

Institutional Supporting of Social Innovations¹

Evgeny Popov, Zhoomart Omonov and Anna Veretennikova

Ural Federal University named after the First President of Russia B.N Yeltsin;

Yekaterinburg, Russia

popov@prm.uran.ru

jomaomon@gmail.com

vay_uiec@mail.ru

Abstract: The article examines the institutional environment of social innovations that is one of the most significant factor of social innovations' development. The study makes recommendations on how to improve the efficiency of the institutional management of social innovations. In order to achieve the aim of our research, it has been developed the definition, typology and analytical review of practices of social innovations in Russia and the rest of the world. In addition, it has been proposed a methodological approach to the systematisation of social innovation, including the institutions of production, distribution, regulation and consumption.

Keywords: Social innovation, institutional environment, typology of innovation, public sector, innovation practice

1. Introduction

Social innovation is one of the most effective tools of the socio-economic system aimed at improving public welfare (Moore, 1995). Among the most common examples of basic social innovation are included: Wikipedia, The Open University, mass education projects such as Coursera and Khan Academy; community wind farms (Battistella C., Nonino F., 2012) and others. The phenomena currently most familiar to the individual appear as the result of the implementation of social innovations. (Mulgan G., Tuckers S., Ali R., Sanders B., 2007).

The topicality and relevance of the study's indicated area of expertise is confirmed by the increasing number of forums and conferences devoted to the problems of social innovation: the conference "Social Innovation Residency" in Canada, "Social Innovation Summit" in San Francisco; the regular thematic TACSI meetings in Australia, the Young Foundation in London; the Office of Social Innovation and Civic Participation in the White House in Washington, DC; the Ministry of Social Development and Social Innovation in British Columbia, and more. In this connection, an equally important consideration is the issue of institutional support for social innovations. It should be noted that the growing interest in this issue, both from the scientific community and from practitioners, might be called a global trend. On the one hand, there is an active increase in social inequality both at the global level and within individual countries, at the same time as an uneven distribution of the resources and budgetary constraints of developing countries, resulting in major changes, not only in the economic and social space, but also politically. On the other hand, the processes of globalisation facilitate the active dissemination of new methods and tools for solving social problems and their grafting into different areas as well as demonstrating the growth of involvement of citizens in the solution of global problems. All of this requires new institutional mechanisms of interaction of economic agents to address growing social problems.

Despite the present interest in the subject, economic theory has not yet formed a unified concept to underpin their study; any minor breakthroughs in this area are represented only by individual scientists and research projects. Among the foreign researchers of this area can be identified G. Mulgan, P. Koch, G. Huknes, S. Tucker, R. Ali, B. Sanders G. Filas, M. Moore, R. Nelson and L. Earl. Meanwhile, the number of Russian researchers working in this area is much smaller; among them are included A. Golubeva, E. Sokolova. An example of a large-scale research project encompassing the various aspects of innovation in the public sector is implemented in the European Union in the 2003-2006 research project entitled PUBLIN (Koch P., Cunningham P., Schwabsky N., Hauknes J., 2005). The project investigated the main trends in the development of innovations in the public sector, especially social, technological and administrative innovation in public administration and public enterprises.

¹ The study was financially supported by the Russian Science Foundation at Udmurt State University (Izhevsk, Russia), project No. 15-18-00049.

One of the most important steps in the formation of a concept of social innovation and the development of this phenomenon in practice is to develop a clear definition, systematic typology of social innovation and institutional environment, which would provide momentum for methodological development in subsequent studies.

The institutional environment of social innovation is a set of institutions, institutional arrangements, rules and regulations, which support an interaction between economic agents at all stages of social-innovation process. Institutions, on the one hand, are the catalyst for social innovation, but on the other - are the barriers that hinder the development of socially innovative projects.

The concept of "social innovation" is interdisciplinary, so that the research included the integration of the modern economic theory, sociology, philosophy and political science for developing a common approach to the analysis of the institutional mechanisms of regulation of social innovations. We have used various methodologies as a groundwork such as: neoinstitutional and neoclassical economic approaches, categorical and instrumental apparatus of the institutional-evolution economic theory, the theory of public sector economy, and the economics of knowledge.

