

ESSI Webinar, 14 June 2022

---

## Social Innovation Measurement

How to capture the impact of social innovation?

---

Judith Terstriep<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Institute for Work and Technology, Westphalian University Gelsenkirchen,  
terstriep@iat.eu

---

### Outline

Despite the many advances made in social innovation research, researchers have not yet been able to adequately answer how to determine whether a social added value is created and whether this is associated with disadvantages elsewhere (Mildenberger et al., 2020).

The debate on social impact measurement is about the estimation of such social added value. It tries to capture the positive and ideally also negative consequences of the activities of organisations on society (Wry & Haugh 2018). It is important to emphasise that social innovation and social impact can come from a wide range of actors (Terstriep et al., 2021a), from civil society organisations (Ramus et al., 2018) to informal groups and even social movements (Carberry et al., 2019), businesses (Phillips et al. 2015) or public administration (Moulaert et al., 2007). But even at the organisational level, it is difficult to measure impact (Then et al., 2017). Indirect or hard-to-tangible effects such as empowerment, change of mindset or empowerment are often entirely left out (Krlev et al., 2014; Beer & Micheli, 2018). When we think about social innovations that are often locally embedded (Krlev et al., 2018) but have an impact beyond regions, the difficulties associated with impact assessment are magnified. Social innovation requires that activities and thus change processes occur at various levels (Seelos & Mair, 2017; Pel et al., 2020; Krlev et al., 2020). The effects include, for example, changes in social discourse (Krlev & Lund 2020), the emergence of new actor constellations (Phillips et al. 2017), the transformation of social institutions (van Wijk et al. 2019) or the practices of organisations (Terstriep et al., 2021b; Krlev et al., 2020b; Seelos & Mair, 2017).

Following a brief introduction to the theme, in this interactive webinar, we would like to discuss with you the following questions:

1. Which innovation (proto)types and innovation paths (dynamics) must be included in a broad understanding of social innovation?

2. What indicators and data are available for integrated impact measurement, and how do they have to be processed in order to be usable in a low-threshold way?

## References

- Beer, H. A., & Micheli, P. (2018). Advancing Performance Measurement Theory by Focusing on Subjects: Lessons from the Measurement of Social Value. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 20(3), 755-771. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12175>
- Carberry, E. J., Bharati, P., & Levy, D. L. (2019). Social Movements as Catalysts for Corporate Social Innovation: Environmental Activism and the Adoption of Green Information Systems. *Business & Society*, 58(5), 1083-1127. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650317701674>
- Krlev, G., & Lund, A. B. (2020). Social Innovation Ignored: Framing Nonprofit Activities in European News Media. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 31(5), 949-965. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-020-00224-7>
- Krlev, G., Anheier, H. K., & Mildemberger, G. (2019). Results. The Comparative Analysis. In H. K. Anheier, G. Krlev, & G. Mildemberger (eds.), *Social Innovation. Comparative Perspectives* (pp. 257-279). New York, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Krlev, G., Bund, E., & Mildemberger, G. (2014). Measuring What Matters — Indicators of Social Innovativeness on the National Level. *Information Systems Management*, 31(3), 200-224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10580530.2014.923265>
- Krlev, G., Mildemberger, G., & Anheier, H. K. (2020). Innovation and societal transformation – what changes when the ‘social’ comes in? *International Review of Applied Economics*, 34(5), 529-540. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02692171.2020.1820247>
- Mildemberger, G.; Schimpf, G. & Streicher, J. (2020). Social Innovation Assessment? Reflections on the impacts of social innovation on society - Outcomes of a systematic literature review. *European Public & Social Innovation Review*, 5(2):1-13.
- Moulaert, F., Martinelli, F., González, S., & Swyngedouw, E. (2007). Introduction: Social Innovation and Governance in European Cities: Urban Development Between Path Dependency and Radical Innovation. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 14(3), 195-203. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0969776407077737>
- Phillips, W., Lee, H., Ghobadian, A., O'Regan, N., & James, P. (2015). Social Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship: A Systematic Review. *Group & Organization Management*, 40(3), 428-461. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601114560063>
- Ramus, T., La Cara, B., Vaccaro, A., & Brusoni, S. (2018). Social or Commercial? Innovation Strategies in Social Enterprises at Times of Turbulence. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 28(4), 463-492. <https://doi.org/10.1017/beq.2017.55>
- Seelos, C., & Mair, J. (2017). *Innovation and Scaling for Impact. How Effective Social Enterprises Do It*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Terstriep, J., Krlev, G., Mildemberger, G., Strambach, S., Thurmann, J.-F., & Wloka, L.-F. (2021). Measuring social Innovation. In J. Howaldt, C. Kaletka, & A. Schröder (Eds.), *A Research Agenda for Social Innovation* (pp. 263-286). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781789909357.00024>
- Terstriep, J., Wloka, L., Geme, Y., & Rico Palacios, J. S. (2021b). *Indikatorik Soziale Innovationen: Ergebnisse der Messung organisationaler Innovativität*. Gelsenkirchen: Insittut Arbeit und Technik.
- van Wijk, J., Zietsma, C., & Dorado, S. (2019). Social Innovation: Integrating Micro, Meso, and Macro Level Insights From Institutional Theory. *Business & Society*, 58(5), 887-918. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650318789104>
- Wry, T. E., & Haugh, H. (2018). Brace for impact. Uniting our diverse voices through a social impact frame. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 33(5): 566–574. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2018.04.010>