defining the term innovation, it is significant to note that innovation is not just a tool that is specific to the entrepreneur or that it can only be used by an entrepreneur. In other words, a

capitalist or a manager can take innovative decisions as well. However, in this section, it is wanted to be underlined that the term innovation is an indispensable and very important concept for an entrepreneur (Barringer, & Bluedorn, 1999). Change as a law of nature takes place at any moment. As a result of this change, new applications and developments are encountered every day and are adapted to these innovations. However, innovation defines something new that can be deliberately sustained and reproducible that brings a value or benefit (Drucker, 1999; Hollenstein, 1996; Howard, & Sheth, 1969; Nohria, & Gulati, 1996). In other words, Innovation can be defined as an application that meets new requirements, unclear needs or existing market needs. To make it clear, innovation does not only come with a solution to an existing need but also creates a need and a solution at the same time that people has not realized yet.

In summary, when the terms entrepreneur, entrepreneurship and innovation are explained up to this section, it will be discussed what characteristics and differences are experienced when the 'social' expression comes to the front of these terms. In other words, it is aimed to make it clear who is the social entrepreneur and what is the term social innovation according to researchers.

To make the distinctions between business entrepreneur and social entrepreneur, there are three main key differences that are about profit, investor and the definition of wealth according to the entrepreneurs. Before explaining these three differences it is logical to understand who the business entrepreneur is. Making a profit is the reason of the business entrepreneur's existence. In other words, a business entrepreneur only acts for the sake of turning the profit (Martin, & Osberg, 2007). Firstly, from this definition, it can be concluded that the social entrepreneur does not pursue a profit, but this deduction will be wrong. Because, the social entrepreneur also aims for profit, but his or her main aim is to increase social welfare and aims to use the amount of profit that social entrepreneur has gained on new initiatives that will increase social welfare (Alter, 2007; Alvord, Brown & Letts, 2004; Dees, 2007). Second, many social entrepreneurs get their initial funding from philanthropists. Although these investors want to see a return on investment (ROI), they are more interested in business because of their social missions. A traditional, business entrepreneurship usually seeks capital from a venture capitalist firm — and they're all about

the ROI and nothing else. Thirdly, both types of entrepreneurs seek to have profit and affect serious change in a positive way. However, a business entrepreneur defines wealth as money. On the other hand, a social entrepreneur sees money as a tool for their main purpose to affect real change throughout the world for a better social welfare (Thompson, Alvy & Lees, 2000).

The term innovation has a lot of subheadings in the literature like technical innovation, administrative innovation, product innovation, process innovation, radical innovation, incremental innovation, architectural innovation, creative innovation, or adoptive innovation (Damanpour, 1991; Knight, 1967; Damanpour, & Evan, 1984; Kimberley, & Evanisko, 1981; Utterback, & Abbernathy, 1975; Thompson, 2004). However, the term social innovation cannot be classified as a subheading of innovation. On the contrary, it is thought that it would be more appropriate to consider and examine as a different kind of innovation. Because the term social innovation is capable of covering all of the sub-headings mentioned above, it would mean having a contextual and conceptual perspective (Moulaert, & Sekia, 2003). Although there is no consensus or concurrence on the concept of social innovation, it is mainly the process of developing and implementing effective solutions to challenging and often systemic social issues to support social progress. Despite the term social innovation is weakly conceptualized, due to the rather grey dominance, policy-based literature (Mulgan, 2009; Goldenberg et al., 2009), there are four elements seem to be recurring. First, social innovation seeks to produce long-term results that are appropriate for a (part of) society, given the needs and challenges of the upcoming problems of the society (within the group). Society is the key word of the first dimension of social innovation. Secondly, social innovation has a change-maker or rule-changer characteristic that is more visible and strong than innovation has. In other words, social innovation can be explained with the words that are 'roundaboutness' (Majone, 1998; p. 97) or 'institutional conversion' (Hall, & Thelen, 2009). Thirdly, organizational boundaries and jurisdictions should be crossed because social innovation undoubtedly needs and refers to the idea of collaboration with relevant stakeholders (Sørensen, & Torfing, 2011). In the end, social innovation needs and shows the exchange of highly free and interactive information, knowledge and experience in which new ideas and concepts are discussed in intra and inter-organizational networks. (Chesbrough, 2006; Von Hippel, 2005).

As the concept of social innovation is concerned with society as the dominant feature, within the characteristics of being a game changer and normative in order to increase the welfare of the society, it is an interactive structure that throws aside the organizational constraints and boundaries and it provides the information flow on both sides. Social innovation -with these features- deserves to be an indispensable part of the public sector and can be analysed as a touchstone and obligation of existence of the public sector (Hartley, 2005).

Even though there is not a consensus or a concurrence about the term social innovation in the literature, the contextual relationship between social innovation and the public sector will be discussed and the concept of social innovation in the public sector will be defined and the value and importance of social innovation in the public sector will be addressed in this part of the introduction chapter briefly (Moore, 1995; Bason, 2018). The aim of social innovation is to increase social welfare; to increase accessibility and quality in basic social issues such as equality, justice, education, health and transportation. From this logic, the act of social innovation and its processes meet these common goals with the existing and operating public institutions. In other words, as Drucker's example, that accepts innovation as the tool of an entrepreneur, public institutions or the public sector can see the social innovation as a main tool to meet the existing and future needs of public or society. So, it is logical to make the key difference on innovation between the private and public sector clear. In short, innovation in the private sector is almost valued by its definition: it is a tool to provide competitiveness in new markets and have more and more profit (Hartley, 2005). Even though liberalization and marketing have been introduced in the public sector in last decades, especially as a way of ensuring efficiency-based innovation, the main driving force of public innovation is to create public value and deeply social value creation instead of gaining much more profit. As it is mentioned above, it should not be taken as meaning that social innovation and, in particular, social innovation in the public sector does not pursue profit. In other words, social innovation should not be confused with social responsibility activities that do not seek profit and measured their effects and social impact by the specialists (Brown, 2010; Gökbulut, 2013).

Currently, there are no inclusive and advanced standards for the measurement and analysis of the level of social innovation in the public sector. This is because of the difficulties to

reach a common definition of the concept of social innovation (Zappalà, & Lyons, 2009). Tummers et al. (2013) point out the need for continuing research on the topic of social innovation in the public sector in order to fill the “evidence gap” of the created social value from social entrepreneurship and social innovation in the public sector. As we can see, social innovation is central and very important in the fields of public sector but there is a gap in the literature of the understanding of the current status, future trends, and comparative status of Turkey’s public sector with other developed countries’ public institutions. As discussed later in the theory chapter, the literature around social innovation in the public sector is dominated by different methods to analyse and clarify social innovation and not the understanding around the concept. Therefore, the purpose of this thesis is to identify and explore the understanding social innovation in the public sector, why it is significant, and what the drivers and challenges are with social innovation according to the literature, current status and the view of the public sector officers.

1.1. Background

Although there is no consensus on social innovation and especially, social innovation in the public sector and it is considered as a concept in which different dimensions have been discussed in the literature as a priority or as a more important subject, the trend of the research topic that has been discussed and researched in recent years is increasing and has become a prominent issue as a gap evidence in the literature (Mulgan, 2009).

Rogers (2010) stresses that the interest in conceptualizing the term innovation is not a new phenomenon (Moore and Hartley, 2010; Fagerberg, & Verspagen, 2006). However, the meaning and scientific concept of innovation and the conceptual integrity of the branches and classifications have been subject to changes in the historical process. From the first third decades of the 20th century to 1980s, it is significant that innovation was perceived as a technological development or was mostly considered synonymous to technological innovation. Precursors of innovation researches in this period came with the both works on innovation economics as of the 1930s (Schumpeter, 1931) and the rediscovery of innovation as of the 1980s within a systems approach (general, national, regional; Lundvall et al., 1999) in innovation and economic development (Edquist, 1992).

In addition to the above information and classifications, there are also researchers who present the concept of innovation with more sharp distinctions and divide the different historical processes into different periods. According to Chesbrough (2003), there are six generations of innovation models in the historical process that are technology push, market (need) pull, coupling pull and interactive model, integrated model, networking-model, and open innovation. The contents of these six innovation models, the basic contents of the authors and models that set out these basic arguments are briefly explained in the table below (Meissner, & Kotsemir, 2016).

Generation	Innovation model	Period	Author of fundamental ideas	Essence of the model
1	Technology push	1950s-late 1960s	Usher (1955)	Linear process
2	Market (need pull)	Late 1960s-first half of 1970s	Myers and Marquis (1969)	R&D on customer wishes
3	Coupling model	Second half of 1970s-end of 1980s	Mowery and Rosenberg (1979)	Interaction of different functions
	Interactive model		Rothwell and Zegveld (1985)	Interaction with research institutions and market
4	Integrated pull	End of 1980s-early 1990s	Kline and Rosenberg (1986)	Simultaneous process with feedback loops: 'Chain-linked model'
5	Networking-model	1990s	Rothwell (1992)	System integration and networks (SIN)

6	Open innovation	2000s	Chesbrough (2003a)	Innovation collaboration and multiple exploitation paths
---	-----------------	-------	--------------------	--

Table1. Six Generations of Innovation (Meissner, & Kotsemir, 2016).

This perception of work on economic and technological innovation overshadowed the term social innovation that has a more than two centuries-old history. Consequently, the socio political and human dimensions of development and innovation were emerged again, and technology as well as business organisation came to the front as drivers of development. From the 1970s onwards, as a result of various developments, when social and political interest in innovation returned, especially in urban and regional development areas that were directly related to society, social innovation began to lead an intellectual life and the topic become a pioneering research topic with a scientific reality and vital qualities, social economy and emancipation movements and as an ethical principle within the corporate social responsibility ambitions of large parts of the business world (Porter, & Kramer, 2006; Carroll, 1999; Epstein, 2018). In 2000s, almost all of the technological developments that took place in the last century began to take place at a cumulative and increasing rate, and these developments brought the social problems which were impossible to ignore in the face of the policymakers that are the public institutions and the society (Nicholls, & Teasdale, 2017).

Considering that the reason for the existence of public institutions is to increase social welfare and thus the level of equity and satisfaction of the society by producing rational solutions to social problems, although there is no consensus on social innovation, social innovation is an important milestone in the public sector and an important issue to be investigated. Maas and Grieco (2017) claim that the society increasingly require services that are provided by public institutions to be transparent, legitimate, and accountable about the impact they aim to achieve (Bagnoli, & Megali, 2011). For this reason, the extent to

which the public institutions have improved and what kind of innovations and new practices in order to provide better services to the society gain importance.

Although the concept of social innovation has emerged as a concept frequently mentioned in the literature in recent years, it has not been dealt with much in the public sector under the pattern of social innovation. However, when President Obama and Prime Minister Cameron mentioned a few words on the subject, it started to gain a structure that was not only a magical and abstract word but also has a practical structure (European Commission, 2015). The discussion until now indicates that social innovation on solving the social problems of the society is very central and significant on providing social welfare but there is a gap in the literature of an understanding of measuring social innovation capacities of public sector institutions in Turkey, why it is important and what the challenges are. Further, as discussed in the introduction part the term social innovation in the public sector is still “fuzzy”. This knowledge gap needs to be filled and the phenomenon of social innovation in the public sector needs to develop.

1.2. Aim of the Thesis and Research Questions

This thesis aims to identify and explore the understanding of how and why social innovation is taking place in the public sector and why it is significant, and what the drivers and challenges are with social innovation in the public sector institutions in Turkey, current status and the view of the public sector senior executives and officers.

In order to fulfil the aim of this thesis, a qualitative study was conducted with information gathered from significant actors involved in the fields of social entrepreneurship and social innovation in the public sector. Each of these actors is one of the top executives in the capacity of general manager or head of department in public institutions currently. In addition, selected public institutions can be characterized as public institutions in which social innovation is carried out in a more visible and relevant manner. All of these actors have the knowledge required to contribute to this thesis. By identifying and exploring the understanding of measurement and analysis of the level of social innovation in the public

sector, why it is significant, and what the drivers and challenges are with social innovation, this study will contribute to a more explicit understanding of the “fuzzy” term social innovation in the public sector. In this thesis, there is an argument that social innovation in the public sector is in an institutionalization process in Turkey. Therefore, institutional theory is used to create further understanding about the phenomenon. This frame has not yet been used to understand the concept of social innovation in the public sector in Turkey. Moreover, this thesis will contribute to the development of a common understanding of social innovation in the public sector, which can facilitate the knowledge diffusion and the expansion of social innovation in the public sector. This leads to the research questions this thesis intends to answer.

Why does social innovation important for public institutions?

What is the level of social innovation in public institutions?

How do practitioners and policy makers understand social innovation in the public sector and why is it important? How is their perception on social innovation?

What are the perceived drivers and challenges of social innovation?

1.3. Outline of the Thesis

This thesis is structured as follows. The next chapter consists of one section with an investigation of previous research on the topic social innovation, followed by the second part, which is the analytical framework used to analyse the empirical results. After the theory chapter comes the research methodology chapter with detailed descriptions of research method, data collection, data analysis, and lastly a section with validity, ethical considerations and limitations. The fourth chapter in this thesis is the empirical chapter consisting of the results from the interviews. This chapter is divided into sections that follow the different parts of the analytical framework and the key codes from the data analysis process. The empirical chapter is followed by the analysis chapter where the empirical results are analysed. This chapter is divided into the different parts of the analytical framework and the empirical results are analysed under the key codes. This chapter ends with concluding remarks. The last chapter consists of conclusion, contribution of the thesis, and a discussion and future research.

PART II

2. THEORY

The first section in the theory chapter is an investigation of previous research of the concept social innovation generally and social innovation in the public sector, where the research gap this thesis intends to fill are displayed. This section is followed by the analytical framework for the analysis.

2.1. Social Innovation

In order to understand better and comprehend a scientific concept, it would be appropriate to evaluate the historical development and evolution of the concept comprehensively. Otherwise, there may be a risk that the in-depth analysis of the concept will not be at the desired level. Therefore, in this part of the thesis, firstly, the tendencies of the concept of social innovation in the historical process will be emphasized.

When the literature is analysed deeply to clear out the history of the concept social innovation it is understood that the term is first used in religious texts in the 15th century in the Western world (Godin, 2012). Until end of the 19th century, more or less synonymous of social innovation, the terms radical change or renewing the old were using to describe the social innovation. From the beginning of the 20th century until the 1980s, the term innovation or concept was associated only with technological innovation or was considered to be a synonym concept. In 1858, in a political and a simple way, William Sargant used the term social innovation to underline that increasing social welfare is only possible with a healthy society. However, after the definition of Sargant on social innovation, the meaning of term polarised into two directions that are political and social. While the political direction

is about being revolutionary and republican, social direction is about social change (Day, 2004). In later periods, some scientists like Weber, Durkheim, Schumpeter, Tarde, and others developed some theories of societal change and development in which social invention, social transformation and change. To give an example, most notably in the works of Joseph Schumpeter, the study of innovation began in the field of economics and technological developments. These theories, which take place in a respectable and dominant manner in the scientific world, have continued for a long time to continue their activities in literature and social life as well as in political life (Godin, 2012; Moulaert, & Nussbaumer, 2008; Moulaert, MacCallum, & Leubolt, 2017a). The loss of interest in SI has been carried out ideologically and analytically by the increase in the belief in technological innovation, as applied by the economy of innovation. From the beginning of the 1940s to the end of the 1960s, as a result of increasing technological developments and economics innovation, the concept of innovation turned into a concept that was characterized as equivalent to technological innovation only and the concept of social innovation lost its validity (Meichenitsch et al., 2016). In 1960s and 1970s, from bottom-up, as a result of the social and economic emancipation movements the term social innovation has emerged again and had the centre point of the scientific and political debates which are about transformation of the societies in a positive way (Moulaert, & Scott, 1997). From these periods, there has been a growing consensus among others who require widespread social innovation to cope with the major challenges facing practitioners, policy makers, research community and communities now and in the future (Howaldt, & Schwarz, 2010). However, there is not an entirely consensus of the term social innovation in the literature. Because it is accepted as a term which is weakly conceptualized, due to the dominance of rather grey, policy-oriented literature because of its complexity and the different perspectives by different academic from different disciplines (Mulgan, 2009; Goldenberg et al, 2009; Howaldt, Schwarz, Henning, & Hees, 2010; Mair, 2010; Cels et al. 2012; Bates, 2012).

Social innovation (Mulgan, 2006), as it mentioned above, even though there is no unintended consensus or unique definition, defined as services and innovative activities that are motivated by the goal of meeting a social need and that are mostly evolved and spread out through organizations whose objectives are social. Connected to this definition, is the definition of social innovation by the European Commission (2011).

“The European Commission (2011) looks at social innovation as innovation that is social in its ends and in its means, thereby embracing new ideas that meet social needs by creating new social relationships and collaborations”.

Although an in-depth historical analysis of the concept of social innovation has been carried out, it has been possible in one or two decades that this concept has taken place in different main disciplines in social sciences such as public administration (Klein et al. 2010), management (Clements, & Sense, 2010), education (Schroder, 2012) and social entrepreneurship (Short et al., 2009).

Before describing the typical characteristics of the concept of social innovation and explaining the distinctive variables of this concept, it is considered appropriate to make two important paradigm definitions related to the concept of social innovation in the historical process. In other words, Shockley (2015), in the book of International Handbook of Social Innovation, claims that the concept of social innovation has a literature consisting of two main streams that are grounded in “Anglo-American entrepreneurship studies” and the other in “Euro-Canadian social economies”. To make it clear, social innovation from “Anglo-American” current focuses not only on the structural reasons or on-depth analysis of social problems, but rather on the solution of the problems and the achievement of the result, while the social innovation arising from the “Euro-Canadian” trend leads to in-depth scientific analysis, social and political changes, structural reforms that try to reach the source of problems, focuses on administrative relations, socio-economic dimensions and socio-psychological explanations (Montgomery, 2016; Moulaert et al., 2013a; Moulaert, & Mehmood 2017b; Nicholls et al., 2015; Oosterlynck et al., 2013a, 2013b; Parés et al., 2017; Rüede, & Lurtz, 2012; Young Foundation, 2012).

As it is mentioned above, although there is no clear and definite consensus on the concept, it is understood that after the in-depth and multi-dimensional analysis of the concept of social innovation, four main features from Bekkers et al. (2013) have come to the forefront in terms of definition.