The aim of this study is the development of theoretical-methodological principles of economic theory through a disclosure and typology of social innovations, and their analysis as applied to contemporary Russia, as well as the systematisation of institutions supporting the social development of the territory. To achieve the objectives of our research we have developed a definition and a typology of social innovation, which takes into account the following characteristics: the scale, the level of government involvement, the type of social innovation initiations, degree of novelty and scope of social innovations. In addition, we propose the systematization of social innovation, including the institutions of production, distribution, regulation and consumption. The results of this study are important not only from an academic point of view, but also from the praxis. The study made recommendations on how to improve the effectiveness of institutional management of social innovations.

2. The Essence of Social Innovation

One of the first definitions of social innovation belongs G. Mulgan, S. Tucker, R. Ali and B. Sanders, who understood the term social innovation to refer to "new ideas that are working to achieve social goals." However, this definition does not reflect the essential characteristics of social innovation or show where it contrasts with innovation in general. Often, business innovation contributes to the obtaining of an economic benefit in the form of profit, as well as the attainment of social goals (Mulgan G., Tuckers S., Ali R., Sanders B., 2007).

Table 1: Definitions of social innovation

Definition	Authors
Social innovations are new ideas that are working to achieve social goals	G. Mulgan, S. Tucker, R. Ali, B. Sanders
Social innovation is any new and useful solution aimed at meeting social needs	George Phils
social innovations are changing in the cultural, legal and regulatory structures of society that increase their collective power resources to improve social and economic performance	R. Heiskala
Innovations in the public sector are new ideas the embodiment of which would lead to an increase in social value	Koch P., Cunningham P., Schwabsky N., Hauknes J.,
Social innovations are any new ideas with the potential to improve either the macro quality of life or the quantity of life.	Pol E., Ville S.

George Phils (Phils, 2009) understands social innovation to refer to any new and useful solution aimed at meeting social needs. The main weak point in this definition is that it advances a utility requirement of social innovation. In practice, however, the effects of innovation can be unpredictable (LU, 2013).

R. Heiskala (Heiskala, 2007) understands social innovation to refer to changes in the cultural, legal and regulatory structures of society that increase their collective power resources to improve social and economic performance. The main value of this definition is the reference to "increasing the collective power resources".

Furthermore, the author understands social innovation not as an idea but as a transformation that creates an alternative approach to the determination of the essence of social innovations.

The concept of "social innovation" is close to the concept of "innovation in the public sector". Therefore, "...innovations in the public sector are new ideas the embodiment of which would lead to an increase in social value" (Koch P., Cunningham P., Schwabsky N., Hauknes J., 2005). These definitions can be deceptive, however, implying that social innovation is one of the types of innovation that focuses primarily on social needs.

The presented review allows the formation of three main approaches to the definition of social innovations. Representatives of the first approach (Mulgan G., Tuckers S., Ali R., Sanders B., 2007 ; Phils, 2009 ; Tanimoto, 2012 ; Pol E., Ville S., 2009) consider the term to refer to innovations that focus on social objectives. The second approach (Heiscalea, 2007 ; McElroy, 2002) taken by the Centre for Social Innovation at Stanford University refers to social innovations as those innovations that are taking place in the social space. Representatives of the third approach (Koch P., Cunningham P., Schwabsky N., Hauknes J., 2005 ; Cowen, 1992 ; Golubeva A.A., Sokolova E.V, 2010) consider social innovation to include innovations in the public sector. The lack of a unified approach to the definition of "social innovation" was the cause of the author's understanding of the representation, boundaries and characteristics of social innovation, as this is of great methodological significance for the further development of this sector (Kimberly, 1982).

On the basis of the analysis, a list of the characteristics inherent in social innovation was formulated. Among these characteristics are included:

- innovation;
- social space;
- increase in productivity;
- resolution of social problems.

Based on these characteristics, the authors have proposed the following definition of social innovations. *Social innovation consists of new ideas, opportunities and actions within the social space that increase the possibility of utilising resources to address economic, social, cultural and environmental issues.*

It should be noted that social space refers to the multidimensional space of interrelated social processes, relations, practices and positions. In other words, the essence of social innovation is to increase the capabilities of various resources for dealing primarily with social problems.

