

SUVI KOKKO

DEVELOPMENT DISSERTATION BRIEF

2020:05

SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND INNOVATION FOR TRANSFORMATIVE CHANGE: EMPIRICAL STUDIES OF SANITATION INNOVATION

***Social entrepreneurship and innovation for
transformative change***

Empirical studies of sanitation innovation

Suvi Kokko

Development Dissertation Brief 2020:05

till

Expertgruppen för Biståndsanalys (EBA)

Suvi Kokko disputerade i maj 2019 på avhandlingen “Transforming society through multilevel dynamics – a case of social entrepreneurship in the sanitation sector” vid Institutionen för Ekonomi på Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet (SLU). Hennes primära forskningsintressen ligger kring frågor om entreprenörskap och innovation för hållbar utveckling och samhällsförändring.

Avhandlingen finns här: <http://pub-dev21.slub.se/16111/> och Suvi kan nås på suvi.kokko@slu.se

Original title of dissertation: Kokko, S (2019). Transforming society through multilevel dynamics. Diss. (sammanfattning/summary) Uppsala : Sveriges lantbruksuniv., Acta Universitatis Agriculturae Sueciae, 1652-6880 ; 2019:31

The Expert Group for Aid Studies – EBA – is a Government committee analysing and evaluating Swedish international development aid. This report can be downloaded free of charge at www.eba.se

Please refer to the present paper as:

Stefan Granlund (2020), *Social entrepreneurship and innovation for transformative change - Empirical studies of sanitation innovation* , EBA Dissertation Brief 2020:05, Augusti 2020, Expertgruppen för biståndsanalys, Sverige.

Printed by Elanders Sverige AB
Stockholm 2020

Cover design by Emma Andersson

ABSTRACT

Social entrepreneurship and social innovation are expected to take on a growing role in solving global problems of sustainability. The main aim of this dissertation has been to advance knowledge about the social innovation process, which social entrepreneurs engage in. The empirical research is based on a longitudinal case study of a Swedish social entrepreneur operating in the sanitation sector in Kenya. The results suggest that the policy domain may need to shift its focus from understanding the success of social innovation and social entrepreneurship in economic terms, to understanding change in the logics and practices of institutions and in the deeper structures of society where the problems that social entrepreneurs aim to change actually reside. Multiple approaches are necessary in order to understand the social innovation process, which social entrepreneurs engage in. The use of singular approaches to understand the complexity of the process provides only partial and narrow answers and, consequently, actions in practice and in policy. Actors involved in solving the sanitation problem may benefit from widening their frames of the sanitation problem, by actively acknowledging the need to consider new ideas of sustainable sanitation as well as diverse mind-sets and meanings of sanitation across all actors in the sanitation regime to create transformative change.

SAMMANFATTNING

Socialt entreprenörskap och social innovation förväntas ta en växande roll i lösningen på globala hållbarhetsutmaningar. Huvudsyftet med denna avhandling har varit att utveckla kunskap om de sociala innovationsprocesser som entreprenörer engagerar sig i. Den empiriska forskningen baseras på en longitudinell fallstudie av en svensk samhällsentreprenör verksam inom sanitetssektorn i Kenya. Resultaten indikerar att policysektorn kan behöva flytta fokus från att förstå framgången av socialt entreprenörskap och social innovation i ekonomiska termer till att istället förstå förändring i institutioners logiker och praktiker

och de djupare samhälleliga strukturerna där problemen som sociala entreprenörer syftar på att lösa egentligen föreligger. Multipla tillvägagångssätt behövs för att förstå den sociala innovationsprocessen. Användning av förenklade tillvägagångssätt och perspektiv för att förstå dessa processers komplexitet ger ofullständiga svar och följaktligen otillräckliga åtgärder i policy och praktik. Aktörer delaktiga i att lösa sanitetsproblemet kan gynnas av att vidga sina inramningar av sanitetsproblemet genom att aktivt erkänna behovet av att skala nya idéer kring hållbar sanitet samt nya tankesätt och betydelser av sanitet hos aktörer i sanitetssystemet för att kunna skapa transformativ samhällsförändring.