According to the Bekkers et al. (2013), first of all, social innovation seeks to achieve sustainable solutions or long lasting outcomes to the needs and challenges that society face with. In other words, these outcomes that are mentioned above should be directly associated with society. Social innovation, therefore, is beyond the concept of innovation which can be limited only by the technological developments that can be commercialized and it has some unique features. These properties can be associated with the social welfare creation offered by social innovation. In the literature, the concept of innovation relates to the transformation of newness or novelty in product, service or processes into economic and social benefits, and the emphasis is on the commercialization of newness (Bekkers, Edelenbos, & Steijn, 2011). Additionally, the term innovation is normally related to human being. However, this relationship is not as directly and strong as social innovation has with the human being. After these explanations made it needs to be underlined again, as emphasized in the first part of the paragraph, innovations or newness within the scope of social innovation arise directly from the social needs of individuals or societies (Mulgan, 2006; European Commission, 2011; Mair, 2010; Cels et al. 2012; Bates 2012). These social needs that are society wrestling or challenging with can be exemplified like the ageing of the population or unemployment.

Secondly, in social innovation, the stakeholders as well as the end-users participate in the process directly by using the collaborative innovation networks (Bason, 2018; Lee, 2012). In other words, within these collaborative innovation networks, organizational boundaries and jurisdictions should be crossed by relevant stakeholders and end-users due to the structure and functioning of social innovation (Sepulveda, 2015).

Thirdly, relevant stakeholders are active and participatory in all processes of design, preparation, production, presentation and marketing. They bring in their knowledge, information and resources so that they can be shared on the purpose of producing outcomes that are relevant to them (Chesbrough, 2003, 2006; Von Hippel, 2005, 2007).

And lastly, social innovation in accordance with first three, refers not only to the production of new outcomes but also the process of innovation. It can be easily claimed that social innovation is beyond technological innovations. In other words, it is beyond related to

science and technology driven needs and innovations. It conceptualizes the societal needs and socially driven requirements by learning and reflection processes (Howaldt, & Schwarz, 2010).

2.2. What Is Distinct About Social Innovation?

Measuring the success of the social innovation is not as easy as calculating the innovation results or outcomes. Because of its complexity and problematic structure, results or outcomes of the social innovation cannot be clearly assessed and defined. Additionally, as it stated above, organizational boundaries and jurisdictions are crossed in social innovation process because of its structure that has capacity to cover like relationships of power and stakeholders or the involvements of users at every stage like experts, bureaucrats, and professionals; designing platforms which make it easy to assemble project teams or virtual organizations. Also, as a requirement of a nature, whereas in business the firm is the key agent of innovation, social innovation has a wider network that consists of some commissioners in the public sector, providers in social enterprises, advocates in social movements, and entrepreneurs in business. In other words, all segments of society, all strata of society and all elements that make it public can be accepted as a key agent of social innovation (Brown, & Duguid; 2000; Greenhalgh et al. 2004; Bason, 2018; Osborne, & Brown, 2011).

2.3. Social Innovation in the Public Sector

Public sector in a general way and its institutions especially are considered to be one of the most important and key factor disciplines of innovation when the size of the social mass it serves and the effects of the products it provides and the effects of the services on the society and their different direct or indirect dimensions are considered. Although there is a general opinion that the free market economy and increasing liberalization reduce the influence and periphery of public institutions every day, public institutions are increasing their specific gravity or their social impact on society every day with the (social) innovative moves they are making already or they will make in the future (Moore and Hartley, 2010).

According to OECD Report (2018), in the public sector, social innovation is responding to several challenges and having a positive impact that should be measured. In other words, innovation in government explores how to improve systems and practices, new and better ways of providing public services due to meet the societal needs and requirements. However, according to the existing literature and the in-depth analysis made on it, it is thought that public institutions have some structural barriers related to innovative work and operations due to the rules formed with sharp lines and the non-flexible structural systems. These barriers of public institutions are strongly related to the legal culture that the public sector has a structure due to its existence. However, this kind of an existence that is not flexible or restricted is changing day by day and this continuing process on the public sector will be discussed after the barriers are handled (Kickert, 2007).

To discuss the issue with the barriers of public institutions have on social innovation, there are three elements seem particularly important. These three elements are consists of ‘*standardization and formalization practices, rule-driven path dependencies, and legal mandate and their jurisdictions*’ (Hofstede, 1980; Deal, & Kennedy, 1983; Handy, 1986; Schein, 2004; Bernier, & Hafsi, 2007). Firstly, standardization and formalization practices fosters stability and predictability that reduces the capacity of innovation of the public institutions. These kinds of features also discourage initiative, creativity and risk-taking (Schumpeter, 1942; Burns, & Stalker, 1961; Damanpour, 1991; Scott, 1998; Walker, 2007). Secondly, new ideas, methods, concepts lead to resistance to change by rule-driven path dependencies (Pierson, 2000; Bernier, & Hafsi, 2007). At last but not at least, especially government agencies are not willing to share the knowledge, experiences, resources, and information with the stakeholders because of their legal mandate and their jurisdictions (Feller, I, & Feller, E., 1981; Kelman, 2008).

Public institutions or the public sector do not only face barriers in the process of social innovation, but also come up with a number of repulsive effects or drivers that lead (force) to innovation by accelerating and facilitating this process (Kelman, 2008; Pollitt, 2011). To give an example, firstly, changes related to the environment of public administration such as globalization, individualization, fragmentation via computerization. Besides these kinds of changes and improvements in the present times, some political and administrative problems

occur or come along with some actual needs and the level of innovation increases in the same way. As a result of this contextual relationship, there is a network of forcing and driving relations in the public sector innovation (Damanpour and Evans, 1984; Walker, 2007; Fernandez, & Wise, 2010; Borins, 2000; Vigoda-Gadot et al, 2008; Salge, & Vera, 2012). Secondly, innovation and search for new combinations are triggered by the versatility of public administration, which creates a competition between the values to be reached. A dialectical process in public institutions is increasing due to the multi-rationality of public administration via communication developments worldwide (Hartley, 2005). Thirdly, contrary to misconception or perception that competition is a phenomenon that occurs only in the free market economy or the private sector competition in the public sector is rising as well. To give some examples, services that are given by government challenge with the private initiatives because of the private sector partnerships and citizens are evolving to customers. Additionally, customers' expectations and their options and alternatives are rising (Windrum, & Koch, 2008; Tummers, Jilke, & Van de Walle, 2013). Also, benchmarking and other performance management systems that make the quality and outcomes of public services transparent, public sector organizations are increasingly to each other (Dorsch, & Yasin, 1998; Folz, 2004). In addition to competition with private sector and private enterprises, public institutions are competing with public institutions in their cities, regions, countries and even in foreign countries (Berry, F., & Berry, W., 2007; Walker, 2007; Anttiroiko, Bailey, & Valkama, 2011; Sørensen, & Torfing, 2011). Fourthly, '*an electoral sense*' is forcing the public institutions to give the services in a better and innovative way automatically and by nature. In other words, political competition leads the public institutions to serve in an innovative way and to increase the efficiency of the service they provide and this leads to the public sector's social innovation as an increasing value and concept (Walker, 2007; Bekkers, Edelenbos & Steijn, 2011).

2.4. Institutionalism in Social Innovation in The Public Sector

As mentioned before, the interest in research about the development of assessing social innovation in the public sector has increased. Before using the theory of institutionalism in the analysis of social innovation in the public sector, different methods used in the research, analysis and scaling of social innovation will be mentioned and some discussions will be

made on these methods. In recent years, there has been increasing pressure on the evaluation and measurement of social innovation in the public sector, as a result of pressure from independent supervisory agencies, public institution managers, international organizations and communities and, in particular, citizens as the customer and the end user of the service provided (McLaughlin et al. 2009). What is perhaps more difficult to achieve social innovation in the public and to offer innovative activities and services to citizens in a correct and efficient way is what criteria and how to evaluate social innovation in public institutions. Further, the understanding of the factors connected to social innovation in the public sector is more ambiguous than for economic performance. In other words, looking for answers to the question of how and why social innovation is happening in the public sector is more complicated and complex than analysing the most complex economic equations for public institutions (Ebrahim, & Rangan, 2014). Therefore, the aim this thesis intends to attain, specify, and explore the understanding of drivers and barriers of social innovation in the public sector, why it is significant, and what the drivers and challenges social innovation is facing with in public sector in Turkey.

Social innovation comes to the fore as a concept aimed at finding solutions to many incidents and problems such as health, education, poverty, disadvantaged groups of society, gender equality, climate change, global warming, reduction of natural resources, consumption society, efficient use of energy. The main challenge in specifying and measuring social innovation is to convert the qualitative, soft, outcomes to the quantitative terms. Due to this complication, several social measurement tools, initiatives, and frameworks that aim to assess social innovation have been developed (Dainienė & Dagilienė, 2015) such as “European Public Sector Innovation Scoreboard” (EPSIS, 2013) provided by the European Commission, “Integrated model for measuring social innovation” introduced by TEPSIE project (2014), “Regional Social Innovation Index” provided by INNOBASQUE research (2013), “European Social Innovation Index” provided by the Vision (2011), “Australian Public Sector Innovation Indicators” provided by APSII project. Additionally, some institutions such as NESTA, MEPIN, Innobarometer, EPSIS etc. introduced some questionnaires for measurement of innovations in the public sector. At organizational level, triple bottom line (TBL) approach is often used to analyse the social innovation. In the TBL approach, there are three main headings that are social, environmental and financial. All

issues that may be subject to social innovation are classified under these three headings. (Norman, & MacDonald, 2004; Hubbard, 2009; Godfrey, & Manikas, 2012). The other method on the purpose of scaling social innovation is used by the researchers is the Balance Scorecard that is developed by Kaplan and Norton (1996). Some more models and common approaches for analysing and measuring social innovation at an organization's activities are (Rosenzweig et al., 2004; Foster, & Rosenzweig, 2010; TEPSIE, 2014):

- Social Return on Investment (SROI);
- Social Reporting Standard (SRS);
- Social Cost Benefit Analysis (SCBA);
- Randomized Control Trials (RCTs);
- Theories of Change;
- Balanced Scorecard (BSc);
- Acumen Fund Scorecard;
- Social Return Assessment;
- AtKisson Compass Assessment;
- Ongoing Assessment of Social Impact (OASIS);
- Poverty and Social Impact Analysis (PSIA);
- and others.

In addition to all this, some researchers have developed some models to evaluate existing social innovation analysis methods, and the similarities and the differences across them (Millar, & Hall, 2013; Zappalà, & Lyons, 2009).

As mentioned in many points of the research, social innovation is a multidimensional and multidisciplinary phenomenon that does not consist of only one dimension. Despite the development of many methods and scales for the analysis of social innovation by research institutions and organizations or individual researchers, each individual, institution or stakeholder contributing to social innovation takes social innovation and its positive effects, drivers or barriers in different dimensions and evaluates them with different perspectives. In the literature, as mentioned in the above section, there is a large number of scales trying to convert qualitative data into quantitative data in the analysis of social innovation in public

institutions. However, these scales are insufficient in the in-depth analysis of social innovation in public institutions and in understanding what is actually happening. In fact, this situation makes it difficult for the analysis of social innovation to achieve the objective directly, fully, and objectively. In order to overcome these problems and issues, the theory of institutionalism will be used in the analysis of social innovation in public institutions. In addition, the public sector in Turkey because it has a distinctive and unique features, in-depth carried out as a qualitative analysis of the subject in a comprehensive manner will contribute to the understanding and would help fill the gap in the literature is considered. To understand the phenomenon social innovation in the public sector, although it is considered that the above scaling and analysis methods are suitable for the analysis of social innovation in the public sector, it is considered most appropriate to use the theory of institutionalism in this respect. Additionally, to understand the concept of the social innovation in the public sector, it is claimed that using the theory of institutionalism will give chance to contribute something new to field of social innovation. Fundamentally, specific parts of the theory of institutionalism is used in this research such as three pillars of institution (Scott, 2013) and legitimacy (Suchman, 1995). Research will continue with the expression of the analytical framework.

2.5. Analytical Framework

In the literature, there is an argument that social innovation in the public sector is at the process of institutionalism. It is thought that this field is an immature area but is currently developing. For this reason, the analytical framework is partly built on institutional theory. The first part of the analytical framework starts with the three pillars of institutions (Scott, 2013; Trevino, 2008) and moves on with legitimacy (Suchman, 1995). The analytical framework ends with a description of wicked problems (Rittel, & Webber, 1973; Buchanan, 1992). While wicked problems could be connected to several of the challenges with social innovation in the public sector, the three pillars of institutions and legitimacy can support the understanding of field and its performance.

2.5.1. Three Pillars of Institutions

Institutions are not organizations that develop and live independently of the internal structure of the institution. On the contrary, institutions are organizations that are constantly interacting and living in a progressive manner within the corporate environment. Institutions are organizations that define the social actors' classes, the appropriate forms of activity or relationships for these actors. In other words, institutions are living mechanisms that have shared rules and categorization (Barley, & Tolbert, 1997). According to North (1993), institutions are human constraints that shape the rules of play in a society or forms of interaction in society. Jepperson (1991) states that institutions and institutionalization are dependent on context. According to DiMaggio and Powell (1983), the diffusion of innovations among organizations can be coercive isomorphism, normative pressures or mimetic processes. Coercive isomorphism may be caused by formal or informal pressures imposed on the organization by the cultural expectations of the society in which it operates (DiMaggio, & Powell, 1983). Another factor underlying the co-modulation of organizations is normative pressures. The primary source of normative pressures is professionalization. Van de Ven (1986) argues that organizations sometimes endeavour to choose the techniques that have proven to be beneficial to their previous users, while Abrahamson (1991) mentions that innovations can spread as a means of reducing uncertainty among organizations. By imitating organizations within and outside the group of similar organizations, organizations try to break the pressure on uncertainty. Theorists identify these kinds of responses as mimetic processes. Scott (2013, p.56) clarifies the concept of institutions as “institutions comprise regulative, normative, and cultural-cognitive elements that, together with associated activities and resources, provide stability and meaning to social life”. Shortly, theorists identify regulative, normative, and cultural-cognitive social systems as main elements of institutions (Scott, 2013).

There seems to be parallels between coercive isomorphism, normative pressures or mimetic processes of DiMaggio and Powell (1983) and the vital parts of the institutions that Scott (1995) defines as regulatory, normative and cultural-cognitive systems. However, while the types of syncretism of DiMaggio and Powell (1983) point to the mechanisms of institutional change, the regulatory, normative and cultural-cognitive pillars, which are described by

Scott (1995) as different aspects of institutions, include a broader range of mechanisms and conceptualization including the mechanisms of change of DiMaggio and Powell (Scott, 1995: 35).

Regulative theorists claim that organizational change occurs as a result of market forces of and regulative organizational elements that are driven by coercive means. Scott (2013) claims that “The rule setting is formal, as the rules set by the law.” In other words, regulatory processes include formal rule-making, monitoring and sanctioning activities. Individuals can accept the existence and validity of the system of institutionalized rules without having to believe that the rules are fair, correct or appropriate. Institutions work effectively because individuals know that the cost of infringing formal or informal rules is very heavy (Barnett, & Carroll, 1993; Mason, Kirkbride, & Bryde, 2007).

Normative theorists express that focusing on informal structures rather than formal structures in organizational change is quite important and crucial. In normative systems, goals and aims are defined as usual. However, the process of achieving these goals and aims should progress on appropriate way that is according to norms and values. In other words, the normative pillar of institutions is about how things should be done (Scott, 2013). Additionally, normative processes consist of feelings about what is appropriate in society. Similar to regulatory processes, normative processes involve the pursuit of rules. Individuals follow normative rules because they find it both morally appropriate and legally correct (Colbeck, 2002).

Cultural-cognitive theorists claim that conceptual beliefs, mental models, and interpretations of shared meanings give shape on organizations. In other words, the change in institutions occur as a result of organizational members and culturally supported. Cognitive processes consist of the widespread application and acceptance of an activity. Additionally, activities and behaviours begin to institutionalize when people accept that they are the basic parts of social life. An indicator of cognitive institutionalization is the spread of belief that an activity or structure is the right idea. Another proof of cognitive institutionalization is that when individuals combine activity with other activities, when other individuals in the organization

implement similar activities or when individuals in other organizations implement the activity (Reid, & Griffith, 2006).

Legitimacy consists of three pillars of institutions that are regulative, normative and cultural-cognitive elements. In other words, rules or laws, normative support, or cultural alignment provide a basis for legitimacy (Scott, 1995).

Institutional Dimension	Cultural-cognitive	Normative	Regulative
Social Basis	Taken for granted	Morality	Sanctions
Mechanism	Visibility	Training, professionalization, certification	Laws, regulations, agreements
Reason for Homogeneity	Uncertainty	Responsibility	Dependence
Homogeneity Mechanism	Copycat	Moral	Compelling
Example	Departmentalization in companies	Total quality management practices of companies	Use of standard accounting system

Table 2. Three Pillars of Institutions

2.5.2. Legitimacy

The institution is a socially constructed behaviour pattern or rule system that is constantly reproduced under normal conditions. Institutionalization defines a social order or pattern as the process of getting this quality (Jepperson, 1991). In other words, institutionalization is the process by which certain forms of behaviour and thought acquire a rule-like status (Meyer, & Rowan, 1977). On the one hand, institutions allow people to act by providing options on how to behave in a particular situation, while limiting human behaviour to specific options. In this sense, it provides social order by providing meaning and stability to social behaviour. Institutions stabilize social behaviour with their cognitive, moral and pragmatic dimensions (Scott, 1995). It may have been guessed from the above, but it's still worth telling. There are three types of legitimacy: cognitive, moral and pragmatic legitimacy (Suchman, 1995). These types of legitimacy correspond to cognitive, moral and normative mechanisms, respectively, from institutional adjustment mechanisms. Cognitive legitimacy is legitimacy based on the existence of an acclaimed cultural explanation. Moral legitimacy is the kind of legitimacy based on value judgments. Pragmatic legitimacy is legitimacy based on interests (Özen, 2002).

Cognitive legitimacy is the least recognized but the strongest kind of legitimacy by other types of legitimacy. Institutions with such legitimacy acquire the otherwise unimaginable and unquestionable status. For example, in modern societies, the concept of hospital has such a status because it is a form of organization that modern societies built in the historical process as a solution to the question of how to solve health problems. On the other hand, moral legitimacy is related to whether the actions of an organization are correct by the value judgments of the relevant social groups. For example, in the case of the mining company, the fact that the mining company operating there according to the value judgments of the local people and environmentalists poses a threat to healthy living rights means that the actions of the company are not the moral legitimacy of their actions. Pragmatic legitimacy relates to the degree to which an organization's actions are appropriate to the interests of various social groups and organizations. For example, environmental organizations, Goose of making gold mining in the mountains in Turkey, he obtained from regional tourism and

far below put forward would provide income of agricultural income, the extraction of gold in that area is a statement whether the utilitarian legitimacy in their eyes (Özen, & Özen, 2011).