We note that the description of social innovation is possible on the basis of the apparatus of modern institutional economics (Popov E.V., Katz I. S., 2014), which permits an assessment of the formation and maintenance necessary for the development of social innovations of economic institutions (Popov, 2014).

3. Typology of Social Innovation

Currently, there is no uniform classification of social innovation in the scientific literature, with only partial achievements in this respect represented by the research of G. Mulgan, S. Toker, R. Aliyev, B. Sanders, A.A. Golubevov, E.V. Sokolovoy, V. Simon and others. However, the presence of a classification or typology of the object of research indicates the degree of elaboration of the respective scientific field. This permits the establishment of general principles and methods of financing, planning, forecasting, performance assessment and economic incentives, as well as the conducting of a more detailed analysis of the problem in question in order to take the most effective action in relation to the object under study (Popov E.V., Omonov Z.K., Katsl .S., 2012).

The review showed that there are many social innovation classifications, with the choice of the typology depending on the goal of the study. In our typology, we draw upon the principal indicators according to which all social innovations may be classified.

Depending on their extent, social innovations may be considered at the:

- organisational level (Popov, 2005);
- micro level;

- local level (urban, rural settlement, municipal);
- regional level (at the level of a selected region);
- national level (at the level of the country);
- international level (social innovation covering a certain number of countries) (Popov E.V., Omonov Z.K., Katz I.S., 2012).

Depending on their participation in state structures, social innovations may be considered as:

- state funded;
- privately funded: financed by commercial and non-profit organisations as well as individuals;
- Funded through a combination of public and private sources.

Depending on their initiator, social innovations may be considered as:

- "top-down" innovations, initiated by the state or by organisations and institutions that stand higher in the hierarchy of power (Tanimoto, 2012);
- "bottom-up" innovations, initiated by ordinary people, public-sector workers, public servants (Golubeva A.A., Sokolova E.V., 2010).

Depending on the degree of novelty, social innovations can be divided into:

- gradual social innovations (minor improvements to existing services, processes, institutions);
- radical social innovations (radical changes to existing services, processes, institutions);
- systemic social innovation (creation of a new system or a fundamental change to an existing system).

Depending on the scope of application, social innovations can be differentiated for approaching the following tasks:

- For improving quality of life: social innovation in health care, education (McElroy, 2002) and social security can significantly enhance the quality of life of the population;
- For environmental protection: using social innovation to overcome the negative consequences of climate change and environmental pollution (Gonzalez-Padron T., Tomas G., Hult M., Calantone R., 2008);
- For improving the efficiency of production benefits (Martinus, 2014): social innovation can greatly improve the efficiency of the production of goods and services, as well as the production of public benefits;
- For creating new industries: the capturing of new markets, the development of existing and new industries;
- For improving social justice: social innovations address problems associated with the development of social inequalities, including unequal access to education, health and public services as well as the inability to maintain social relationships (Golubeva A.A., Sokolova E.V., 2010).

Thus, five of the most important and fundamental attributes are identified, permitting us to consider social innovation in terms of scale, state support, creation process, applied relevance and characteristics of novelty.

4. The Institutional Social Innovation Environment

The institutional environment is broadly understood as the set of rules, regulations and enforcement mechanisms that facilitate interaction between economic agents. The institutional social innovation environment is, in turn, comprised by the set of institutions, institutional arrangements, rules and regulations that enable interaction between economic agents to facilitate the creation of social innovations.

When analysing the institutional social innovation environment, the authors drew on the content of the process of reproduction, comprised by the phases of production, distribution, exchange and consumption. By analogy to these phases, when analysing the institutional environment of social innovations, the corresponding institutions were distinguished according to production, distribution or consumption activity types. The exchange phase was not considered due to the social orientation of the object of the study. At the same time, in the context of managing institutions of social innovation, institutional regulation should be provided that includes the appropriate set of rules and regulations for the management of processes of production, distribution and consumption of social innovations. It should be noted that the application of the provided classification of institutions is possible at national, regional and local levels, but requires an adjustment when studying the international institutional environment.