INTRODUCTION

Societal and environmental challenges are too pressing and too complex for business and government as usual (Westall, 2007)

It has been suggested that radical innovations are needed to solve many of the current social, economic and environmental challenges (Hegger et al., 2007). This kind of innovation involves entrepreneurial agency that challenges existing structures, rather than adapts to them, to achieve transformative change (Westley et al., 2006; Avelino et al., 2017). One such agent of change is the social entrepreneur, who, through entrepreneurial agency, catalyses socially motivated innovation – social innovation (Mair et al., 2006; Richez-Battesti et al., 2012). Both social entrepreneurship and social innovation are gaining momentum in Sweden (Emilsson, 2015; Gawell et al., 2016; Lindberg & Berg Jansson, 2016; Government of Sweden, 2018) and worldwide (OECD, 2013; European Commission, 2014; Larsson & Palmberg, 2015). This is due to their potential to create sustainable social transformation by mobilising ideas, capacities, resources, and social agreements in different social structures (Alvord et al., 2004, p. 262). Social entrepreneurship and social innovation are seen as a response to narrow economic outlooks on development, the dominant business models, the needs of the Global South, as well as the increased engagement of citizens

and non-governmental organisations (NGO) in innovation (Van der Have & Rubalcaba, 2016). They tend to pop-up where both the state and the market have failed to meet people's needs (Peredo & Chrisman, 2006; Howaldt & Schwarz, 2010). During the course of this PhD research project, I have followed a Swedish social entrepreneur, Peepoople, through a period of growth and high expectations for creating transformative change to the organisation's bankruptcy in late 2015. By providing an innovative sanitation solution, the Peepoo-bag, to people lacking access to decent sanitation in the Global South, Peepoople aimed to transform the practice of sanitation. The longitudinal engagement with the organisation has resulted in new insights into the dynamics of multiple actors in the social innovation process – a process that was more complex than it seemed at the start of this PhD research project.

Background and rationale

The norm of development has been market-based, technology-driven and top-down processes of change (Millard, 2014). In parallel to this, current global ecological and social challenges (UN, 2019) have triggered a new development paradigm – sustainable development (Osburg & Schmidpeter, 2013). The challenges of sustainable development are increasingly understood in terms of transformative change, not solely in technology and solutions stemming from the natural sciences and technological innovations, but also in consumption patterns and regulation (Smith et al., 2010, p. 439). The shift toward sustainability has thus been claimed to be a cultural or societal challenge (Howaldt & Schwarz, 2010) requiring radical innovation (Hegger et al., 2007; Geels et al., 2008) to transform social structures and practices, involving the revision of values and lifestyles (Millard, 2018). These kinds of systemic changes are needed in many areas, such as food production, water, sanitation, transport and energy (Hargreaves et al. 2011; Moore et al., 2015).

As a response, many governments have taken an interest in pursuing innovation-driven growth policies, which include social innovation, broadly

conceptualised as new ways to create and implement social change (Van der Have & Rubalcaba, 2016). What makes these innovations exciting and relevant for the current challenges faced by society is that they often compete with, and have the potential to replace, the dominant, at times unsustainable ways of doing things (Beveridge & Guy, 2005; Seyfang & Haxeltine, 2012). Hence, they have the potential to transform society. This trend is also prevalent within Swedish organisations, including the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), which has launched and supported initiatives directed at increasing the number of social entrepreneurs. These initiatives include, for instance, SE-Outreach Accelerator programme, INNOBIS, Innovations against Poverty and Business 4 Development.

Policy (OECD, 2013; European Commission, 2014; Government of Sweden, 2018) places substantial expectations on social entrepreneurs to transform societies. However, the empirical case explored in my dissertation illustrates how challenging and complex the process of creating change is, which may lead social innovation projects to fail (Westley et al., 2014) and did so in the studied case. Indeed, some previous studies have criticised the limited ability of social entrepreneurship to create transformative change (e.g. Ganz et al., 2018), and more knowledge is needed concerning how and why some social innovations succeed in creating transformative change while others do not (Bloom & Chatterji, 2008; Westley et al., 2014).

Research and practice have tended to resort to market-based approaches and mechanisms to understand the change created by social entrepreneurship (Dees, 1998; Mair & Martí, 2006; European Commission, 2012; Dorado & Ventresca, 2013; Lepoutre et al., 2013; Phillips et al., 2015; Rey-Martí et al., 2016). The systemic and transformative change, which social entrepreneurship typically is associated with, is often understood in terms of impact and social value for the end-users of the solutions provided (Nicholls, 2009; Short et al., 2009; Smith & Stevens, 2010; Greico et al., 2015; Rawhouser et al., 2019). These complex concepts are frequently reduced to numbers to assess their progress, with market-like feedback

mechanisms, which focus on the most direct dimension of the context where the innovation is expected to have an impact (e.g. end-users or beneficiaries) (Dees, 1998). This is done using methods like counting beneficiaries reached, the number of replications of social entrepreneurial activity across geographical contexts (Moore et al., 2015) or financial and managerial outcomes. These are poor indicators of change in the empirical context of my dissertation, since they fail to explain why the seemingly well-functioning and locally appreciated social innovation failed to take hold.