2.5.3. Wicked Problems

In the research by Rittel and Webber (1973) they discuss, what they call, wicked problems. Wicked problems are problems that do not have clear traits and they comprise almost all public policy issues. There could be a comprehensive formulation of a tame problem that includes all the information the problem-solver needs to understand and solve the problem. However, that is not the case for a wicked problem. The information required to understand a wicked problem depends on one's idea for solving it. To formulate this kind of problem in detail, it requires a comprehensive inventory of all imaginable solutions in advance. This is because the information of a wicked problem depends on the understanding of the problem. So, to understand a wicked problem one must have knowledge about its context and one must search for information with the orientation of a solution suggestion. One of the challenges with wicked problems is that there are no true or false answers. None of the involved parties has the authority to set formal decision rules and their judgements commonly differ according to their interests, special value-set, and ideological preferences (Rittel, & Webber, 1973). As Rittel and Webber (1973, p. 161) stress "the formulation of a wicked problem is the problem".

PART III

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This methodology chapter consists of a detailed description of the research method used in this thesis, data collection, data analysis, and the chapter ends with a section of validity, ethical considerations and limitations of the thesis.

3.1. Research Design

In this thesis, an abductive qualitative approach was used. Abductive approach is used in cases where it is not possible to have all the necessary information on a subject, it is the name given to making the best out of the available data. In order to be able to answer the research questions and to achieve the aim of identifying and explore the understanding of social innovation, why it is significant, and what the challenges are with social innovation in the public sector in Turkey, institutional theory and legitimacy are linked with the research questions and these theories were the starting points of the analytical framework and the questionnaire (Appendix A) was developed through these. However, wicked problems became a part of the analytical framework after the responses because similar patterns were found between drivers and challenges of social innovation and wicked problems, and it was an interesting dimension for the analysis. This was the reason for the abductive approach. The analytical framework is discussed later in this chapter.

This study is designed as a case study where the term social innovation is the case. The choice to have social innovation as case, was because the understanding of the “fuzzy” term social innovation is central in this study, and the respondents were a way to collect significant

information to be able to understand social innovation in public institutions in Turkey. To fulfil the aim of this thesis, the most appropriate choice was to gather information from respondents that work in authorities and organizations that are central at a highest and strongest national level in these fields in Turkey. The area of social innovation has a few decades history but the concept is still very new and immature in Turkey. Therefore, the required information for the case social innovation needed to be collected from respondents that have the knowledge and the experiences within this area.

3.1.1. Selection of Respondents

Services such as education, family, work, social policies, culture, health, industry, technology, agriculture, youth and sports, transportation and infrastructure, justice, energy, municipalisation in local scale, and higher education are the main service items of public institutions. These services are in the content of the legislature in Turkey's parliament, justice services are provided by the presidency of the executive and judicial organs. Ministries stand out as the highest and most competent body in the submission of these services as sub-breakdowns of the public sector. In addition, the public institutions such as YÖK, KYK, TUBITAK, Union of Municipalities of Turkey, and Turkish Statistical Institute are the forefront as a major corporation serving in the public sector.

Interviews were conducted on the purpose of analysing the social innovation level and its trends in the public sector in Turkey. The respondents are sixteen people who are senior executives that have significant positions, for this thesis, at the authorities and organizations they work in. These authorities and organizations are central actors for the development of the area social innovation and impact in Turkey. In addition, attention was paid to ensure that the interviewee had been working as general manager, assistant general manager, secretary general, deputy general secretary and head of department. Also, interviews are mostly conducted with the strategy development departments of the institutions, mainly because it was aimed that the interviewees would have a general and comprehensive knowledge of the institution. Additionally, in order to keep the names of the respondents confidential, each was assigned a number code from 1 to 16.

No	Respondent	Authority/Organization
1	Interviewee 1	Strategy and Budget Department of the President of the Republic of Turkey (SBB)
2	Interviewee 2	R & D, Quality and Monitoring Department of the Ministry of National Education (MEB)
3	Interviewee 3	Strategy Development Department of the Ministry of Industry and Technology
4	Interviewee 4	General Secretariat of Union of Municipalities of Turkey (TBB)
5	Interviewee 5	Department of Strategy Development of Grand National Assembly of Turkey (TBMM)
6	Interviewee 6	Department of Strategy Development of Ankara University
7	Interviewee 7	Department of Strategy Development of the Council of Higher Education (YÖK)
8	Interviewee 8	Department of Strategy Development of the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization
9	Interviewee 9	Department of Investment Monitoring and Coordination of Governorship of Ankara
10	Interviewee 10	General Secretariat of the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK)
11	Interviewee 11	Department of Strategy Development of the Ministry of Youth and Sports
12	Interviewee 12	Department of Strategy Development of the Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Services
13	Interviewee 13	Department of Strategy Development of Higher Education Student Loan and Housing Board (KYK)

14	Interviewee 14	General Directorate of Agricultural Research of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
15	Interviewee 15	Department of Strategy Development of the Ministry of Justice
16	Interviewee 16	Department of Strategy Development of Turkish Statistical Institute

Table 2. Respondents and the authorities/organizations they work in.

The basic duties of the Strategy and Budget Directorate are to determine the main objectives, principles and objectives determined by the President of the Republic of Turkey to determine the general principles, and procedures for the preparation, implementation and monitoring of strategic plans, the development plan of the strategic plans of the public administrations, the policies determined by the President and the medium-term program to ensure that they are prepared in accordance with the stated objectives and objectives, to monitor the implementation and to evaluate the results. Interviewee 1 is one of the two vice presidents of this important institution, where public planning, policies and budgeting are determined. The Ministry of National Education is the institution where all educational policies of the national scale are determined and carried out. Interviewee 2 is the head of the R & D, Quality and Monitoring Department of the Ministry of National Education (MEB). The Ministry of Industry and Technology is the most important institution in which all policies related to innovation and entrepreneurship are organized and grants and support programs are organized. Interviewee 3 is the Head of Strategy Development Department of this institution. The mission of Union of Municipalities of Turkey (TBB) is to support the empowerment of local governments and their effective service provision, to safeguard their rights and interests, to strive for the strengthening of local democracy, to introduce them to recent developments and innovations at the global level, and to represent them in national and international platforms. Interviewee 4 is the Deputy Secretary General of this institution. Grand National Assembly of Turkey is the legislative body has the people's national sovereignty. The Turkish Grand National Assembly, consisting of 550 deputies, can be considered as a mechanism for resolving the problems of all provinces, where they come together and discuss the problems and aim to find solutions to the problems. Interviewee 5

is the Head of Department of Strategy Development of Grand National Assembly of Turkey (TBMM). Ankara University with more than 70,000 students in the capital of the Republic of Turkey serves as the first university in the Republican era of Turkey. Interviewee 6 is the Head of Department of Strategy Development of Ankara University. The mission of YÖK is to monitor the compliance of education and other activities in higher education institutions with the purpose and main principles specified by law according to the principles to be prepared by the Council of Higher Education. In other words, YÖK serves as a supervisory body regulating and supervising the services provided by all state and foundation universities across the country. Interviewee 7 is the Head of Department of Strategy Development of the Council of Higher Education (YÖK). The mission of the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization is defined as doing regulatory, supervisory, participatory and solution-oriented understanding of planning, construction, transformation and environmental management in order to create cities and settlements with high quality of life compatible with the sustainable environment. Interviewee 8 is the Head of Department of Strategy Development of the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization. The governor is the official who provides the general administration of the province and controls the progress of the province. Interviewee 9 is the Head of Department of Investment Monitoring and Coordination of Governorship of Ankara. The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey is a national agency of Turkey whose stated goal is to develop "science, technology and innovation" policies, support and conduct research and development, and to "play a leading role in the creation of a science and technology culture" in the country. Interviewee 10 serves as Secretary General of the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK). The Ministry of Youth and Sports is the most competent institution to organize activities and policies on young people and sports on a national scale. Interviewee 11 is the Head of Strategy Development of the Ministry of Youth and Sports. The main tasks of the Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Services are defined as providing social services that strengthen individual and family within the framework of social values, increasing employment with the aim of contributing to socio-economic development, regulating working life, taking supervising measures and maintaining the effectiveness of social security system. Interviewee 12 serves as the Head of Strategy Development of the Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Services. The mission of Student Loan and Housing Board is defined as providing social / cultural / sporting activities with credit / scholarship, shelter, nutrition services and social activities to support the education of higher education students

and to contribute to their personal development by means of social state and human oriented approaches. Interviewee 13 is the Head of Department of Strategy Development of Higher Education Student Loan and Housing Board (KYK). The mission of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry is defined as the achievement of access to reliable food and high quality agricultural products required by the country and the world markets, ensuring sustainable use of agricultural and ecological resources, setting and implementing policies in order to raise the standard of living in rural areas. Interviewee 14 serves as director at General Directorate of Agricultural Research of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. The main duties of the Ministry of Justice are to ensure that judicial service is provided for all citizens in an impartial, independent, equitable and fast manner. Interviewee 15 is the Head of the Department of Strategy Development of the Ministry of Justice. The mission of Turkish Statistical Institute is to produce statistics in accordance with international standards by considering the needs and priorities of national and international users and to ensure the coordination among institutions taking place in the official statistics production process. Interviewee 16 serves as the Head of Department of Strategy Development of Turkish Statistical Institute. This information was collected during the interviews and at the authorities' and organizations' websites (Appendix B).

All the institutions listed above stand out as institutions that sustain social innovation in the public sector. When the innovation is considered, it can be considered that the most important institution is the Ministry of Industry and Technology. However, all these institutions that serve in different fields and sectors, from education to agriculture, from youth to sports, from municipal services to governorship services, from legislative to judicial bodies, from universities to credit and dormitory services, are seen as institutions that pave the way for social problems through social innovation and social welfare. The institutions such as TurkStat and the Presidency Strategy and Budget Directorate are institutions that facilitate the analysis of social innovation and, in other words, enable the evaluation of the pioneers of this trend and the benefits produced. As a result, senior managers interviewed for this in the calculation of corporate social innovation trends in public institutions in Turkey as most contributions are to be presented to the fore.

The selection criterion was determined by identifying public institutions that could be most related to social innovation. After the above-mentioned institutions were identified, they were contacted with the managers of the senior positions of these institutions in order to conduct semi-structured interviews. However, senior managers could only have knowledge of specific issues, which might not serve the main purpose of the thesis. After the analysis, it was understood that the heads of strategy development of the public institutions stated were informed about all the bodies of the institutions and these presidencies were discussed. In addition, meetings were held with senior executives such as general secretary and secretary general in some public institutions.

This sampling process was valuable for this study because all of the selected respondents work in authorities and an organization that operates at a national level within the area of social innovation on the purpose of solving social problems and increasing social welfare via social innovation policies and this condition fulfilled the selection criteria. This sampling process enabled to select respondents that could provide significant information to the case social innovation, which made this selection appropriate and valuable.

3.2. Data Collection

Data to the thesis was gathered through semi structured face-to-face interviews. The election of semi structured interviews was to provide as valuable and relevant information as possible for the thesis, and for the interviewees to be able to elaborate the answers. The interviews were well prepared with one elaborated interview guide with open-ended questions for all the interviews (Appendix A; Table 2). This questionnaire is a comprehensive one that generally analyses social innovation-entrepreneurship tendency in public institutions and partly developed through the three pillars of institutions and legitimacy from the analytical framework. Questions 2 and 3 belong to legitimacy, question 4 belongs to the regulative pillar of institutions, questions 5 and 6 to the normative pillar, and question 1 and 7 to the cultural-cognitive pillar (Appendix A). This made it easier to gather relevant information

required to analyse the data and answer the research questions, but also to categorize the responses and identify key codes, which is discussed more in the data analysis part.

This interview guide made the interviews flexible and it had scope for follow-up questions from the researcher but also for clarifying questions if needed, which provided relevant answers. Semi structured interviews were appropriate for this research because it was easy for the participants to answer from their and their authority's or organization's point of view, but there was still a control over the questioning. Gathering data this way was favourable because it generated detailed and significant information.

3.2.1. The Interview Process

Appointments were made through the secretaries of the senior executives and official correspondence are used. All these meetings with senior executives were held in 2018. All interviews were made in the authorities of the managers and recorded in voice or in writing according to their permission status. Each interview lasted approximately one or one and a half hours. During the interview, the highest level of care was taken not to ask the managers any questions that would lead to any orientation.

Sixteen interviews were conducted during this research, one with each of the respondents mentioned above (Appendix B). As mentioned before, all the selected respondents have the knowledge and the experiences of this area, that were needed to contribute to this study. To collect data from these participants were significant in order to collect correct, important, and valuable information to be able to identify and explore the understanding of social innovation, why it is significant, and what the drivers and challenges are with social innovation in the public sector institutions in Turkey. The respondents were contacted before the interviews through phone calls or e-mails with information about the purpose of the thesis and the interviews, the approximate time of the interview, and how the information should be processed. They were asked about how they wanted their information to be treated, if they approved of recording the interview, and if it was possible to contact them if the data required completion. Further, all interviews were recorded and transcribed subsequently. To

secure that the data were treated in an appropriate manner for the participants, a final draft was sent to them to check the information. This process was to guarantee the participants that the information they provided should be treated in a proper manner, and that they were not forced to participate in the research.

3.3. Data Analysis

The transcriptions of the interviews simplified to analyse the gathered data. To process the data and to provide a general picture of the answers, the transcriptions were read several times. The data analysis process followed the analysis approach by Gioia, Corley and Hamilton (2013) with 1st - and 2nd-order analyses. However, the data in this thesis was not so extensive that it required a deep data analysis in each step. Therefore, it is only the last step, the aggregated dimensions, that is demonstrated in Table 3. In the 1st -order analysis, the answers were organized into different categories under the different parts of the analytical framework, legitimacy, regulative pillar, normative pillar, cultural-cognitive pillar, and wicked problems. In these identified categories similarities and differences were found in the responses. Worth to mention here is that, as mentioned before, wicked problems became a part of the analytical framework after the interviews. It was after the transcriptions were read, but before the categorization of the answers, the researcher saw a pattern that could be analysed with the concept of wicked problems. This is discussed more in the next part. As mentioned before, some of the questions were developed through the three pillars of institutions and legitimacy. This simplified the categorization of the answers that were linked to these. In the 2nd-order analysis, the different categories that already were organized into the different parts of the analytical framework were coded into key codes that were theoretically driven from the empirical data, which made it easier to analyse the responses. Table 3. displays the identified key codes from the empirical responses connected to legitimacy, regulative pillar, normative pillar, cultural-cognitive pillar, and wicked problems. This analysis process simplified to analyse the answers and made it easier to clearly answer the research questions.

Analytical Framework	Key Codes	Headings Empirical Character
Legitimacy	Positive effects on society Solution of the social problems Increasing social welfare	Social Innovation and Its Importance
Regulative Pillar	Standardized strategy	Legal Requirements and Standardization
Normative Pillar	Training, professionalization, certification	Proof of Entitlement
Cultural-Cognitive Pillar	Common understanding No symbols	The Actors Work to Support What Leads to Social Innovation Exchanges Between Actors and Symbols
Wicked Problems	Complex to analyse Drain-pipe problem	Challenges with Social Innovation

Table 3. Key codes from the data analysis process and which part of the analytical framework the sections in the empirical chapter belong to.

3.3.1. Analytical Framework

The analysis of the empirical results was elaborated through the analytical framework in the theory chapter by using theoretically driven codes when coding the data (Table 3.). As mentioned before, the analytical framework consists of Scott's (2013) three pillars of institutions (Barnett, & Carroll, 1993; Colbeck, 2002), legitimacy (Suchman, 1995), and the concept wicked problems that is developed by Rittel and Webber (1973). Institutional theory was used in this thesis because the researcher believes that social innovation in the public institutions is in an institutionalization process in Turkey. Even if the concept of social innovation is immature it probably is going to develop fast due to the medium-term development plans at national level. The three pillars of institutions are the building blocks

of institutions and therefore it made sense to develop part of the questions through these, but also because it was interesting to see if there was a pattern of an institutionalization process. Moreover, none of the studies before of social innovation in the public sector have used institutional theory, which this thesis therefore could contribute with. Legitimacy is required in the pillars of institutions and there was a feeling that legitimacy is what analysing social innovation is about. These were the reasons why legitimacy was an appropriate part of the analytical framework and the development of the questions too. After the interviews and the reading of the transcriptions, it was difficult to link all the responses to the three pillars of institutions and legitimacy, and the responses indicated a pattern that could be connected to wicked problems. Therefore, wicked problems became a part of the analytical framework after the gathered data and categories could therefore be organized under wicked problems. The analysis starts with legitimacy, which is a different order than in the analytical framework. This is due to that the general answers of what social innovation is and its importance, is linked to legitimacy and therefore it was more natural to start with that. The analysis strategy discussed in this section facilitated the analysis, and provided a structured picture and analysis of the answers. Further, it also simplified to answer the research questions in an adequate way. The empirical part is structured as follow. The answers from all the interviewees are aggregated and presented in different sections. Each section belongs to one or two of the different parts of the analytical framework (Table 3.). One can easily identify whose answer it is. The different sections in the empirical part follow the different parts of the analytical framework and the coding (Table 3.).

3.4. Validity, Ethical Considerations and Limitations

Since this study is a scientific study, care has been taken to pay attention to issues related to validity and to pay utmost attention to ethical requirements. It has been paid attention to verify the data and results obtained and to provide accurate and reliable results for readers. The validity strategies used in this thesis were as follow. The selection process was significant for the validity of the thesis. In the selection of interviews with the concept of corporate social innovation of institutions serving the public sector in Turkey has taken that institutions most likely to be associated. In addition, since they are intended to have a general knowledge of these institutions and the sector, they have been interviewed with the strategy

development departments or general secretaries of these institutions. As mentioned before, the selected respondents are people that work in authorities and organizations that are central in this area in Turkey, and the respondents have significant positions, the knowledge, and the experiences to provide relevant and significant answers. This selection also resulted in answers from different perspectives. Further, the snowball sampling of the some interviewees brought even further validity to the thesis because the people that recommended these respondents have an awareness of their knowledge and experiences in this area. On the purpose of having further validity, in addition to the ministries, interviews were also held with senior executives of public institutions such as TURKSTAT and TÜBİTAK. The selection criteria were well developed before the contact with the respondents, which also brought credibility to the thesis.

The research questions in this thesis are not directly linked to the authorities and the organizations the participants work in, they are more general about social innovation. This probably contributed to that the collected information is credible and not biased. Additionally, the responses from different perspective supported each other and brought validity and credibility to the study. If the interviews required complementation, they were complemented.

All the transcriptions have been read several times to make sure that no mistakes have been made and that relevant answers have been presented. Lastly, the data analysis process was made cautiously and has been very careful and accurate.

Limitations in this study is to begin with that the results are difficult to generalize to other contexts than Turkey. Limitations of having interviews are that the gathered data is coming from interviewees which might bias the answers and the responses could be subjective. Further, the answers might also be biased by the presence of the researcher. To avoid the limitations of having interviews, the participants are working at different authorities and organizations, which has contributed with responses from different perspective, knowledge and experiences, and the answers have supported each other, which made the results credible.