Institutions of production in this area comprise a set of rules, regulations and enforcement mechanisms that arise directly from the creation of social innovations. In other words, this type of institution characterises the institutional conditions for the creation of new methods and mechanisms for meeting social needs. The inflexibility and inefficiency of the existing institutional structures, combined with limited resources, fragmentation and social inequality, contribute to the development of institutional forms of social innovation like public-private partnerships and social entrepreneurship. The creation of conditions for the realisation of projects within these institutional forms is also the primary function of institutions producing social innovation. The question of building effective mechanisms of interaction between regulatory authorities and private companies is revealed in detail in the work of the 2014 Nobel Prize in Economics laureate J. Tirole (Tirole, 2015).

Institutions of distribution of social innovation comprise a set of norms and rules of interaction between economic entities, allowing them to distribute social innovations across different territories. Institutions of distribution create the necessary conditions for the diffusion of social innovations. It should be borne in mind that the institutions of distribution also have national, regional and local characteristics due to the specific features of the territory across which the social innovations are distributed.

Institutions of consumption of social innovations comprise a set of rules and regulations arising from the consumption of individual social goods. Changes in the means of satisfying social needs also lead to changes in the operation of new social consumer products or services, causing the formation of new consumption standards and norms. Within the context of this group of institutions, relations arise between individuals and the direct producers of public goods (private companies or the state) concerning access to these benefits and their usage.

Institutions for the regulation of public goods are a very important group, providing a kind of institutional superstructure that supports the reproduction of social innovations. The main functions of regulatory institutions are to create the conditions for the development of social innovation, provide support for economic agents in overcoming existing barriers to this type of activity, maintain both financial and advisory support in the production of social innovation, and others.

The presented classification of institutions of social innovations can be applied in the construction of an institutional atlas of social innovation, as well as to identify areas in the institutional social innovation environment for which current provision does not exist.

Currently, in the Russian scientific community and the economy as a whole, there is growing interest, as well as a number of measures conducive to the formation of the institutional social innovation environment; generally speaking, however, existing capacity is not conducive to the development of social innovations. The main reason is the absence of a specific regulatory mechanism. In addition, a significant impact on the underdevelopment of the institutional environment of social innovations involves factors such as corruption, institutions that do not meet contemporary requirements and excessive bureaucratisation.

The disclosure of problems of social innovation in Russia and elsewhere in the world is also possible by means of presenting social innovation practices.

5. The Practical Implementation of Social Innovation

Over the past 40 years, social innovations have made significant changes in the world order, affecting not only social and economic, but also cultural and environmental spheres of activity. Table 2 provides an overview of the most interesting and sought-after social innovations, revealing their nature and displaying the results of their implementation.

Table 2: Examples of the most famous social innovations globally².

²The official website of the Open University URL: <http://www.open.ac.uk/about/main/> (date accessed: 30/07/2015)

Official site of Fair Trade International. URL: <http://www.fairtrade.net/> (date accessed: 30/07/2015)

Official website of Greenpeace. URL: <http://www.greenpeace.org/russia/ru/about/> (date accessed: 30/07/2015)

Official website of Nobel laureates URL: http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/2006/grameen-facts.html (date accessed: 30/07/2015)

Title	Description	Results
The Open University in the UK	University of Open Education, which was created to provide education to people who want to study at a location and time convenient to their lives. It employs a wide range of distance-learning techniques.	Since its foundation, it has welcomed more than three million students, with more than 200 thousand students currently enrolled on its courses. In 2005, the University took first place in a public survey on graduate satisfaction.
Public "Fairtrade" Movement	The organisation upholds standards of justice in international labour, the environment and social regulation. It fights against the oppression of developing countries by developed countries in international trade. In this regard, it is developing a system of fair trade, certifying manufacturers who meet their requirements.	Currently, more than 600 manufacturers in 58 developing countries have received a certificate of fair trade.
Greenpeace	Independent, international, non-governmental environmental organisation. The aim of the organisation is to protect the environment, provide environmental education and promote ecological lifestyles.	More than 2.8 million members, over 100 thousand volunteers, around 1,500 employees. Donations over €265 million.
Grameen Bank	Founded in 1983 by Professor M. Janus, the bank was originally conceived as a means of combating poverty among the rural population, for which he was later awarded a Nobel Prize. The founder was convinced that "traditional" charity "kills" initiative, creating only dependency. Mothers, illiterate peasants, and unemployed urban youth – here all those who could not obtain credit from any other bank could receive low-interest micro-loans without collateral. Due to its innovative system, reimbursement of loans was 98% and loan terms were violated in only 20% of cases.	It has more than 2,500 branches in Bangladesh, covering more than 87,000 villages or 97% of the territory. Such systems of microcredit are relied on by rural populations all over the world.
Participatory Budgeting	The participatory decision-making model for the allocation of budgets at the municipal and national levels. Members of the public form budget-spending priorities and select persons responsible for their implementation. This approach was first used in the city of Porto Alegre. A comparative analysis of these models across 8 municipalities showed that the budgeting and budget expenditures are transparent and accountable, with the population demonstrating satisfaction with expenditures and budget allocations.	According to the World Bank, this model has led to an increase in quality of life. Between 1988 and 1997, sewerage services and water supplies to households increased from 75% to 98%, the number of schools increased by 4 times and the overall share of spending on health and education increased from 13% to 40%. Based on this, more than 140 municipalities have adopted this budgeting model.

The analysis presented in Table 2 shows that social innovations can have a huge effect both at the national and global levels. The educational services of the Open University in the UK are accessed worldwide; the Fairtrade social movement operates in more than 65 countries; members of the "Greenpeace" movement number more than 2.8 million people. Grameen Bank has broadcast its rural microcredit model worldwide, providing opportunities to the poorest segments of the population. Implementation of the participatory budgeting model has improved the quality of life in many municipalities in Brazil as well as developing a mechanism under active consideration by other countries.

Neither is social innovation absent in Russia. Currently, the government has adopted the "Strategy of Innovative Development of the Russian Federation until 2020." In addition to supporting the development of environment and technological innovations, this strategy involves increasing the innovativeness of the state

itself. Within this framework, measures are implemented to improve state and municipal government on the basis of innovation. Of course, this is an important development step; however, unsuccessful examples of the introduction of social innovations are unfortunately more prevalent than the successful ones. Examples of social innovations introduced in Russia are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Social Innovations in Russia³

Title	Description	Results
Electronic Russia	The purpose of the programme is to provide a radical acceleration of exchange processes in the economy and society as a whole, especially between citizens and public authorities, in order to enhance the efficiency of state and municipal government. The programme was conducted from 2002 to 2010.	The effectiveness of the programme turned out to be low. Electronic data interchanges between the government and population are not functioning; according to the World Bank, effectiveness of government has not been altered. Compared to the planned ₺7 billion, ₺21 billion ended up being spent. In 2011, the Prosecutor General's Office reported the direction to the Investigation Committee concerning the alleged embezzlement of materials for the project.
Technical Regulations	Documents setting out mandatory requirements to objects of technical regulation (products, buildings and structures, production processes, operation, storage, transportation, marketing and utilisation). The regulations were supposed to replace the outdated GOST standards. It was intended that the regulations would be introduced by directly applicable laws that will eliminate additional administrative barriers and corruption. The concept of technical regulation was first introduced in 1996.	By 2010, it was planned to introduce up to 700 technical regulations. Over seven years, a total of 11 were introduced; over the same period of time, the cost of the technical regulation reform ballooned to over ₺5.3 billion.
USAIF (Unified State Automated Information System)	Designed for state control over the volume of production and turnover of ethyl alcohol, alcohol and alcohol-containing products.	Cost of implementation – ₺7-12 billion Manufacturers estimated their losses for 2006 at \$1 billion US; total losses were up to ₺60 billion.
The Green Corridor project	The project was created in order to establish the conditions for fast tracking documents in the provision of municipal services to the population. The project was developed and implemented in the city of Shakhty in Rostov oblast.	The contacting of officials by an applicant for registering land rent has fallen from 32 to 3 times. The process of implementing land parcels used to take 12 months or more; following the implementation of the project it came to take 18 days. This significantly reduced the material and time expenditure of the population for municipal services.