It would be beneficial for future research to gather data from more respondents. That could provide even further significant information and more support for the results, which could be beneficial for this underdeveloped area. More interviews in this thesis was not possible due to the time limit. However, even if it might be beneficial with more collected data, a triangulation has been made between the gathered data and the analytical framework to validate the outcomes and to have theoretical saturation in the research.

The next section of this thesis begins with an empirical chapter, followed by an analysis of the empirical results, conclusion, contribution of the thesis, and discussion and future research.

PART IV

4. RESULTS FROM THE INTERVIEWS

This empirical chapter is structured after the different parts of the analytical framework and the coding of the empirical data (Table 3.). All sections, except section 4.4, end with a table of quotes from the interviewees.

4.1. Social Innovation in the Public Institutions and Its Importance

Interviewee 1 argues that “*social innovation should be considered as the reasons for the existence of public institutions*”, which can be directly related to legitimacy. Interviewee 4 believes that “*the reduction of social innovation to the level of individuals, institutions or communities is not correct and it is appropriate to consider the change resulting from this concept outside of certain classifications*”. Additionally, “*social innovation is of great importance for the sustainability of institutions*” (Interviewee 16). In other words, social innovation compasses all levels rather than covering only one level (Interviewee 7; Interviewee 9). Interviewee 10 stresses that “*there should also be an attempt to solve social problems in all areas where social problems exist. Social innovation can be considered as a whole of the initiatives that are necessary to solve all these problems*”. “*Reducing expenditures in a management area by differentiating processes or methods can make it possible to increase resources to other areas. Thus, it can contribute to the increase of social welfare*” (Interviewee 5). According to Interviewee 12, “*social innovation is measurable improvements of vulnerable target groups’ life qualities that result in savings for the public sectors budget*”. “*Public institutions exist to produce solutions to social problems and each institution that aims to provide innovative solutions to social problems has to carry out activities that may be subject to social innovation*” (Interviewee 15). Interviewee 16 claims that “*social innovation is related to big data analysis and can only be carried out if big data is available*”.

Interviewee 11 expresses that “*Social innovation can contribute to the creation of healthier societies*”. Social innovation can contribute to increasing the living standards of disadvantaged groups such as young people, women and people with disabilities (Interviewee 11; Interviewee 13). Interviewee 8 claims that “*social innovation contributes to better service of the relevant public institution*”. “*The quality of the services provided by the public institution determines the level of success of the public institution*” (Interviewee 6). “*As a result of developments such as globalization, climate change, migration and population growth, the need for social innovation has increased*” (Interviewee 2). “*Public institutions, which are the pioneers in social innovation practices, stand out in the competition in the public sector*” (Interviewee 14). Today, competition does not take place only between public institutions. Now the public institutions compete with each other as well as the competition among other sectors and other countries and try to achieve competitive advantage (Interviewee 3; Interviewee 10).

Social innovation is significant because the concept social innovation is not only about an individual, a certain level of the organization, or only one institution. The scope and effects should be addressed in a much broader way. “*Social problems have many different dimensions*” (Interviewee 1). Interviewee 7 stresses that “*analysing these dimensions and revealing their resources accurately is a very difficult process*”. Interviewee 5 argues that “*the reason why this analysis is quite difficult is that it is a complex and challenging process to achieve a systematic cause-effect relationship as in quantitative studies when social innovation is considered*”.

Determining the social problems to be tackled is also of great importance. While determining the social problems of the society, objective and scientific methods should be followed. Interviewee 12 argues that “*conducting innovative activities that can be the subject of social innovation without knowing the basic problems of society will prevent the desired results*”. There is no problem in the determination of social problems and in monitoring such objective pathways. Social problems are all relevant to people. *As a matter of fact, any prioritization among social problems is not correct* (Interviewee 6).

The realization of technological advances is of course important for societies, but social innovation must be taken as a concept beyond technological innovation because it directly touches human beings. Interviewee 3 argues that *“technological or business innovation is concerned only with commercialized technological innovations, while social innovation is about providing technology-based solutions to social problems”*. *“Public institutions should not only focus on technological developments, but also give importance to the technology-based solution of social problems while carrying out projects for the solution of social problems and providing assistance to projects”*. According to Interviewee 15, *“social innovation, which offers solutions to social problems that cannot be recovered or compensated, is of vital importance”*.

Respondent	Quotes
Interviewee 1	<i>“Social innovation should be considered as the reasons for the existence of public institutions”</i> <i>“Social problems have many different dimensions”</i>
Interviewee 2	<i>“As a result of developments such as globalization, climate change, migration and population growth, the need for social innovation has increased”</i>
Interviewee 3	<i>“Competition does not take place within public institutions but also occur among other sectors”</i> <i>“Technological or business innovation is concerned only with commercialized technological innovations, while social innovation is about providing technology-based solutions to social problems”</i>
Interviewee 4	<i>“The reduction of social innovation to the level of individuals, institutions or communities is not correct and it is appropriate to consider the change resulting from this concept outside of certain classifications”</i>
Interviewee 5	<i>“Reducing expenditures in a management area by differentiating processes or methods can make it possible to increase resources to other areas. Thus, it can contribute to the increase of social welfare”</i>

	<p><i>“The reason why this analysis is quite difficult is that it is a complex and challenging process to achieve a systematic cause-effect relationship as in quantitative studies when social innovation is considered”</i></p>
Interviewee 6	<p><i>“The quality of the services provided by the public institution determines the level of success of the public institution”</i></p> <p><i>“As a matter of fact, any prioritization among social problems is not correct”</i></p>
Interviewee 7	<p><i>“Social innovation compasses all levels rather than covering only one level”</i></p> <p><i>“Analysing these dimensions and revealing their resources accurately is a very difficult process”</i></p>
Interviewee 8	<p><i>“Social innovation contributes to better service of the relevant public institution”</i></p>
Interviewee 9	<p><i>“Social innovation compasses all levels rather than covering only one level”</i></p>
Interviewee 10	<p><i>“There should also be an attempt to solve social problems in all areas where social problems exist. Social innovation can be considered as a whole of the initiatives that are necessary to solve all these problems”</i></p>
Interviewee 11	<p><i>“Social innovation can contribute to the creation of healthier societies”</i></p> <p><i>“Disadvantaged groups may benefit from new applications that may arise as a result of social innovation.”</i></p>
Interviewee 12	<p><i>“Social innovation is measurable improvements of vulnerable target groups’ life qualities that result in savings for the public sectors budget”</i></p> <p><i>“Conducting innovative activities that can be the subject of social innovation without knowing the basic problems of society will prevent the desired results”</i></p>
Interviewee 13	<p><i>“Social innovation can contribute to increasing the living standards of disadvantaged groups”</i></p>

Interviewee 14	<i>“Public institutions, which are the pioneers in social innovation practices, stand out in the competition in the public sector”</i>
Interviewee 15	<i>“Public institutions exist to produce solutions to social problems and each institution that aims to provide innovative solutions to social problems has to carry out activities that may be subject to social innovation”</i> <i>“Social innovation, which offers solutions to social problems that cannot be recovered or compensated, is of vital importance”</i>
Interviewee 16	<i>“Social innovation is related to big data analysis and can only be carried out if big data is available”</i> <i>“Social innovation is of great importance for the sustainability of institutions”</i>

Table 4. Quotes from chapter 4.1.

4.2. Legal Requirements and Standardization

Interviewee 3, Interviewee 4, and Interviewee 5 stress that there are no legislations and no formal standards for the concept of social innovation, its trends and assessment. *“The lack of any legislation or standardization regarding social innovation does not encourage institutions to pursue activities that may be subject to social innovation”* (Interviewee 4). Interviewee 9 claims that *“the government needs to define social innovation in a specific way”*. Interviewee 5 argues that *“there should be laws, regulations and contracts binding on social innovation for public institutions”*. Sanctions shall ensure that organizations or persons are punished in some way if the institutions are not followed. *“However, such sanctions drying responsibility and power of the transmitter elements do not exist in Turkey”* (Interviewee 15). In addition, Interviewee 2 claims that *“measuring the quality of services of public institutions is also important”*. Interviewee 1 stresses that it might be difficult to find a standardized framework, maybe a method. *“It is not possible to determine a single standard that will determine the framework of social innovation”* (Interviewee 1). Sanctions shall ensure that organizations or persons are punished in some way if the institutions are not followed. *“As there is no legal regulation on social innovation, there is no sanction mechanism for institutions that do not produce solutions and innovations that may be subject*

to social innovation” (Interviewee 3). There should not be a wrong conclusion as public institutions are institutions that do not aim to provide solutions to social problems. Interviewee 12 stresses that *“the legislation emphasizes the solution of social problems by public institutions, but such emphasis is either indirectly or not directly related to social innovation”*.

What kind of innovative methods are used by public institutions in solving social problems and the success of these methods is important. *“Some legal obligations need to be established as to what methods the public institutions will follow when innovating”* (Interviewee 8). There are some countenancing mechanisms that encourage institutions to innovate. However, Interviewee 14 argues that *“these mechanisms need to go beyond their incentive status and reach a legal stage”*. Interviewee 1 claims that *“in public institutions, only those departments that are interested in innovation and whose responsibility is innovation should be established according to legal requirements”*. Innovation and entrepreneurship within the organization and the innovation and entrepreneurship of the services provided by the institution to the external environment need to be made. In other words, intrapreneurship should be analysed as a different issue. *“It is very important for civil servants working in public institutions to develop themselves and their institutions within the scope of intrapreneurship”* (Interviewee 15). Intrapreneurship does not only contribute to the development of the internal environment of the institution, but also contributes to the development of the service offered to the external environment. Interviewee 5 asserts that *“intrapreneurship and entrepreneurship should be analysed at all scales, including personnel, units, departments and institutions, and the necessary responsibilities and reward mechanisms should be provided by providing legal status”*.

Respondent	Quotes
Interviewee 1	<i>“It is not possible to determine a single standard that will determine the framework of social innovation”</i>

	<i>“In public institutions, only those departments that are interested in innovation and whose responsibility is innovation should be established according to legal requirements”</i>
Interviewee 2	<i>“Measuring the quality of services of public institutions is also important”</i>
Interviewee 3	<i>“As there is no legal regulation on social innovation, there is no sanction .mechanism for institutions that do not produce solutions and innovations that may be subject to social innovation”</i>
Interviewee 4	<i>“The lack of any legislation or standardization regarding social innovation does not encourage institutions to pursue activities that may be subject to social innovation”</i>
Interviewee 5	<i>“There should be laws, regulations and contracts binding on social innovation for public institutions”</i> <i>“Intrapreneurship and entrepreneurship should be analysed at all scales, including personnel, units, departments and institutions, and the necessary responsibilities and reward mechanisms should be provided by providing legal status”</i>
Interviewee 8	<i>“Some legal obligations need to be established as to what methods the public institutions will follow when innovating”</i> <i>“In the process of bringing the concept of social innovation and social innovation in public institutions into legal infrastructure, opinions and suggestions of all actors other than public institutions should be taken”</i>
Interviewee 9	<i>“The state needs to define social innovation in a specific way”</i>
Interviewee 12	<i>“The legislation emphasizes the solution of social problems by public institutions, but such emphasis is either indirectly or not directly related to social innovation”</i>
Interviewee 14	<i>“These mechanisms need to go beyond their incentive status and reach a legal stage”</i>
Interviewee 15	<i>“Such sanctions drying responsibility and power of the transmitter elements do not exist in Turkey”</i>

	<p><i>“It is very important for civil servants working in public institutions to develop themselves and their institutions within the scope of intrapreneurship”</i></p>
--	--

Table 5. Quotes from chapter 4.2.

4.3. Proof of Entitlement

The social basis of the moral dimension of an institution is that the institution is morally correct and appropriate. Carrier mechanisms are education, occupation programmes and certification system. Interviewee 4 claims that *“applications such as training programs and certificate trainings are perceived as very positive by the managers and employees of the institution”*. *“The trainings provided by the employees of the institution or by external trainers are considered from a normative point of view”* (Interviewee 12). Interviewee 1 stresses that *“the managers of the institutions want to implement the training and practices in other institutions to in their own institutions”*. *“Employees of the institutions also demand training such as occupation education, specialization, and certification and consider it as a necessity and moral responsibility”* (Interviewee 3; Interviewee 15). Additionally, company managers learn that some management practices (eg, total quality management, lean manufacturing, matrix structure, and change engineering) make companies more effective and efficient through the training they receive. Interviewee 8 claims that *“total quality management and similar types of innovative and advanced management have gained a moral and important dimension to be applied in almost all of our institution and other institution. Providing better quality and innovative services to citizens is considered to be the most important aspect of social innovation”*. *“We have learned that many public institutions have shifted to a non-hierarchical horizontal-dimensioned management approach and we have worked on this field”* (Interviewee 14). Thus, by installing a moral value to these applications, they enable the adoption of modern and contemporary applications in their companies.

Public institutions are not legally obliged to carry out social responsibility projects such as charity work, but moral behaviour forms supported by social norms and values. Interviewee 12 stresses that *“projects that provide solutions to social problems by our institution are*

carried out by the obligations of moral responsibility”. “As a public institution aiming to provide solutions to the social problems and to support the society, we feel the obligation to implement projects and activities that are not legally necessary” (Interviewee 7). Interviewee 6 claims that “in the case of conducting social responsibility projects, both the commitment of the organization’s own employees to the institution and the positive emotions and perceptions of the citizen felt towards the organization are increasing”.

Respondent	Quotes
Interviewee 1	<i>“The managers of the institutions want to implement the training and practices in other institutions in their own institutions”</i>
Interviewee 3	<i>“Employees of the institutions also demand training such as occupation education, specialization, and certification and consider it as a necessity and moral responsibility”</i>
Interviewee 4	<i>“Applications such as training programs and certificate trainings are perceived as very positive by the managers and employees of the institution”</i>
Interviewee 6	<i>“In the case of conducting social responsibility projects, both the commitment of the organization’s own employees to the institution and the positive emotions and perceptions of the citizen felt towards the organization are increasing”</i>
Interviewee 7	<i>“As a public institution aiming to provide solutions to the social problems and to support the society, we feel the obligation to implement projects and activities that are not legally necessary”</i>
Interviewee 8	<i>“Total quality management and similar types of innovative and advanced management have gained a moral and important dimension to be applied in almost all of our institution and other institution”</i> <i>“Providing better quality and innovative services to citizens is considered to be the most important aspect of social innovation”</i>
Interviewee 12	<i>“The trainings provided by the employees of the institution or by external trainers are considered from a normative point of view”</i> <i>“Projects that provide solutions to social problems by our institution are carried out by the obligations of moral responsibility”</i>

Interviewee 14	<i>“We have learned that many public institutions have shifted to a non-hierarchical horizontal-dimensioned management approach and we have worked on this field”</i>
Interviewee 15	<i>“Employees of the institutions also demand training such as occupation education, specialization, and certification and consider it as a necessity and moral responsibility”</i>

Table 6. Quotes from chapter 4.3.

4.4. The Actors Work to Support What Leads To Social Innovation

From a political and social perspective, the question around social innovation existed for several years but has not been the most significant issue compared to other big issues of government and the public sector institutions. The question has been growing faster for twenty years approximately. The Government gives their authorities direct missions for them to start to develop.

However, some institutions, such as the Strategy and Budget Directorate of the Presidency, state that they have provided services at the periphery of this concept social innovation even though they did not directly associate the activities they have carried out to solve social problems and increase social welfare in the past. The Strategy and Budget Directorate was established in the 1960s to plan the socio-economic development of the country. Planning the socio-economic development as development policies of the country It is an institution built on a development that is altogether which includes not only the economy or income but also the social dimensions of development. The institution is considered as one of the most competent institutions of the public sector, including technical equipment, human resources and financial capacity in the Turkish public sector. With these characteristics, SBD aims to make social innovation more visible. It carries out activities in order to promote the recognition and conceptual implementation of social innovation within the organization, in the public sector and throughout the country (Interviewee 1).

Ministry of National Education started working on social innovation field in 2010. In 2010, a General Directorate was established under the name of Innovation and Education Technologies at the Ministry of National Education. The only main task and focus of this General Directorate is to carry out projects and activities related to entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship, innovation and social innovation concepts for the internal and external environment of the institution. Scientific and technological policies are determined by the General Directorate of Innovation and Education Technologies in order to improve the quality and conditions of education in general and related activities are carried out. In 2008, the largest comprehensive “smart board project” among all Ministries in the world was launched and in addition to this, students have increased their interaction with technology by granting students tablet computers. Since 2013-2014 academic year, by organizing innovation prizes around the country for both students and teachers, it encourages both the Ministry employees and their students, who are the biggest service providers and recipients, to innovate (Interviewee 2).

The Ministry of Industry and Technology carries out its social innovation activities under the umbrella of the General Directorates of R & D Incentives, General Directorate of Incentive Implementation and Foreign Capital, General Directorate of Development Agencies and Directorate of Strategy Development. Since 2006, the Ministry of Industry and Technology has participated in national and international organizations such as panels, conferences and symposiums as a guest institution and organizes them as a host institution in some events. Additionally, they put effort on incubators, to increase the support of social entrepreneurs, and the area around leading social innovation projects via development agencies of cities in the local scale. To give an example, development agencies have been supporting and monitoring projects since 2011 with young social entrepreneur development programs focused on social entrepreneurship. (Interviewee 3).

Leadership projects are carried out every year in order to increase the social entrepreneurship capacity of the municipalities coordinated by the Union of Municipalities since 2011. With these projects, it is aimed to develop leadership characteristics of top executives of municipalities. In order to increase the level of knowledge and experience of social entrepreneurship by the Union of Municipalities, the secretariat of some EU projects is

carried out. In addition to this, successful projects in the field of social entrepreneurship are modelled and applied by taking advantage of international examples in EU meetings. Currently, the Intercultural Cities Project, which will be carried out to increase the social innovation capacity of the municipalities, is in preparation and design phase (Interviewee 4).

The Turkish Grand National Assembly is the main and most powerful institution of the legislature with the authority given by the Law. As it is known, the laws aim to increase social welfare and with this feature, the Assembly carries out activities that may be the subject of social innovation. Although no special unit has been established in the field of social innovation or social entrepreneurship within the Assembly, the awareness of social innovation has increased especially in the last decade (Interviewee 5).

There is a Technopolis which serves as a Technology Development Zone (TDZ) within Ankara University. This Technopolis is a specialized TDZ that specializes mainly in agriculture and the environment. Since 2015, "Ankara University Teknokent" has been carrying out innovation and entrepreneurship programs under the name of "Invention Day". Among the sub-headings of this comprehensive program are some activities under social innovation which aim to raise awareness with the participation of various stakeholders on environment and disadvantaged individuals (Interviewee 6).