As shown in Table 3, the "Electronic Russia" project turned out to be ineffective, despite the fact that it cost more than ₺21 billion. Instead of the planned 700 technical regulations, only 11 were adopted over the last 7 years; however, work currently underway in this direction is intended to introduce new technical regulations that will operate throughout the territory of the Eurasian Economic Union. The Unified State Automated Information System (USAIF) is designed for the state control of production and turnover of ethyl alcohol. The cost of implementing this system is estimated at around ₺7-12 billion. The inappropriate design of this system had a negative impact on producers in the form of losses for 2006 of \$1 billion US; total losses amounted to ₺60 billion. A successful example of social innovation was the introduction of the "Green Corridor" project,

³Site of the Ministry of Telecom and Mass Communications URL: <http://minsvyaz.ru/ru/activity/programs/6/> (date accessed: 30/07/2015)

Site of "Technical Regulations in the Russian Federation" <http://www.tehreg.ru/> (date accessed: 30/07/2015)

EGAIS <http://www.egais.com/>;

Ponamarenko S.A. Social Innovation in the Municipality // Economic Bulletin of the Rostov State University, No.4, Part 2, 2008. p. 342

which has reduced administrative barriers, corruption, time and costs for municipal public services by ten times over.

The social innovations presented were implemented primarily at the state level. However, international experience demonstrates the effectiveness of innovations implemented by social entrepreneurs and non-governmental organisations, as well as within the framework of public-private partnership projects. According to the Investment Fund of the Russian Federation, the Federal Ministry for Regional Development oversaw 51 projects in 2014, receiving budget allocations totalling ₺1107.1 billion. Both the active work of the Investment Fund of the Russian Federation, as well as the size of the financing, support the development of this area, at the same time as recognising its prospects.

Regarding the development of social entrepreneurship, a number of problems are evident. The first of these concerns the absence of federal legislation regulating this kind of activity. However, in accordance with the Federal Law "On Non-commercial Organisations", in 2010, the concept of "socially-oriented non-profit organisations" was introduced; this includes non-profit organisations carrying out activities aimed at solving social problems, the development of civil society in the Russian Federation, etc.⁴.

Referring to the dynamics of the development of the institutional social innovation environment, the existence of positive trends should be noted. For example, the HSE [National Research University Higher School of Economics] operates and actively develops the Center for Social Entrepreneurship and Social Innovation Studies. Such centres have been established in different regions over the past two or three years, including the Astrakhan oblast, Tatarstan Republic, Bashkortostan, Khabarovsk krai, Omsk oblast, Stavropol krai, Belgorod oblast, Krasnoyarsk krai and others. All this confirms the feasibility of the development of the institutional environment in this type of activity, as evidenced by the growing interest in the prospects of this direction.

6. Conclusion

The conducted investigation for the purpose of the development of the theoretical-methodological positions of economic theory by means of the disclosure of the essence and typology of social innovations, their analysis in connection with of modern Russia, and also the systematisation of institutions, which ensure the social of the developments of territories, made it possible to obtain the following results.

Firstly, it was proposed to define social innovation as consisting of new ideas, opportunities and actions within the social space that increase the possibility of utilising resources to address economic, social, cultural and environmental issues.

Secondly, based on our review of the scientific literature, a typology of social innovation was developed, which contains the following criteria: scale; level of government involvement; type of initiator; degree of innovation; and scope of application.

Thirdly, when studying the institutional environment of social innovations, the following types of institutions were distinguished: institutions of production; institutions of distribution; institutions of consumption; and regulatory institutions for social innovation.

When considering the practical application of social innovations, it was found that, given correct implementation, these types of innovation can achieve good results. However, the majority of Russian social innovation projects are ineffective in practice. The main reason lies in the backwardness of institutions, corruption, administrative barriers and gaps in the system of state regulation. The need to overcome barriers to the implementation of social innovation creates space for further research. The formation of the institutional environment and the activation of social and innovative projects, both at the national level and initiated by private entrepreneurs, is a priority in this area.

References

Battistella C., Nonino F. (2012) 'Open Innovation Web-Based Platforms: The Impact of Different Forms of Motivation on Collaboration', *Innovation: Management, Policy & Practice* N 14, pp. 557-575.

⁴ Federal Law of 12/01/1996 N 7-FZ (rev. 13/07/2015) "On Non-commercial Organisations"

- Cowen, T. (1992) *Public Goods and Externalities: Old and New Perspectives*. In *Public Goods and Market Failures: A Critical Examination*, New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Frens M., Lambert R. (2008) 'Open and Close Innovations: Comparative Analysis of National Practice', *Innovatsii i Ekonomika*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 16-31.
- Golubeva A. A., Sokolova E. V. (2010) 'Innovation in Public Sector: Introduction to the Problem', *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta*, pp. 28-57.
- Gonzalez-Padron T., Tomas G., Hult M., Calantone R. (2008) 'Exploiting Innovative Opportunities in Global Purchasing: an Assessment of Ethical Climate and Relationship Performance', *Industrial Marketing Management*, N 37, pp. 69-82.
- Heiscalà, R. (2007) 'Social Innovations: Structural and Power Perspectives', *Social Innovations, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*, pp. 52-79.
- Kimberly, J.R. (1982) *Managerial Innovation*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Koch P., Cunningham P., Schwabsky N., Hauknes J. (2005) *Summary and Policy Recommendations. Innovation in the Public Sector D20*, Oslo: Publin.
- Koch P., Hauknes J. (2005) *On Innovation in the Public Sector*, Oslo: Publin.
- Lettice, F. (nd) 'The Social Innovation Process: Themes, Challenges and Implications for Practice', *Int. J. Technology Management*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 345-456.
- LU, A.-D. (2013) 'Harnessing Social Innovation through Inclusive Thinking', *Japan Social Innovation Journal*, Vol, 3, No. 1, pp. 56-61.
- Martinus, K. (2014) 'Can Public Space be a Platform for Social Innovation? A Study of Sannomiya, Kobe, Japan', *Japan Social Innovation Journal*, no. 4, pp. 44-54.
- McElroy, W.M. (2002) 'Social innovation capital', *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, vol. 3, pp. 30-39.
- Moore, M.H. (1995) *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Mulgan G., Tuckers S., Ali R., Sanders B. (2007) 'Social Innovation: What it is, Why it Matters and How it can be Accelerated', London, 52.
- Mumford, M.D. (2002) 'Social Innovation: Ten Cases From Benjamin Franklin', *Creativity Research Journal*, pp. 253-266.
- Murray R., Caulier-Grice J., Mulgan G. (2010) *The Open Book of Social Innovation*, London: The Young Foundation.
- Phils, J. (2009) 'Rediscovering Social Innovations', Stanford.
- Pol E., Ville S. (2009) 'Social Innovation: Buzz Word or Enduring Term?', *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, no. 38, pp. 878-885.
- Ponomarenko, S.A. (2008) 'Social Innovation in Municipal Education', *Ekonomicheskii vestnik Rostovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 341-345.
- Popov, E.V. (2005) 'Minieconomics as a Separate Part of Microeconomics', *Atlantic Economic Journal*, vol. 32, no. 3, p. 133.
- Popov, E.V. (2014) 'Transaction Estimation of Institutions', *Advances in Economics and Business*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 58-64.
- Popov E.V., Katz I.S. (2014) 'Istituzioni del settore beni pubblici nel mondo e Russia', *Italian Science Review*, vol. 18, no. 9, pp. 180-183.
- Popov E.V., Omonov Z.K., Kats I.S. (2012) *Institutional-Evolutionary Features of Public Goods Sector*, Yekaterinburg: Insitut Ekonomiki Uro RAN.
- Rogers E.M., Everett M. (2003) *Diffusion of Innovations*, 5th edition, New York: Free Press.
- Tanimoto, K. (2012) 'The Emergent Process of Social Innovation: Multi-Stakeholders Perspective', *Int. J. Innovation and Regional Development*, vol. 4, pp. 267-279.
- Tirole, J. (2015) 'Market Power and Regulation', *The Economic Sciences Prize Committee of the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences*, 13 Oct, pp. 1-43, Available: http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/economic-sciences/laureates/2014/advanced-economicscienc [15 Oct 2015].
- Wilmot, T.M. (2003) *The Dynamics of Visioning and Social Innovation: A Grounded Theory Study of the Impact of Appreciative Inquiry in Sustaining Long-Term Organizational Change*, Ohio: Case Western Reserve University.