Higher Education entered into a restructuring process in academic, institutional and administrative aspects with the Higher Education Law in 1981. With this law, all higher education institutions in our country have been gathered under the roof of Higher Education Council (YÖK), academies have been transformed into universities, education institutes have been converted into education faculties and conservatories and vocational schools have been connected to universities. In other words, all universities, which are the most important stakeholders of development, entrepreneurship, progress and development in a country, operate within the body of YÖK. It also publishes entrepreneurial and innovative university index every year. In addition, in 2017 some universities were designated as research universities by YÖK. In the following periods, it is thought that categorization such as entrepreneurial university will be made by YÖK (Interviewee 7).

Since 2014, the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization has provided Smart City applications with a legal status. In this context, smart cities and social innovation activities have gained momentum. In addition, the Ministry carries out projects on urban culture and social innovation in order to design smart cities. (Interviewee 8).

Governorship of Ankara does not have a unit or department in the field of social innovation. The institutions only participates in training programs that can be associated with this field of study (Interviewee 9).

TÜBİTAK carries out activities in the fields of entrepreneurship, innovation and social innovation within numerous Presidencies such as R & D and Innovation Department. The perception that TÜBİTAK is an institution that only supports scientific research in the field of (hard) science rather than social sciences has changed in the last decade. There are many projects and activities in national and international scale that support social entrepreneurship and social innovation in the last decade (Interviewee 10).

Since 2010, the Ministry of Youth and Sports has been organizing national weeks of innovation. In addition, it carries out innovation activities ranging from art to education, from sports to science for all young people across the country. It is aimed to contribute to increase social welfare through these activities (Interviewee 11).

The Ministry of Family, Labor and Social Services is engaged in social policies as required by the sub-sectors it serves. Social services have the responsibility to create individual change by empowering individuals to make their own decisions and manage their lives. Social services are one of the most important professions that are effective as an agent of change in every stage of development. Thus, in a society, social innovation is realized through the application area of the social work profession. The field of application includes the services offered by the profession. Although the Ministry has provided services with

different names in certain periods, the Ministry has been producing many new software which may be subject to social innovation especially since 2008 (Interviewee 12).

Since 2016, Quality of Service program aims to provide solutions for the social problems experienced in the state dormitories by the authority of Higher Education Student Loan and Housing Board (KYK). Additionally, continuous satisfaction surveys are carried out for close to 700000 students staying in state dormitories and the policies of the institution are organized according to these surveys (Interviewee 13).

The Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry is a ministry that attaches great importance to innovation. There are approximately 50 research institutes and close to 2200 R & D personnel. In addition, the Agricultural Economics Program carries out policies aimed at preventing uncontrolled migration from village to city, which is one of the biggest socio-economic problems of our country (Interviewee 14).

Today, the speed, reliability and performance of the service offered to the citizens is proportional to how effective the information technologies are used. For this reason, Ministry of Justice built a system make their services more effective and efficient. The National Judicial Network Information System (UYAP) has been used throughout the country since 2004. This system is considered to be one of the best examples of social innovation in the public sector (Interviewee 15).

TURKSTAT is among the institutions which use the technology most intensively among the public institutions. The competence of the institution is very high in subjects such as storage, classification and analysis of data. Establishment of social sciences laboratories, big data analysis, data mining, such as the work of the institution is available (Interviewee 16).

No	Institution	Year	Social Innovation Project(s)
----	-------------	------	------------------------------

1	Presidency Strategy and Budget Directorate	1960s-nowadays	Development Agencies (regional social welfare development)
2	The Ministry of National Education	2008-nowadays	Innovation and Education Technologies Department / Smart Board Project
3	The Ministry of Industry and Technology	2011-nowadays	Young Social Entrepreneur Development Programs
4	Union of Municipalities	2019 (expected)	Intercultural Cities Project / Increasing Social Innovation Capacity of the Municipalities
5	Turkish Grand National Assembly	2019 (expected)	Social Innovation Research Commission
6	Ankara University	2015-nowadays	Social Invention Days
7	Higher Education Council (YÖK)	2017	Classification of Universities / Research Universities
8	The Ministry of Environment and Urbanization	2014-nowadays	Smart City (applications) Zero Waste Project
9	Governorship of Ankara	2012-nowadays	Training Programs
10	TÜBİTAK	2007-nowadays	R & D and Innovation Department / Social Innovation Grants and Supports
11	The Ministry of Youth and Sports	2010-nowadays	Weeks of Innovation

12	The Ministry of Family, Labor and Social Services	2011-nowadays	Electronic Clamp
13	Higher Education Student Loan and Housing Board (KYK)	2010-nowadays	Smart Buildings
14	The Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry	2016-2017	Agricultural Economics Program (uncontrolled migration from village to city)
15	The Ministry of Justice	2014-nowadays	The National Judicial Network Information System (UYAP)
16	TURKSTAT	2010-nowadays	Social Sciences Laboratories Big Data Analysis Data Mining Project

Table 7. Social Innovation Projects of the Public Institutions

4.5. Exchanges between Actors and Symbols

According to the Public Financial Management and Control Law No. 5018, a 5-year strategic plan is required for public institutions. In the prepared strategic plans, a headline on innovation was created for public institutions. Also, there are explanations for the solution of social problems in the related title in the preparation of strategic plan. In addition, strategic plan preparation guidelines were prepared for the relevant sectors of public institutions and the aim was to standardize strategic plans through these guidelines. A more systematic form of information gathering through special commissions is a social innovation. These commissions are formed by the Strategy and Budget Directorate by public institutions - non-governmental organizations and all domestic and foreign institutions. (Interviewee 1).

However, there is not enough common understanding of social innovation and social entrepreneurship for the public institutions in Turkey yet. *“It is quite important for the actors*

to have a common understanding of what social innovation is, because otherwise it is just an odd concept” (Interviewee 1). To give an example, while trying to fulfil the National Judiciary Network Project within the scope of the Ministry of Justice, cooperation was made with public institutions such as the Population Administration, the Ministry of Interior and the General Directorate of Security. “However, since a common understanding system for the solution of social problems has not been developed enough, many difficulties have been encountered in the cooperation process” (Interviewee 15). Additionally, there are problems in the storage, analysis, mining and sharing of the “big data” obtained with the institutions. “There is no common point of view regarding innovation and social innovation among public institutions” (Interviewee 16).

The Ministry of Industry and Technology continuously calls for grants related to social innovation and social entrepreneurship projects. While making these grants, they are cooperating with public institutions such as TÜBİTAK, YÖK and universities. In addition, information is exchanged with non-governmental organizations such as TÜSİAD, MÜSİAD and TOBB. However, there is not a single perception about what these institutions are and what the concept of social innovation actually is. Therefore, there are confusion about what the projects actually aim for. More interestingly, there are disagreements between the institutions, within the Ministry of Industry and Technology. Even in the literature, it is claimed that social innovation is not a concept reached. However, *“in order to determine the target more accurately and clearly, it is considered that a single and sharp understanding of social innovation should be developed” (Interviewee 3).*

There is not only one perspective available on social innovation among universities in Turkey. Some universities focus solely on social responsibility projects by focusing on the non-profit structure of social innovation, while some universities think that social innovation can be sustained for profit and focuses on profitable projects. *“The Council of Higher Education (YÖK) is not considered to have a defined policy on social innovation” (Interviewee 7). “The Ministry of Industry and Technology is considered to play a key role in the creation of the social innovation ecosystem and in the design of the network. All public institutions can be included in this network to be established within the Ministry of Industry and Technology” (Interviewee 5). The Governorate of Ankara believes that “a common*

social innovation policy determined by the central government will increase the efficiency in this regard” (Interviewee 9). It is thought that “a common understanding of social innovation can be implemented in local administrations with the contribution of local municipalities” (Interviewee 4).

In addition to all this, “scientific research projects are carried out by the Development Agencies in order to establish social innovation networks in the provinces. As a result of these projects, it is thought that a definition will be reached for the concept of social innovation” (Interviewee 3).

As social innovation is a concept that is not fully reached and matured on content, symbols related to the subject are not formed. In other words, there are no symbols that can be considered as natural actors on consensus (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 4). However, there have been relatively long-standing public institutions working on the concept of social innovation, and it is thought that the symbols will spontaneously turn into a mature form as the concept becomes mature enough (Interviewee 14).

Respondent	Quotes
Interviewee 1	<p><i>“It is significant for the actors to have a common understanding of what social impact is, because otherwise it is just an odd concept”</i></p> <p><i>“There are not symbols yet on the concept of social innovation in Turkey”</i></p>
Interviewee 3	<p><i>“In order to determine the target more accurately and clearly, it is considered that a single and sharp understanding of social innovation should be developed”</i></p> <p><i>“Scientific research projects are carried out by the Development Agencies in order to establish social innovation networks in the provinces. As a result of these projects, it is thought that a definition will be reached for the concept of social innovation”</i></p>
Interviewee 4	<p><i>“A common understanding of social innovation can be implemented in local administrations with the contribution of local municipalities”</i></p>

	<p><i>“As the concept matures, the symbols will emerge and become valid. “As the concept matures, the symbols will emerge and become valid. In addition, common understanding will become more visible”</i></p>
Interviewee 5	<p><i>“The Ministry of Industry and Technology is considered to play a key role in the creation of the social innovation ecosystem and in the design of the network. All public institutions can be included in this network to be established within the Ministry of Industry and Technology”</i></p>
Interviewee 7	<p><i>“The Council of Higher Education (YÖK) is not considered to have a defined policy on social innovation”</i></p>
Interviewee 9	<p><i>“A common social innovation policy determined by the central government will increase the efficiency in this regard”</i></p>
Interviewee 14	<p><i>“There are not common symbols on social innovation but will be created soon when the concept becomes mature enough”</i></p>
Interviewee 15	<p><i>“However, since a common understanding system for the solution of social problems has not been developed enough, many difficulties have been encountered in the cooperation process”</i></p>
Interviewee 16	<p><i>“There are problems in the storage, analysis, mining and sharing of the large data obtained with the institutions. There is no common point of view regarding innovation and social innovation among public institutions”</i></p>

Table 8. Quotes from chapter 4.5.

4.6. Challenges with the Social Innovation in the Public Sector

“The main issue on social innovation is the cultural complexity” (Interviewee 1). A culture of social innovation in the public sector has not been established. *“The biggest challenge to social innovation is the lack of a culture”* (Interviewee 5). *“There is no established culture of social innovation among the ministries, and there is no established culture in the public institutions”* (Interviewee 3). In addition to cooperating with other public institutions for social innovation, public institutions also cooperate with civil society organizations such as TOBB, TÜSİAD and MÜSİAD. However, the problem of coexistence is also seen in these

collaborations. In addition to institutions, this kind of culture towards social innovation is undeveloped throughout the country. *“There is no complete understanding of what the concept of social innovation means among public institutions and what it does not include and what it contains”* (Interviewee 1). Interviewee 10 claims that *“some public institutions consider social innovation only as non-profit social responsibility projects, while some public institutions consider social innovation as a profit-making solution to social problems”*. Some public institutions do not believe that sustainability of social innovation cannot be achieved unless it is aimed at profit.

“Social innovation is quite complex to analyse and measure” (Interviewee 2). *“The analysis of the concept of social innovation by scientific and mathematical methods cannot be performed as easily as some quantitative analyses”* (Interviewee 16). Senior executives of public institutions explain this situation for some different reasons. One reason for this is that *“even in the literature, social innovation is not a concept that has yet to be fully achieved”* (Interviewee 4). The other reason is about *“social innovation’s abstract structure and concept”* (Interviewee 15). Another reason is that *“social impact analysis is not widespread in our country in the analysis of the results of social innovation”* (Interviewee 10).

“There are a lot of different models to analyse which makes it difficult to implement social innovation” (Interviewee 10). *“A standardisation should be made about what public institutions will carry out on social innovation”* (Interviewee 9). Interviewee 8 claims that *“Classifications should be made on not only choosing process of the applications but also the kind of applications will be carried out”*. *“There is not a unique perception of the concept of social innovation in the public institutions”* (Interviewee 7).

According to Interviewee 4, there is a drain-pipe problem that occurs because of the difference between the expenditure makers and the beneficiaries. In other words, the problem may be that one of their areas of responsibility does not want to pay for something they cannot use.

Respondent	Quotes
Interviewee 1	<p><i>“The main issue on social innovation is the cultural complexity”</i></p> <p><i>“There is no complete understanding of what the concept of social innovation means among public institutions and what it does not include and what it contains”</i></p>
Interviewee 2	<i>“Social innovation is quite complex to analyse and measure”</i>
Interviewee 4	<p><i>“The lack of an institutional and legal obligation is seen as one of the most important obstacles to social innovation”</i></p> <p><i>“Social innovation practices should be put into practice at the level of local governments”</i></p>
Interviewee 5	<i>“The biggest challenge to social innovation is the lack of a culture”</i>
Interviewee 7	<i>“There is not a unique perception of the concept of social innovation in the public institutions”</i>
Interviewee 8	<i>“Classifications should be made on not only choosing process of the applications but also the kind of applications will be carried out”</i>
Interviewee 9	<i>“A standardisation should be made about what public institutions will carry out on social innovation”</i>
Interviewee 10	<p><i>“Some public institutions consider social innovation only as non-profit social responsibility projects, while some public institutions consider social innovation as a profit-making solution to social problems”</i></p> <p><i>“Social impact analysis is not widespread in our country in the analysis of the results of social innovation”</i></p> <p><i>“There are a lot of different models to analyse which makes it difficult to implement social innovation”</i></p>
Interviewee 14	<i>“Since human resources management in public institutions is still not fully performance-oriented, social innovation analysis is not carried out efficiently”</i>
Interviewee 15	<i>“Social innovation’s abstract structure and concept”</i>
Interviewee 16	<i>“The analysis of the concept of social innovation by scientific and mathematical methods cannot be performed as easily as some quantitative analyses”</i>

Table 9. Quotes from chapter 4.6.

PART V

5. ANALYSIS OF THE EMPIRICAL RESULTS

This analytical chapter is divided into the different parts of the analytical framework, where the empirical results from the previous chapter are analysed under the key codes from the data analysis process (Table 3.). The chapter ends with concluding remarks.

5.1. Legitimacy

5.1.1. Positive Effects on the Society

Even if the responses from the empirical part are somewhat different from each other, it can be seen that there is a general opinion that social innovation is a concept that provides opportunities for solving certain social problems. Interviewee 16 argues that “*social innovation is of great importance for the sustainability of institutions*”. Interviewee 15 claims that “*social innovation, which offers solutions to social problems that cannot be recovered or compensated, is of vital importance*”. In other words, social innovation is considered to be a social saving because it is thought to eliminate future costs. Interviewee 11 expresses that “*social innovation can contribute to the creation of healthier societies*”. To give an example, the training of healthy societies and individuals will prevent the occurrence of health problems that may occur in future processes. It will be possible to provide a more effective and qualified social services which will be provided with social innovation in another way. This means that resources such as time, money, and human resources are saved. This situation shows that the concept of social innovation is linked to moral legitimacy, because it is seen that stakeholders in social entrepreneurship and social

innovation probably expect positive social consequences and impacts. Analysis of social innovation activities should be done in a scientific manner and contribute to the positive effects that solve important social problems in the short, medium and long term (Interviewee 5). Suchman (1995) emphasizes that moral legitimacy is a positive normative assessment of institutions and activities, and that if stakeholders do not see a positive effect, stakeholders will probably not consider social initiatives as morally legitimate. It can be argued that the actors involved in this thesis are stakeholders in social entrepreneurship and social innovation. Public institutions like all Ministries and the other institutions such as TÜBİTAK, KYK and YÖK are considered to be the most important stakeholders of social innovation. Social innovation is in accordance with the definition of legitimacy by Suchman (1995, p. 574) that, the actions of being are linked to the assumption that some socially constructed norms, values, beliefs within the system of beliefs are desirable and appropriate. It can be argued that there is a general perception that social impact should be attained in entrepreneurship and social innovation. Interviewee 5 argues that social impact is a demand that contributes to a value for society. If social entrepreneurs cannot demonstrate any legitimacy, then stakeholders should make any effort to solve the social problems. Interviewee 15 claims that “*public institutions exist to produce solutions to social problems and each institution that aims to provide innovative solutions to social problems has to carry out activities that may be subject to social innovation*”. In this context, activities that may be subject to social innovation at the level of legitimacy of public institutions have a great impact and importance.

Also, public institutions that make new investments and applications on the subject of social innovation aim to create positive effects in society as a result of their innovations. There is no hesitation in this regard. However, some public institutions and their senior executives think that there should be some positive effects on their institutions while creating positive effects on society. In other words, some of them think that have positive effects on society should be rewarded and encouraged. In addition, they think that it is considered that it would be appropriate to make some legal arrangements to increase the budgets of public institutions that have a positive impact on society. Shortly, senior executives claim that the opportunities and capabilities of public institutions can be increased and the welfare of their employees can be increased via social innovation. This is where there needs to be a change in the mind-

set, as displayed in the empirical results. The senior executives in the public sector must start to identify if the activities of social initiatives are the right things to do instead of focus on if it benefits them.

5.1.2. Solution of the Social Problems

The aim of social innovation is to contribute not only to public institutions that make social innovation, but also to senior executives and to create positive effects. In other words, it should be underlined deeply that the ultimate aim of social innovation is to find solutions to social problems. Interviewee 3 claims that *“technological or business innovation is concerned only with commercialized technological innovations, while social innovation is about providing technology-based solutions to social innovations”*. Interviewee 1 claims that *“social problems have many different dimensions”* and Interviewee 7 argues that *“analysing these dimensions and revealing their resources accurately is a very difficult process”*. Also, Interviewee 5 underlines that *“the reason why this analysis is quite difficult is that it is a complex and challenging process to achieve a systematic cause-effect relationship as in quantitative studies when social innovation is considered”*. There is a need for a contextual and in-depth scientific analysis despite all the problems arising from being a multi-dimensional and abstract concept. In other words, although the word legitimacy is not directly expressed in semi-structured interviews with senior executives of public institutions, it is emphasized that social innovation should be placed on the ground of legitimacy. In order for social innovation to gain legitimacy, it is necessary to determine and analyse the different dimensions of social problems in detail. In other words, social innovation should be analysed correctly and the information of the society should not be avoided in the process of carrying out activities that may be subject to social innovation. The relevant public institution may contribute to the level of legitimacy it has in order to share the social problems with technology-based innovations and to share it with the public intensively (Suchman, 1995; Dart, 2004).

Also, Interviewee 8 stresses that *“social innovation contributes to better service of the relevant public institution”* and Interviewee 1 argues that *“social innovation should be considered as the reasons for the existence of public institutions”*. It is important that the

efforts of the public institutions on social innovation and the success they have made and what they will do in the future to solve social problems in the eyes of the society. This will both contribute to the institution's existence and increase the support received by the central government. In other words, both the budget will increase and a positive change in the perception towards the institution will be exposed to the citizens. In other words, it is emphasized that public institutions that carry out social innovation activities offer better and higher quality services than other public institutions and solve social problems as reasons of existence. In addition, the issue of social innovation should not be limited to a restricted section of an organization, a sector or society as Interviewee 3 and Interviewee 4 express. Interviewee 3 expresses that *“competition does not take place within public institutions but also occur among other sectors”*. Interviewee 4 claims that *“the reduction of social innovation to the level of individuals, institutions or communities is not correct”*. Social and environmental performance is directly linked to legitimacy via accountability and credibility according to Mason, Kirkbride, and Bryde (2007). Therefore, in order to contribute to the level of legitimacy, in addition to the issues listed above, the relevant public institution should also give importance to its credibility and accountability and work in this field.

As mentioned above, the concept of social innovation and social problems are multidimensional and complex. Interviewee 10 underlines that *“there should also be an attempt to solve social problems in all areas where social problems exist. Social innovation can be considered as a whole of the initiatives that are necessary to solve all these problems”*. If the solution of social problems is considered as the cause of the existence of public institutions, there is a need for a public institution to provide a solution where there are social problems. Interviewee 12 claims that *“conducting innovative activities that can be the subject of social innovation without knowing the basic problems of society will prevent the desired results”*. Therefore, the comprehensive classification of the sources of social problems and their classification and classification will contribute to the legitimacy of the concept of social innovation in public institutions. At last, Interviewee 6 underlines that *“as a matter of fact, any prioritization among social problems is not correct”*. For this reason, since social problems cannot be abandoned or neglected, it will not be appropriate to make some prioritization among them by making any prioritization.

5.1.3. Increasing Social Welfare

Interviewee 4 addresses that *“the reduction of social innovation to the level of individuals, institutions or communities is not correct and it is appropriate to consider the change resulting from this concept outside of certain classifications.* In other words, social innovation is not something that may be the subject of certain minor limitations. Also, the difference between social innovation and social responsibility projects is the ability to achieve social impact and its measurement. Interviewee 14 identifies that *“public institutions, which are the pioneers in social innovation practices, stand out in the competition in the public sector”*. In addition, social innovation aims at sustainability. Sustainability is also possible with profit. Otherwise only one-time application or solutions will be possible. The main aim of solving the social problems of the society and creating a positive effect on the society is to increase social welfare. Therefore, public institutions wishing to increase social welfare are obliged to rationally analyse the problem areas of the society. Interviewee 2 claims that *“Conducting innovative activities that can be the subject of social innovation without knowing the basic problems of society will prevent the desired results”*. Increasing social welfare will also be possible by increasing efficiency and effectiveness. Interviewee 5 argues that *“reducing expenditures in a management area by differentiating processes or methods can make it possible to increase resources to other areas. Thus, it can contribute to the increase of social welfare”*. Interviewee 11 underlines that *“social innovation can contribute to the creation of healthier societies”*. The increase in the level of legitimacy of public institutions carrying out social innovation activities is therefore directly proportional to the increase in social welfare as Interviewee 11 and Interviewee 12 define. Interviewee 11 expresses that *“disadvantaged groups may benefit from new applications that may arise as a result of social innovation”*. Increasing the welfare of society by increasing the quality of life and reducing social spending is directly related to the more rational management of the legitimacy process (Suchman, 1995). Therefore, it should be underlined that social spending should be reduced in related subjects and the remaining budget is transferred to different social problems by increasing the social welfare of the whole society including disadvantaged groups as Interviewee 12 and Interviewee 13 explains. Interviewee 12 claims that *“social innovation is measurable improvements of vulnerable target groups’ life qualities that result in savings for the public sectors budget”* and Interviewee 13 underlines that *“social innovation can contribute to increasing the living*

standards of disadvantaged groups". As a matter of fact, the legitimacy of the concept of social innovation and the public institutions carrying out social innovation activities will be legitimized by increasing social welfare. In this respect, accurate collection, management and analysis of data are important as Interviewee 16 underlines. "*Social innovation is related to big data analysis and can only be carried out if big data is available*" (Interviewee 16).

5.2. The Three Pillars of Institutions

The institutions are not stable institutions which do not change in any way and do not affect the various factors. On the contrary, the institutions are affected by the factors in the internal and external environment, interact with institutional factors and are constantly developing institutions (North, 1993). As can be seen from the empirical responses obtained from the semi-structured interviews with the senior executives of the public institutions, the executives involved in the negotiations and the institutions in which they are involved in this thesis carry out activities that can be subject to social innovation for a few decades. However, both in the internal environment of the institutions and in the public sector, opinions are expressed at various times regarding the concept of social innovation, and academic and social meetings are organized. However, this concept is not systematically regulated and emphasized at national and governmental level. Interviewee 1 claims that "today, the public institutions are faced with rapidly increasing and diversifying problems in society and the solution of these problems is only possible with the services provided to the society by the right and innovative methods of limited financial resources". Also, "*public institutions should continuously develop and change in a positive way in order to solve the ever-evolving and changing social problems*" (Interviewee 4). This situation brings the obligation of the public institutions to solve the social problems and the necessity of being the addressee of the environmental factors. Therefore, depending on North's argument (1993), it can be argued that social innovation in public institutions is in the process of institutionalization, because it is important to develop this area and the area is currently developing and maturing process. For this reason, the three pillars of the institutional structure of public institutions in Turkey of these three pillars of institutions (Scott, 2013), said to be in the process of building. The previous chapter shows that legitimacy is important for social innovation and that the formation, transformation and dissemination of institutions require legitimacy

according to Dacin, Goodstein and Scott (2002). In addition, three pillars of institutions provide a basis for legitimacy (Scott, 2013), which shows that legitimacy and institutions are interrelated with three pillars. Accordingly, it would be appropriate to legitimize the concept of social innovation in order to be institutionalized.

5.3. Regulative Pillar

5.3.1. Standardized Strategy

Interviewee 5 claims that “*there should be laws, regulations and contracts binding on social innovation for public institutions*”. Interviewee 2 and Interviewee 13 underline that social innovation in public institutions should reach a legal stage and infrastructure. Additionally, Interviewee 8 underlines that “*some legal obligations need to be established as to what methods the public institutions will follow when innovating*”. According to the results of the interviews, it is possible to reproduce these explanations and examples for a standardized strategy. In other words, almost all of the respondents believe that it would be appropriate to find a standardized and systematized strategy to analyse and interpret social incoordination in public institutions. Interviewee 1 argues that “*it is not possible to determine a single standard that will determine the framework of social innovation*”. Even if it is difficult to find a standardized regulation and strategy that complies with all kinds of social innovation activities and functioning, it should be a common or comprehensive view of how the level of social innovation is interpreted according to empirical results. The need for a kind of standardized strategy reveals the need to establish a formal standard around social incoherence, and this may be a factor affecting the process of regulation and the development and implementation of legal regulations (Scott, 2013). In addition, one of the problems of social innovation and the complexity of the concept is that there are many understandings that make it difficult to compare different social enterprises that are very complex, multidimensional and comprehensive. This can also be an effective factor in the development of a formal standard and is probably one of the reasons why public institutions operating social innovation are not widely used in the public sector. In this way, social

innovation can achieve a standardization in the public sector. In addition, assessments, analyses and interpretations of success can reach an official standard.

“The state needs to define social innovation in a specific way” (Interviewee 9). Also, *“as there is no legal regulation on social innovation, there is no sanction mechanism for institutions that do not produce solutions and innovations that may be subject to social innovation”* (Interviewee 3). In addition, it is considered appropriate to develop a standardized model and a legal infrastructure especially for comparison between public institutions carrying out social innovation activities. Interviewee 2 argues that *“measuring the quality of services of public institutions is also important”*. Interviewee 4 claims that *“the lack of any legislation or standardization regarding social innovation does not encourage institutions to pursue activities that may be subject to social innovation”*. In other words, a legislative mechanism and strategy should be developed that includes the most appropriate solutions to overcome all social problems of the public sector. These arguments can be supported by the quote from Interview 14. *“These mechanisms need to go beyond their incentive status and reach a legal stage”* (Interviewee 14). Mason, Kirkbride and Bryde (2007) stress that regulatory rules need to be taken into account in social business governance and that they must adhere to specific behavioural standards and performance demanded or expected by internal actors. In connection with this, the development of a standardized legislative infrastructure for the development of social entrepreneurship capacity and social innovation in public institutions. This can also help the development of the concept of legitimacy and facilitate the approach of public institutions to achieve success.

If a standard created around the concept of social innovation strategy in Turkey will probably be structured by the actors in the public sector. In other words, this process will be developed by the senior executives of public institutions and the beneficiaries of it. These arguments can be supported by the quote from Interview 5 Interviewee 15. *“Intrapreneurship and entrepreneurship should be analysed at all scales, including personnel, units, departments and institutions, and the necessary responsibilities and reward mechanisms should be provided by providing legal status”* (Interviewee 5). Interviewee 15 declares that *“it is very important for civil servants working in public institutions to develop themselves and their institutions within the scope of intrapreneurship”*. As it is understood from the empirical

results, it is important to be successful in social innovation for these actors and public institutions. Consequently, the standards of conduct of governance by public institutions are clearly or indirectly determined by the main beneficiaries of the society and the external mechanisms involved in the interaction (Mason, Kirkbride, & Bryde, 2007). In this direction, as Interviewee 8 addresses that *“in the process of bringing the concept of social innovation and social innovation in public institutions into legal infrastructure, opinions and suggestions of all actors other than public institutions should be taken”*. Interviewee 12 argues that *“the legislation emphasizes the solution of social problems by public institutions, but such emphasis is either indirectly or not directly related to social innovation”*. In short, great efforts need to be made to create a standardized system of how to analyse and develop social innovation on the purpose of gaining legitimacy via regulative pillar. This means that there is a need of standard strategy on public sector’s social innovation by all of the social innovation actors and therefore a lot of effort is needed to create a legal basis.

5.4. Normative Pillar

5.4.1. Training, Professionalization, and Certification

The focal point in the normative pillar is normative rules covering norms and values according to Scott (2013). In this case, it can be argued that the normative system includes innovative activities and social innovation made by the public institutions that provide value for the society, because what is expected to be achieved is to solve the social problems and increase social welfare. This argument is supported by Mason, Kirkbride and Bryde (2007), who claim that social enterprises and their value and cultural norms that can be the subject of social innovation are to achieve maximum social benefit. As can be understood from the empirical results, evidence of social innovation activities to be carried out by public institutions to obtain maximum social benefit may be required as Interviewee 6 underlines. Interviewee 6 stresses that *“in the case of conducting social responsibility projects, both the commitment of the organization’s own employees to the institution and the positive emotions and perceptions of the citizen felt towards the organization are increasing”*. However, evaluating and analysing social innovation has become a normative rule, and it is important

to do this as experimental results show. Interviewee 7 underlines that *“as a public institution aiming to provide solutions to the social problems and to support the society, we feel the obligation to implement projects and activities that are not legally necessary”*. Also, Interviewee 12 claims that *“the trainings provided by the employees of the institution or by external trainers are considered from a normative point of view”*. *“Projects that provide solutions to social problems by our institution are carried out by the obligations of moral responsibility”* (Interviewee 12). This is also an indication that the normative pillar exists but is in the process of development and growth.

Some of the interviewees argue that none of the existing social innovation analysing and evaluating models have become normative in Turkey yet. However, most of the interviewees argue that there are models that are starting to be normative, which implies that this pillar is developing. Interviewee 1 argues that *“the managers of the institutions want to implement the training and practices of other institutions in their own institutions”*. Also, it might specifically be one of these mentioned models that is going to be normative. Also, it is argued that it displays that clarifying social innovation is growing in Turkey according to Interviewee 8. Interviewee 8 expresses that *“providing better quality and innovative services to citizens is considered to be the most important aspect of social innovation”*. Scott (2013) claims that normative systems not only define goals but also determine proper ways to achieve them with efficient methods. *“We have learned that many public institutions have shifted to a non-hierarchical horizontal-dimensioned management approach and we have worked on this field”* (Interviewee 14). Creating positive effect on the society and raising the social welfare the goal in social entrepreneurship and social innovation but the empirical results show that there is still a need for development when it comes to measuring social innovation. Norms are associated with how things should be done (Scott, 2013). *“Total quality management and similar types of innovative and advanced management have gained a moral and important dimension to be applied in almost all of our institution and other institutions”* (Interviewee 8). Moreover, social enterprises face pressures to adopt to specific organizational standards and structures (Reid, & Griffith, 2006).

As a result, the social basis of the moral dimension of an institution is that the institution is morally correct and appropriate. Interviewee 3 claims that *“employees of the institutions*

also demand training such as occupation education, specialization, and certification and consider it as a necessity and moral responsibility". Carrier and motivation mechanisms are education, professionalization and certification system. *"Applications such as training programs and certificate trainings are perceived as very positive by the managers and employees of the institution"* (Interviewee 4). Interviewee 15 argues that *"employees of the institutions also demand training such as occupation education, specialization, and certification and consider it as a necessity and moral responsibility"*. In other words, it is thought that the normative values may be increased by focusing on activities by training, professionalization, and certification.

5.5. Cultural-Cognitive Pillar

5.5.1. Common Understanding

As it can be derived from empirical studies, a common understanding on the concept of social innovation has to be developed. Interviewee 15 states that *"However, since a common understanding system for the solution of social problems has not been developed enough, many difficulties have been encountered in the cooperation process"*. From this statement, it is clear that a common understanding mechanism on the concept is not sufficiently developed. A common understanding of the nature and content of the social framework is emphasized in the cultural-cognitive pillar of institutions (Scott, 2013). The importance of a common understanding mechanism in this area is emphasized. It is understood that there is not enough level of maturity and it is also emphasized that it needs to develop. In addition, there are still diverse understandings on it. According to Interviewee 3, *"In order to determine the target more accurately and clearly, it is considered that a single and sharp understanding of social innovation should be developed"*. It is accepted that there are differences regarding the common understanding mechanism and the importance of forming this mechanism is also emphasized by different participants of the interviews such as Interviewee 1 and Interviewee 9. To give an example, Interviewee 1 argues that *"It is significant for the actors to have a common understanding of what social impact is, because otherwise it is just an odd concept"*. According to Interviewee 9, *"A common social*

innovation policy determined by the central government will increase the efficiency in this regard". After emphasizing the importance of establishing a common understanding mechanism, the opinions about how this mechanism can be formed or which actors will take a role are mentioned. Interviewee 4 underlines that *"A common understanding of social innovation can be implemented in local administrations with the contribution of local municipalities"*. *"Scientific research projects are carried out by the Development Agencies in order to establish social innovation networks in the provinces. As a result of these projects, it is thought that a definition will be reached for the concept of social innovation"* (Interviewee 3). *"The Council of Higher Education (YÖK) is not considered to have a defined policy on social innovation"* (Interviewee 7). In other words, importance is attached to creating a common consensus and suggestions and opinions are made on which stakeholders will play a role. However, there is no detailed and systematic view of what kind of strategic path to follow. In spite of all this, a proposal was made by the Ministry of Industry and Technology relatively close to the desired level, although not exhaustive and detailed. According to Interviewee 5, *"The Ministry of Industry and Technology is considered to play a key role in the creation of the social innovation ecosystem and in the design of the network. All public institutions can be included in this network to be established within the Ministry of Industry and Technology"*.

At last, if main purpose is to reach a more acceptable and valid common understanding of social innovation in the short run, it will be likely possible with a broader stakeholder engagement and a more systematically organized series of actors. In other words, if this field in a general way and especially the concept should be able to grow fast, there probably is a need for more organized exchanges. Scott (2013) underlines that meanings emerge as a result of interactions and this correlation defines the importance of interactions on common understanding. These exchanges can be possible via interactions between actor within the sector and between the actors of the different sectors. This interaction might benefit the knowledge diffusion, cumulative contribution and the development of the phenomenon. Interviewee 4 argues that *"interaction between the actors of social innovation will help growing of the common understanding not only in the public sector but also on the all stakeholders outside the sector"*.

5.5.2. Symbols

There are no symbols of social innovation and social entrepreneurship in Turkey today. The interviewees attributed these arguments to the fact that the common mechanisms of interaction were not developed at the desired and valid level. Also, most of the interviewees state that the symbols are not formed yet due to the area's immature condition because of being relatively new in the field. According to Scott (2013), symbols is the part of the whole cultural-cognitive pillar and meanings are shaped by referring of the objects and activities via symbols (Scott, 2013). Interviewee 1 supports that *“There are not symbols yet on the concept of social innovation in Turkey”*. Also, Interviewee 14 states that *“There are not common symbols on social innovation but will be created soon when the concept becomes mature enough”*. Therefore, the formation and maturation of symbols will contribute to the emergence of a common understanding mechanism as Interviewee 4 underlines. *“As the concept matures, the symbols will emerge and become valid. In addition, common understanding will become more visible”* (Interviewee 4). Therefore, as the content of the concept matures, it is thought that symbols will emerge from the existing or possible actors and this process will be the incubator of the common understanding of the phenomenon.

5.6. Wicked Problems

5.6.1. Complex to Measure

Some problems about social innovation linked to wicked problems. According to Rittel and Webber (1973), wicked problems do not have clear traits and it is claimed by some researchers that social problems do not have certain traits as well. According to Interviewee 4, *“social innovation is not a concept that has yet to be fully achieved”*. Interviewee 1 states that *“there is no complete understanding of what the concept of social innovation means among public institutions and what it does not include and what it contains”*. According to the nature of the concept that social innovation has *“social innovation is quite complex to analyse and measure”* (Interviewee 2). Additionally, *“the main issue on social innovation is the cultural complexity”* (Interviewee 1). A problem solver can know and identify all of

the details of a concrete problem. However, it is not possible to have full knowledge of all the details of social problems. In short, this complexity and abstractness makes social problems almost impossible to solve (Rittel, & Webber, 1973).

It is important to prove and analyse social innovation as it is mentioned and underlined earlier in the research. However, the complexity and the abstract structure of the social problems reveal the question of whether it is possible to analyse and prove the process and results of social innovation. *“The analysis of the concept of social innovation by scientific and mathematical methods cannot be performed as easily as some quantitative analyses”* (Interviewee 16). In other words, proof of some of the social problems that are the subject of social innovation may be easier than others. The analysis of some social problems can be almost impossible because of their multidimensional and complex structure. Therefore, in order to overcome such difficulties to the extent possible, some methods should be developed and a superior effort should be made. At this point, Rittel and Webber (1973) refer to the importance of analysing the context in detail and spending more resources. Interviewee 7 underlines that *“there is not a unique perception and strategy of the concept of social innovation in the public institutions”*. To overcome, it is considered appropriate to find the traits and create a standardized strategy to overcome such problems as much as possible.

Rittel and Webber (1973) argues that the person who wants to solve a social problem must understand all the reasons of the social problem in all dimensions and conceptualize it deeply by considering its background. While analysing a problem in depth with all its dimensions and conceptualizing is already an important problem, another thing is the different problem-solving methods of different people. In other words, different people might want to solve the problem with different solutions. In its simplest form, different people might use different methods to solve the problems. According to Interviewee 10, *“there are a lot of different models to analyse which makes it difficult to implement social innovation”*. To solve this problems some classifications should be defined by using systematic methods as Interviewee 8 and Interviewee 9 underline. To make it clear, Interviewee 9 claims that *“a standardisation should be made about what public institutions will carry out on social innovation”*. *“Classifications should be made on not only choosing process of the applications but also*

the kind of applications will be carried out” (Interviewee 8). Therefore, even if standardized methods are developed, it is not possible to fully and accurately analyse social problems. For this reason, if the concept of social innovation is reached as much as possible, the concept becomes more normative and can be formulated more easily. However, it should not be ignored that “the formulation of a wicked problem is a wicked problem” (Rittel, & Webber, 1973, p. 161).

5.6.2. Drain-Pipe Problem

The problem of drain-pipe discussed in the empirical results of analyses about social problems related to society is also connected to the wicked problems that cover almost all of the political issues (Rittel and Webber, 1973). According to Interviewee 4, there is a drain-pipe problem that occurs because of the difference between the expenditure makers and the beneficiaries. In other words, the problem may be that one of their areas of responsibility does not want to pay for something they cannot use. In addition, the debates on which social problems can be solved by which authorities, who will be held responsible on it. Rittel and Webber (1973) emphasize that it is not clear who will take the initiative, because the fight against wicked problems is not formal and clearly framed, and the decision-making power is not clearly formulated. Thus, there may be difficulties in deciding who or what institution to spend on a social initiative to resolve a particular social problem. According to Interviewee 4, “*there are a lot of different social problems and these problems are aimed to be solved based on different reasons*”. Therefore, there may be differences on solving the social problems regarding which social problem is more important, how to prioritize them and which methods to choose. In other words, there may be problems in deciding which solution should be the most appropriate one and which initiative should be prioritized.

Public actors should do rational analysis of what social problems are needed to be solved, and should not focus on what they can gain in the short or long term if they invest in a social enterprise. If actors in the public sector or, in other words, public institutions only look at and focus on what is beneficial to them, it may be very difficult to find an actor that will make the expenditure. In other words, finding the actor that will take action or take a solution with an appropriate initiative that could be the correct solution of a social problem.

Therefore, if the drain pipe problem needs to be solved, a change in the mentality of many actors in the public sector is required. Otherwise, there may be problems in the decision-making processes of public sector's actors for a social problem that needs to be solved by the social enterprise.

5.7. Concluding Remarks

As stated in this section of analysis, there is a rational social innovation logic and mechanism in which it is possible to prove and measure social innovation. Therefore, there is abstraction and complexity in the analysis and evaluation of the rationality of social innovation. This situation causes a tension between rationality and the resultants from complex issues. It is aimed to minimize this tension with the works and innovations to be made. In addition, it should be underlined that legitimacy and the three pillars of institutions are interlinked and linked to the rationality of social innovation, while wicked problems explains most of the difficulties associated with social innovation. This shows that all these parts of the analytic framework are necessary to understand the whole phenomenon of social innovation.

PART VI

6. CONCLUSION

This is the last chapter in this thesis and it consists of conclusion, followed by contribution of the thesis, and discussion and future research.

This thesis aims to identify and explore the understanding of how and why social innovation is taking place in the public sector and why it is important, and what the drivers and challenges are with social innovation in the public sector institutions in Turkey. This thesis also aims to answer these questions: *How do practitioners and policy makers understand social innovation in the public sector and why is it important? What are the perceived challenges of social innovation?* At the moment the answers to these questions have been reached.

Social innovation can be explained as innovative activities and services that are motivated by the goal of meeting a social need whose primary purposes are social. However, social innovation is differentiated by social responsibility projects and technological innovation with some features. Since the concept of social innovation is a concept that has not been fully reached on the literature and is not mature enough, there are different points of view about the concept. However, the feature that separates social innovation from pure technological innovation is that it focuses directly on social problems. It is aimed to improve products and services, solve social problems and save money by increasing efficiency with innovative applications. So, the point in here should be reached is societal savings as a result of future expenses. In addition, social innovation also differs from social responsibility projects and activities because social innovation has a profit aim in order to ensure

sustainability. It also aims to measure the positive social impacts that social innovation will create or provide. In this context, the concept of legitimacy regarding social innovation comes to the fore. The public institutions that carry out social innovation activities, the actors and stakeholders of these institutions are of course questioning the legitimacy of these activities. Otherwise, these activities and institutions will not have any basis. In this context, regulative, normative and cognitive grounds are the most important three pillars of legitimacy. It is understood that the public institutions carrying out activities related to social innovation are guided by these three pillars of legitimacy to a certain extent and they contribute positively to the level of legitimacy of these three important pillars of institutions.

Rational valuation and analysis of social innovation activities due to their qualitative structure is not as easy as evaluating any quantitative activity. For this reason, there are also linked difficulties to prove and measure the social impact likely to arise as a result of social innovation activities. Therefore, there is no specific or correct and false right or wrong in the activities related to social innovation and the results of these activities. Because it is very complex to measure and understand social problems and it is difficult to distinguish between what a result is and what the impact of social innovation is. However, there are large, global and complex social challenges that need to be solved today, and the structure, nature and number of these problems are increasing and becoming more complex every day. Furthermore, in order to solve these social challenges correctly, actors in the public sector should begin to identify the social problems they want to solve and the social impact they want to achieve, and then provide an effect instead of a product or a service that may not be the only correct solution. Some of the laws of the relevant paragraph is an emphasis on certain social problems and their solutions in Turkey, though, in this context, any regulations for these types of activities and situations not be standardized. In addition, no inclusive strategy document is available. As a result, a formal law on social innovation is considered to be useful in the public sector. In addition, necessary measures should be taken to ensure that the relevant law does not remain on paper only, and that the law should be actively implemented through the activation of the enforcement mechanisms. Finally, it is believed that the development of monitoring and evaluating mechanisms is of vital importance.

There is also a drain-pipe problem in the society. This problem occurs because a segment of society or societies that does not want to pay for something they cannot use. In addition, there are also some problematic debates on which social problems can be solved by which authorities, who will be held responsible on it. To overcome these challenges that are mentioned above, it requires a change in the mind-set of the actors in the public sector.

Today, there are no official regulations or government standards for social innovation in Turkey. However, in addition to the need for a standard strategy for analysing and evaluating social innovation, there is a need to compare a standard legal infrastructure and different social initiatives. Therefore, the analysis and evaluation of social innovation is highly complex and comprehensive since neither the legal nor the standard framework for social innovation is present at the theoretical level or during the implementation phase. In addition, the social innovation concept in the public sector should be made more rational and the information related to this field should be systematically spread throughout the sector.

6.1. Contribution of Thesis

This thesis contributes to a more explicit understanding of the concept of social innovation and social entrepreneurship in the public sector. In addition, it is thought that it will contribute to the development of information dissemination, the development of the field and the development of a common social innovation phenomenon. Studies relating the concept of social innovation to institutional theory are present in the literature. However, in the public sector, any study discussing social innovation and social entrepreneurship was not encountered, so it is thought that this study will contribute to this field. Finally, the thesis contributes to the development of qualitative approaches to social entrepreneurship and social innovation.

6.2. Discussion and Future Research

Today, there are many complex and multidimensional social problems that need to be solved. Moreover, these social problems are becoming increasingly difficult to resolve due to the

factors such as globalization, global warming and migration. In addition, countries have visionary targets. For example, Turkey in 2023 towards the development, sustainability and has the goal of exceeding the contemporary civilization. So, this phenomenon should be developed as soon as possible. Social innovation and social entrepreneurship are very important in order to reach a solution to these social problems, to achieve sustainability goals and to achieve social welfare. Despite the studies on the concept of social innovation, this area still does not constitute a concept. In other words, this area has to mature and develop in both government, society, and academia. This thesis has contributed to the development of the understanding of social innovation and social entrepreneurship, but it is thought that it would be appropriate to conduct studies on several areas for the development of this phenomenon.

In addition to perspectives of public institutions, more information is needed from all stakeholders, such as social entrepreneurs and beneficiaries to analyse the concept of social innovation deeply and more systematically. In this way, more comprehensive information about the relevant field will be obtained. Also, this will help to acquire different perspectives from different stakeholders. If a study that reflects the views and opinions of all stakeholders of the concept of social innovation can be done, it is thought that it will not only contribute to the development of the related literature in the theoretical way but also its applications in the field. Further, there is a need for further research on the challenges facing the concept of social innovation because identifying challenges will lead to more effective solutions and contribute to a wider understanding of this phenomenon. Furthermore, if the concept of social innovation in the context of the public sector and other stakeholders will be investigated in different countries from Turkey, it will contribute to the learning of countries from each other and pave the way for cooperation.

As it is known, public institutions has an immersive role in achieving and increasing social welfare. In other words, the ultimate goal of the government is to raise social welfare with visionary policies in the long term. The public sector, which is shown as one of the most important actors of the concept of social innovation, is of great importance in solving social problems as a result of the activities of social innovation, because it is important in terms of reaching positive social impact. Although social policies and social welfare are emphasized

in certain parts of the law in Turkey, the concept of social innovation and its obligations are not directly addressed. Therefore, the legislation does not have any sanction power associated with social innovation. It is seen that the relevant legislation is necessary in order to ensure the progress of this situation. Therefore, it is believed that the development of a standard and binding legislation and conducting academic and public research on this field will contribute to the relevant literature and field. In this case, to attain the goals of public institutions in Turkey and the countries involved in the development plan will cover the entire front foot to reach strategic goals. Finally, in a future study, it can be investigated how a social innovation phenomenon that has completed the institutionalization process will contribute to the solution of social problems. In this way, it is possible to make comparisons between the two periods and determine the importance level of the institutionalization process.

REFERENCES

- Abrahamson, E. (1991). Managerial fads and fashions: The diffusion and rejection of innovations. *Academy of management review*, 16(3), 586-612.
- Alter, K. (2007). Social enterprise typology. *Virtue ventures LLC*, 12, 1-124.
- Alvord, S. H., Brown, L. D., & Letts, C. W. (2004). Social entrepreneurship and societal transformation: An exploratory study. *The journal of applied behavioral science*, 40(3), 260-282.
- Anttiroiko, A. V., Bailey, S. J., & Valkama, P. (2011). Innovations in public governance in the western world. *Innovations in public governance*, 15, 1.
- Bagnoli, L., & Megali, C. (2011). Measuring performance in social enterprises. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(1), 149-165.
- Barley, S. R., & Tolbert, P. S. (1997). Institutionalization and structuration: Studying the links between action and institution. *Organization studies*, 18(1), 93-117.
- Barnett, W. P., & Carroll, G. R. (1993). How institutional constraints affected the organization of early US telephony. *JL Econ. & Org.*, 9, 98.
- Barringer, B. R., & Bluedorn, A. C. (1999). The relationship between corporate entrepreneurship and strategic management. *Strategic management journal*, 20(5), 421-444.
- Bason, C. (2018). *Leading public sector innovation: Co-creating for a better society*. Policy Press.
- Bates, S. M. (2012). *The social innovation imperative*. McGraw-Hill,
- Bekkers, V. J. J. M., Tummers, L. G., & Voorberg, W. H. (2013). From public innovation to social innovation in the public sector: A literature review of relevant drivers and barriers. *Rotterdam: Erasmus University Rotterdam*.
- Bekkers, V., Edelenbos, J., & Steijn, B. (Eds.). (2011). *Innovation in the public sector*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Bekkers, V.; Tummers, L. Stuijzand, B.G., & Voorberg, W. (2013) 'Social innovation in the public sector: an integrative framework', LIPSE Working Papers No.1, Rotterdam, Erasmus University Rotterdam.
- Bernier, L., & Hafsi, T. (2007). The changing nature of public entrepreneurship. *Public Administration Review*, 67(3), 488-503.
- Berry, F. & W. Berry (2007), Frameworks Comparing Policies Across a large number of political systems: in: P. Sabatier (eds.), *Theories of the Policy Process*, Boulder: Westview; 223-260.
- Borins, S. (2000). Loose cannons and rule breakers, or enterprising leaders? Some evidence about innovative public managers. *Public Administration Review*, 60(6), 498-507.
- Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. (2010). The social life of information.
- Brown, L. (2010). Balancing risk and innovation to improve social work practice. *British Journal of Social Work*, 40(4), 1211-1228.
- Buchanan, R. (1992). Wicked problems in design thinking. *Design issues*, 8(2), 5-21.
- Burns, T., & Stalker, G. M. (1961). The management of innovation. London. *Tavistock Publishing*. Cited in Hurley, RF and Hult, GTM (1998). *Innovation, Market Orientation, and Organisational Learning: An Integration and Empirical Examination*. *Journal of Marketing*, 62, 42-54.
- Carroll, A. B. (1999). Corporate social responsibility: Evolution of a definitional construct. *Business & society*, 38(3), 268-295.
- Cels, S., de Jong, J., & Nauta, F. (2012). *Agents of change: strategy and tactics for social innovation*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Chesbrough, H. (2003). The logic of open innovation: managing intellectual property. *California management review*, 33-58.
- Chesbrough, H. W. (2006). *Open innovation: The new imperative for creating and profiting from technology*. Harvard Business Press.
- Chesbrough, H., Vanhaverbeke, W., & West, J. (Eds.). (2006). *Open innovation: Researching a new paradigm*. Oxford University Press on Demand.

- Clements, M. D., & Sense, A. J. (2010). Socially shaping supply chain integration through learning. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 51(1), 92-105.
- Colbeck, C. L. (2002). Assessing institutionalization of curricular and pedagogical reforms. *Research in Higher Education*, 43(4), 397-421.
- Cuervo, Á., Ribeiro, D., & Roig, S. (2007). Entrepreneurship: concepts, theory and perspective. Introduction. In *Entrepreneurship* (pp. 1-20). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Damanpour, F. (1991). Organizational innovation: A meta-analysis of effects of determinants and moderators. *Academy of management journal*, 34(3), 555-590.
- Damanpour, F., & Evan, W. M. (1984). Organizational innovation and performance: the problem of "organizational lag". *Administrative science quarterly*, 392-409.
- Day, R. J. (2004). From hegemony to affinity: The political logic of the newest social movements. *Cultural Studies*, 18(5), 716-748.
- Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1983). Culture: A new look through old lenses. *The journal of applied behavioral science*, 19(4), 498-505.
- Dees, J. G. (2007). Taking social entrepreneurship seriously. *Society*, 44(3), 24-31.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American sociological review*, 147-160.
- Dorsch, J. J., & Yasin, M. M. (1998). A framework for benchmarking in the public sector: literature review and directions for future research. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 11(2/3), 91-115.
- Drucker, P. (2014). *Innovation and entrepreneurship*. Routledge.
- Drucker, P. F. (1999). Knowledge-worker productivity: The biggest challenge. *California management review*, 41(2), 79-94.
- Drucker, P. F. (n.d.). Management by Objectives and Self-Control. *The Essential Drucker*, 112-126. doi:10.4324/9780080939322-8
- Ebrahim, A., & Rangan, V. K. (2014). What impact? A framework for measuring the scale and scope of social performance. *California Management Review*, 56(3), 118-141.
- Edquist, C. (1992). *Technological and organisational innovations, productivity and employment*. International Labour Office.

- Epstein, M. J. (2018). *Making sustainability work: Best practices in managing and measuring corporate social, environmental and economic impacts*. Routledge.
- European Commission. (2011). *Empowering People, Driving Change: Social Innovation in the European Union*.
- European Commission. (2015). *A Map of Social Enterprises and Their Eco-systems in Europe*.
- Fagerberg, J., & Verspagen, B. (2006, September). Innovation studies-an emerging discipline (or what)? A study of the global network of innovation scholars. In *SPRU 40 th Anniversary Conference. University of Sussex. SPRU*.
- Feller, I., & Feller, E. (1981). Public-Sector Innovation as "Conspicuous Production". *Policy Analysis*, 1-20.
- Fernandez, S., & Wise, L. R. (2010). An exploration of why public organizations 'Ingest' innovations. *Public Administration*, 88(4), 979-998.
- Folz, D. H. (2004). Service quality and benchmarking the performance of municipal services. *Public Administration Review*, 64(2), 209-220.
- Foster, A. D., & Rosenzweig, M. R. (2010). Microeconomics of technology adoption. *Annu. Rev. Econ.*, 2(1), 395-424.
- Gioia, D.A., Corley, K.G. & Hamilton, A.L. (2013). Seeking Qualitative Rigor in Inductive Research: Notes on the Gioia Methodology, *Organizational Research Methods*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp.15- 31
- Godfrey, M., & Manikas, A. (2012). Integrating triple bottom line sustainability concepts into a supplier selection exercise. *Business Education & Accreditation*, 4(1), 1-12.
- Godin, B. (2012). Social Innovation: Utopias of Innovation from c. 1830 to the Present. *Project on the Intellectual History of Innovation Working Paper*, (11), 1-52.
- Goldenberg, J., Han, S., Lehmann, D. R., & Hong, J. W. (2009). The role of hubs in the adoption process. *Journal of marketing*, 73(2), 1-13.
- Gökbulut Özdemir, Ö. (2013). Entrepreneurial marketing and social value creation in Turkish art industry: An ambidextrous perspective. *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, 15(1), 39-60.

- Özdemir, Ö. G. (2012). EKONOMİK GELİŞME VE GİRİŞİMCİLİK: İNOVATİF GİRİŞİMCİLİĞİN YENİ DEĞER YARATIMINDA ROLÜ. *Social Sciences*, 7(1), 1-18.
- Greenhalgh, T., Robert, G., Macfarlane, F., Bate, P., & Kyriakidou, O. (2004). Diffusion of innovations in service organizations: systematic review and recommendations. *The Milbank Quarterly*, 82(4), 581-629.
- Hall, P. A., & Thelen, K. (2009). Institutional change in varieties of capitalism. *Socio-economic review*, 7(1), 7-34.
- Handy, C. B. (1986). *Understanding organizations: Charles B. Handy*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Hartley, J. (2005). Innovation in governance and public services: Past and present. *Public money and management*, 25(1), 27-34.
- Hartley, J. (2005). Innovation in governance and public services: Past and present. *Public money and management*, 25(1), 27-34.
- Haughton, G., Allmendinger, P., & Oosterlynck, S. (2013). Spaces of neoliberal experimentation: soft spaces, postpolitics, and neoliberal governmentality. *Environment and Planning A*, 45(1), 217-234.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture and organizations. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 10(4), 15-41.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Motivation, leadership, and organization: do American theories apply abroad?. *Organizational dynamics*, 9(1), 42-63.
- Hollenstein, H. (1996). A composite indicator of a firm's innovativeness. An empirical analysis based on survey data for Swiss manufacturing. *Research Policy*, 25(4), 633-645.
- Howaldt, J., & Schwarz, M. (2010). *Social Innovation: Concepts, research fields and international trends*. Sozialforschungsstelle Dortmund.
- Howaldt, J., Schwartz, M., Henning, K., & Hees, F. (2010). *Studies for Innovation in a Modern Working Environment—International Monitoring*.
- Howard, J. A., & Sheth, J. N. (1969). The theory of buyer behavior. *New York*, 63.
- Hubbard, G. (2009). Measuring organizational performance: beyond the triple bottom line. *Business strategy and the environment*, 18(3), 177-191.

- Jepperson, R. (1991). Institutions, institutional effects, and institutionalism. *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*, 143-163.
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). Linking the balanced scorecard to strategy. *California management review*, 39(1), 53-79.
- Kelman, H. C. (2008). Reconciliation from a social-psychological perspective. *The social psychology of intergroup reconciliation*, 15-32.
- Kickert, W. (Ed.). (2007). *The study of public management in Europe and the US: a competitive analysis of national distinctiveness*. Routledge.
- Kimberley, J. R. (1981). Managerial innovation. In P. Nystrom & W. Starbuck (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational design*, Vol. 1 (pp. 84–104). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kimberley, J., & Evanisko, M. (1981). Organizational innovation: The influence of individual, organizational, and contextual factors on hospital adoption of technological and administrative innovations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24(4), 689–713.
- Klein, P. G., Mahoney, J. T., McGahan, A. M., & Pitelis, C. N. (2013). Capabilities and strategic entrepreneurship in public organizations. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 7(1), 70-91.
- Kline, S. J., & Rosenberg, N. (1986). An overview of innovation. The positive sum strategy: Harnessing technology for economic growth. *The National Academy of Science, USA*.
- Knight, K. E. (1967). A descriptive model of the intra-firm innovation process. *The journal of business*, 40(4), 478-496.
- Kotsemir, M., & Meissner, D. (2013). Conceptualizing the innovation process—trends and outlook. *Higher School of Economics Research Paper No. WP BPR, 10*.
- Leibenstein, H. (1979). A branch of economics is missing: micro-micro theory. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 17(2), 477-502.
- Lundvall, B. Å. (1999). National business systems and national systems of innovation. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 29(2), 60-77.
- Maas, K., & Grieco, C. (2017). Distinguishing game changers from boastful charlatans: Which social enterprises measure their impact?. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 8(1), 110-128.

- Mair, J. (2010). Social entrepreneurship: taking stock and looking ahead.
- Majone, G. (1998). Europe's 'democratic deficit': The question of standards. *European law journal*, 4(1), 5-28.
- Martin, R. L., & Osberg, S. (2007). Social entrepreneurship: The case for definition.
- Mason, C., Kirkbride, J., & Bryde, D. (2007). From stakeholders to institutions: the changing face of social enterprise governance theory. *Management decision*, 45(2), 284-301.
- Meichenitsch, K., Neumayr, M. and Schenk, M. (eds.) (2016), Neu! Besser! Billiger! Soziale Innovation als leeres Versprechen, Wien: Mandelbaum.
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American journal of sociology*, 83(2), 340-363.
- Millar, R., & Hall, K. (2013). Social return on investment (SROI) and performance measurement: The opportunities and barriers for social enterprises in health and social care. *Public Management Review*, 15(6), 923-941.
- Montgomery, T. (2016). Are social innovation paradigms incommensurable?. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 27(4), 1979-2000.
- Moore, M. H. (1995). *Creating public value: Strategic management in government*. Harvard university press.
- Moore, M., & Hartley, J. (2010). Innovations in governance. In *The new public governance?* (pp. 68-87). Routledge.
- Moulaert, F. (Ed.). (2013). *The international handbook on social innovation: collective action, social learning and transdisciplinary research*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Moulaert, F., & Nussbaumer, J. (2008). *Logique sociale du développement territorial*. PUQ.
- Moulaert, F., & Scott, A. J. (Eds.). (1997). *Cities Enterprise and Society*. A&C Black.
- Moulaert, F., & Sekia, F. (2003). Territorial innovation models: a critical survey. *Regional studies*, 37(3), 289-302.
- Moulaert, F., Mehmood, A., MacCallum, D., & Leubolt, B. (2017). *Social innovation as a trigger for transformations-the role of research*. Publications Office of the European Union.
- Mowery, D., & Rosenberg, N. (1979). The influence of market demand upon innovation: a critical review of some recent empirical studies. *Research policy*, 8(2), 102-153.

- Mulgan, G. (2006). The process of social innovation. *Innovations: technology, governance, globalization*, 1(2), 145-162.
- Mulgan, G. (2009). *The art of public strategy: Mobilizing power and knowledge for the common good*. Oxford University Press on Demand.
- Myers, S., & Marquis, D. G. (1969). *Successful industrial innovation*. Institute of Public Administration.
- Nicholls, A., & Teasdale, S. (2017). Neoliberalism by stealth? Exploring continuity and change within the UK social enterprise policy paradigm. *Policy & Politics*, 45(3), 323-341.
- Nicholls, A., Simon, J., Gabriel, M., & Whelan, C. (Eds.). (2015). *New frontiers in social innovation research*. Springer.
- Nohria, N., & Gulati, R. (1996). Is slack good or bad for innovation?. *Academy of management Journal*, 39(5), 1245-1264.
- Norman, W., & MacDonald, C. (2004). Getting to the bottom of “triple bottom line”. *Business ethics quarterly*, 14(2), 243-262.
- North, D. C. (1993). Institutions and credible commitment. *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics (JITE)/Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft*, 11-23.
- OECD (2018). *Fostering Innovation to Address Social Challenges*. Workshop Proceedings.
- Ormiston, J., & Seymour, R. (2011). Understanding value creation in social entrepreneurship: The importance of aligning mission, strategy and impact measurement. *Journal of social entrepreneurship*, 2(2), 125-150.
- Osborne, S. P., & Brown, L. (2011). Innovation, public policy and public services delivery in the UK. The word that would be king?. *Public Administration*, 89(4), 1335-1350.
- Osborne, S. P., Mclaughlin, K., Chew, C., & Tricker, M. (2009). Good dog SPOT? Single Pot funding of local voluntary and community groups. *Local Economy*, 24(3), 238-252.
- Özen, H., & Özen, Ş. (2011). Interactions in and between strategic action fields: A comparative analysis of two environmental conflicts in gold-mining fields in Turkey. *Organization & Environment*, 24(4), 343-363.
- Özen, Ş. (2002). Bağlam, Aktör, Söylem ve Kurumsal Değişim: Türkiye’de Toplam Kalite Yönetiminin Yayılım Süreci. *Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (2), 47-90.

- Özen, Ş. (2007). Yeni Kurumsal Kuram: Örgütleri Çözümlemede Yeni Ufuklar Yeni Sorunlar. A. S. Sargut ve Ş. Özen (Der). Örgüt Kuramları, 237-330. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Parés, M., Ospina, S. M., & Subirats, J. (Eds.). (2017). *Social innovation and democratic leadership: communities and social change from below*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Pierson, P. (2000). Increasing returns, path dependence, and the study of politics. *American political science review*, 94(2), 251-267.
- Pollitt, C. (2011). 30 years of public management reforms: Has there been a pattern. *World Banks consultation exercise. Obtenido el*, 10.
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2006). The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility. *Harvard business review*, 84(12), 78-92.
- Reid, K., & Griffith, J. (2006). Social enterprise mythology: critiquing some assumptions. *Social enterprise journal*, 2(1), 1-10.
- Reynolds, P., Bosma, N., Autio, E., Hunt, S., De Bono, N., Servais, I., ... & Chin, N. (2005). Global entrepreneurship monitor: Data collection design and implementation 1998–2003. *Small business economics*, 24(3), 205-231.
- Rittel, H. W., & Webber, M. M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy sciences*, 4(2), 155-169.
- Rogers, E. M. (2010). *Diffusion of innovations*. Simon and Schuster.
- Rosenzweig, W., Clark, C., Long, D. & Olsen, S. (2004). Double bottom line project: Assessing social impact in double bottom line ventures. Working paper 13, Berkeley, CA: Center for Responsible Business, University of California Berkeley.
- Rothwell, G., Rothwell, R., & Zegveld, W. (1985). *Reindustrialization and technology*. ME Sharpe.
- Rothwell, R. (1992). Successful industrial innovation: critical factors for the 1990s. *R&d Management*, 22(3), 221-240.
- Rüede, D., & Lurtz, K. (2012). Mapping the various meanings of social innovation: Towards a differentiated understanding of an emerging concept.
- Salge, T. O., & Vera, A. (2012). Benefiting from public sector innovation: the moderating role of customer and learning orientation. *Public Administration Review*, 72(4), 550-559.

- Sargant, W. L. (1860), *Richard Owen and His Social Philosophy*, London: Smith, Elder and Co. Sargant, W. L. (1858), *Social Innovators and Their Schemes*, London: Smith, Elder & Co.
- Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schröder, A. (2012). Implementing innovative structures to improve lifelong learning-a social innovation process: the example Hessencampus. *ZSI Discussion Paper*, (28).
- Schumpeter, J. (1942). Creative destruction. *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*, 825, 82-85.
- Schumpeter, J. A., (1931). 1967, *The Theory of Economic Development*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. Yale University Press.
- Scott, W. R. (1995). Institutions and organizations. Foundations for organizational science. *London: A Sage Publication Series*.
- Scott, W. R. (2013). *Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities*. Sage Publications.
- Sepulveda, L. (2015). Social enterprise—a new phenomenon in the field of economic and social welfare?. *Social Policy & Administration*, 49(7), 842-861.
- Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of management review*, 25(1), 217-226.
- Shockley, G. (2015). *The International Handbook on Social Innovation: Collective Action, Social Learning and Transdisciplinary Research*, edited by Frank Moulaert, Diana MacCallum, Abid Mehmood, and Abdelillah Hamdouch. 2013. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, Massachusetts: Edward Elgar. 500+ xxii. ISBN: 978-1-84980-998-6, \$216. *Journal of Regional Science*, 55(1), 152-154.
- Short, J. C., Moss, T. W., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2009). Research in social entrepreneurship: Past contributions and future opportunities. *Strategic entrepreneurship journal*, 3(2), 161-194.

Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2011). Enhancing collaborative innovation in the public sector. *Administration & Society*, 43(8), 842-868.

Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2011). Enhancing collaborative innovation in the public sector. *Administration & Society*, 43(8), 842-868.

Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of management review*, 20(3), 571-610.

The Young Foundation (2012) Social Innovation Overview: A deliverable of the project: “The theoretical, empirical and policy foundations for building social innovation in Europe” (TEPSIE), European Commission – 7 th Framework Programme, Brussels: European Commission, DG Research.

Thompson, J. L. (2004). The facets of the entrepreneur: identifying entrepreneurial potential. *Management decision*, 42(2), 243-258.

Thompson, J., Alvy, G., & Lees, A. (2000). Social entrepreneurship—a new look at the people and the potential. *Management decision*, 38(5), 328-338.

Townsend, D. M., & Hart, T. A. (2008). Perceived institutional ambiguity and the choice of organizational form in social entrepreneurial ventures. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 32(4), 685-700.

Tummers, L., Gilje, S., & Van de Walle, S. (2013). Citizens in charge? Reviewing the background and value of introducing choice and competition in public services. In *Public Administration Reformation* (pp. 23-41). Routledge.

Usher, A. P. (1955). Technical change and capital formation. In *Capital formation and economic growth* (pp. 523-550). Princeton University Press.

Utterback, J. M., & Abernathy, W. J. (1975). A dynamic model of process and product innovation. *Omega*, 3(6), 639-656.

Van de Ven, A. H. (1986). Central problems in the management of innovation. *Management science*, 32(5), 590-607.

Vigoda-Gadot, E. R. A. N., Shoham, A., Schwabsky, N., & Ruvio, A. (2008). PUBLIC SECTOR INNOVATION FOR EUROPE: A MULTINATIONAL EIGHT-COUNTRY EXPLORATION OF CITIZENS' PERSPECTIVES. *Public Administration*, 86(2), 307-329.

Von Hippel, E. (2005). Democratizing innovation: The evolving phenomenon of user innovation. *Journal für Betriebswirtschaft*, 55(1), 63-78.

Von Hippel, E. (2007). Horizontal innovation networks—by and for users. *Industrial and corporate change*, 16(2), 293-315.

Walker, R. M. (2007). An empirical evaluation of innovation types and organizational and environmental characteristics: Towards a configuration framework. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 591-615.

Windrum, P., & Koch, P. M. (Eds.). (2008). *Innovation in public sector services: entrepreneurship, creativity and management*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Zappalà, G., & Lyons, M. (2009). *Recent approaches to measuring social impact in the Third sector: An overview*. Sydney: Centre for Social Impact.

Appendix A – Questionnaire for the Interviewees

Semi-Structured Interview on the Social Innovation-Entrepreneurship Trends in the Public Sector in Turkey

Kamuda Sosyal İnovasyon-Girişimcilik Eğilimi Analizine Dair Yarı Yapılandırılmış Görüşme Formu

Appendix A – Questionnaire for the Interviewees

1. How do you work with what leads to social impact via social innovation?
 - When did you start to work with these questions about social innovation?
2. What is social innovation for you and why is it important?
3. Does legitimacy play an important role in the field of social innovation? Why?
4. Are there any legal frameworks to work with in this field now?
 - Do you think it would be good with a standardized framework to analyse social innovation and measure its level?
5. Is there anything that is normative or is starting to be normative in this field?
6. Have you heard of these models for measuring social impact of social innovation and do you know if they are used in Turkey?
 - Balance Scorecard
 - Social Return on Investment
 - Blended Value Accounting
7. What is the exchanges between the actors who work within this field?
 - Is it important with a common understanding of what social innovation is? Why?
 - Is there anyone that has become a symbol in this field of social innovation?
8. What challenges are related to social innovation?
 - What is the actual problem with analysing social innovation and measuring its level today?
9. Is there something more you want to add that could be valuable for my thesis?

Ek A1 – Yarı Yapılandırılmış Görüşme Formu / Sosyal İnovasyon ile İlgili Bölüm

1. Sosyal inovasyon yoluyla sosyal etkiye neden olan ne gibi faaliyetler yürütüyorsunuz?

- Sosyal inovasyonla ilgili hangi konularda çalışıyorsunuz?

- Bu konular ile ilgili çalışmaya ne zaman başladınız?

2. Sizin için sosyal inovasyon nedir ve neden önemlidir?

3. Meşruiyet, sosyal inovasyon alanında önemli bir rol oynar mı?

4. Günümüzde bu alanlar ile ilgili çalışmalar yürütmek için yasal çerçeve mevcut mu?

- Sosyal inovasyonu analiz etmek ve seviyesini ölçmek için standartlaştırılmış bir yasal bir çerçevenin faydalı olacağını düşünüyor musunuz?

5. Bu alanda normatif olan veya normatif olmaya başlayan herhangi bir şey var mı?

6. Sosyal inovasyonun sosyal etkisini ölçmek için herhangi bir model ile ilgili bilgi sahibi misiniz?

- Türkiye’de bu konularla ilgili herhangi bir çalışma mevcut mu?

7. Bu alanda çalışan aktörler arasındaki değişim nedir?

- Sosyal inovasyon ile ilgili ülkemizde ortak bir anlayış gelişmiş durumda mıdır?

- Sosyal inovasyon alanında sembol olan biri var mı?

8. Sosyal inovasyonla ilgili hangi zorluklar var?

- Sosyal inovasyonu analiz etmek ve bugünkü seviyesini ölçmekle ilgili asıl sorun nedir?

9. Tezim için değerli olabileceğini düşündüğünüz başka bir husus mevcut mu?

Appendix B – Interviewees

- Interviewee 1 – Strategy and Budget Department of the President of the Republic of Turkey (SBB)

<https://www.sbb.gov.tr/>

- Interviewee 2 – R & D, Quality and Monitoring Department of the Ministry of National Education (MEB)

<https://sgb.meb.gov.tr/>

- Interviewee 3 – Strategy Development Department of the Ministry of Industry and Technology

<https://strateji.sanayi.gov.tr>

- Interviewee 4 – General Secretariat of Union of Municipalities of Turkey (TBB)

[https:// www.tbb.gov.tr/en/](https://www.tbb.gov.tr/en/)

- Interviewee 5 – Department of Strategy Development of Grand National Assembly of Turkey (TBMM)

<https://www.tbmm.gov.tr/>

- Interviewee 6 – Department of Strategy Development of Ankara University (AÜ)

<https://sgdb.ankara.edu.tr>

- Interviewee 7 – Department of Strategy Development of the Council of Higher Education (YÖK)

<https://www.yok.gov.tr/>

- Interviewee 8 – Department of Strategy Development of the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization (ÇŞB)

<https://www.csb.gov.tr/>

- Interviewee 9 – Department of Investment Monitoring and Coordination of Governorship of Ankara

<http://prospersocialimpact.com>

- Interviewee 10 – General Secretariat of the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK)

<https://www.tubitak.gov.tr/>

- Interviewee 11 – Department of Strategy Development of the Ministry of Youth and Sports (GSB)

<https://www.gsb.gov.tr/>

- Interviewee 12 – Department of Strategy Development of the Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Services

<https://www.ailevecalisma.gov.tr/>

- Interviewee 13 – Department of Strategy Development of Higher Education Student Loan and Housing Board (KYK)

<https://www.kyk.gov.tr/>

- Interviewee 14 – General Directorate of Agricultural Research of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry

<https://www.tarimorman.gov.tr/>

- Interviewee 15 – Department of Strategy Development of the Ministry of Justice

<https://www.adalet.gov.tr/>

- Interviewee 16 – Department of Strategy Development of Turkish Statistical Institute

<https://www.tuik.gov.tr/>

ÖZGEÇMİŞ

Kişisel Bilgiler



Soyadı, adı : GİDERLER, MEMDUH EREN
Uyruğu : TC
Doğum tarihi : 25.01.1989
Doğum yeri : Eskişehir
Telefon : 5305148092
e-mail : erengiderler@gmail.com

Eğitim

Derece	Eğitim Birimi	Mezuniyet tarihi
Lisans	Ankara Üniversitesi/Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi/İşletme	16.07.2015
Lise	Heybeliada Deniz Lisesi Komutanlığı	16.06.2007

İş Deneyimi

Yıl	Yer	Görev
2016-Devam ediyor	Ankara Sosyal Bilimler Üniversitesi	Araştırma Görevlisi

Yabancı Dil

İngilizce,

Yayınlar

1. Giderler, C., Giderler, M.E., Güler, M. (2017), "The Correlation Between Organizational Trust and Loneliness at Work-Life: A Research on Employees at a Firm in Turkey", International Journal of Multidisciplinary Thought, CD-ROM. ISSN: 2156-6992: 06(01):141-148.

Hobiler

Yürüyüş, Kitap okuma, Seyahat.