More specifically in terms of the Global South, social entrepreneurship and social innovation are gaining recognition as bottom-up approaches to the design and delivery of public services and are considered important for meeting the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals by 2030 (Millard, 2018; Eischler & Schwarz, 2019). Significant hopes are placed in faster, more efficient and consumer-oriented sustainable development where the responsibility for service delivery is placed outside the public sector (Cherlet, 2014; McEwan et al., 2017).

The Sanitation Context

The Peepoo-bag¹ can be seen as one such socially innovative solution to the global sanitation challenge. A growing number of urban residents live in slums and other informal settlements creating challenges with regard to the provision of basic services (UN, 2018), such as safe sanitation. Currently, 2,3 billion people worldwide lack basic sanitation and 892 million people practice open defecation. Poor sanitation infrastructure and hygiene increase the risk of sanitation-related diseases, and poor health is often associated with the demand for basic sanitation, which motivates investments in sanitation infrastructure. Closely linked to sanitation are the emergent problems of climate change, insecurity, exclusion and inequality,

¹ A biodegradable, one-use toilet bag containing urea, which inactivates and breaks down harmful human faecal pathogens into ammonia and carbonates within 6 weeks, allowing faeces to be safely used as a fertilizer.

as well as migration (WHO & UNICEF, 2017), indicating that the lack of access to improved sanitation is both a social and environmental challenge.

Owing to its informal nature, the state has historically been, and continues to be, largely absent from sanitation planning and provision in informal settlements. In the absence of the state, NGOs and social entrepreneurs have taken on the responsibility of providing basic sanitation services to citizens (O’Keefe et al., 2015), for instance in the form of public and container toilets in Kibera (van Welie et al., 2018). A common perception is that sanitation services in the Global South are not profitable and therefore not provided. The sanitation sector remains underdeveloped and progresses slowly in poor urban areas globally. The inadequate investment in the sanitation is due to several factors, such as weak institutional and policy frameworks and a lack of political will due to the low prestige of the sector. Sanitation in these poor urban areas typically suffers from inadequate and poorly utilised resources, inappropriate approaches and national standards and regulations, and the neglect of end-users’ preferences (Norström et al., 2011). These issues can be seen as a failure on the part of the state to provide basic services. It is often in these contexts that social entrepreneurs see windows of opportunity for innovative solutions (Austin et al., 2006).

Moreover, there is talk of a paradigm shift in sanitation in Sub-Saharan Africa centring around the idea that value can be created from human waste, which thereby can become a revenue-generating source where resources are recovered instead of disposed of (Diener et al., 2014). This has generated increased interest among social entrepreneurs, NGOs, international development agencies and governments in the Global South in market-based approaches to sanitation in informal settlements (O’Keefe et al., 2015). The market-based approaches can stimulate designs that aim to enhance revenue by making use of human waste, and thus simultaneously improving not only health, but also environmental sustainability (Graf et al., 2014). Novel concepts of sanitation can have extensive social and technical implications (Hegger et al., 2007). Presently the existing expensive, large-scale infrastructure investments in sewage systems create path-dependency and

are associated with certain rules, regulations and institutional arrangements, which require that alternative sanitation solutions adapt to these existing structures. New concepts of sanitation need not only to adapt to existing structures, but also to be able to change the sanitation practices of users, suppliers and other related actors in the sanitation sector. Hegger et al. (2007) have suggested that this will require change at multiple levels, especially in terms of new forms of social organisation in sanitation.

This growing challenge of sanitation service provision, infrastructure and new practices requires more relevant research beyond concrete sustainable solutions. However, since few innovative, market-based systems have operated (Norström et al., 2011) and there are only a few human waste treatment technology implementations in use (Diener et al., 2014), limited research has been conducted on empirical cases of innovative sanitation solutions that aim to solve the sanitation challenge. With this contextual background, the empirical case of Peepoople provided a rich setting for this research. It is an interesting case of social entrepreneurship as a generator of social innovation as it involves both technical innovation to solve a social problem, and social innovation in its ability to improve the quality and safety of peoples' lives (cf. Pol & Ville, 2009) by rethinking sanitation and hygiene in informal settlements, and valuing human waste as a resource for agriculture.

The empirical case of Peepoople and the Peepoo-bag

The idea of the Peepoo-bag arose in 2004, when a Swedish architect visited an informal settlement in Bombay with some architecture students. There, he met a women's group that told him that they did not need help building houses, they had access to water and electricity, but that they needed toilets. The architect then started to think about how a modern toilet would work in that context. The starting point was to define the women's expressed sanitation problem in a way that made it possible to design a solution. Together with a family member and a small group of experts from, among others, the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU) and the

Swedish Royal Institute of Technology (KTH), the architect developed the Peepoo-bag and, in 2006, established a limited liability company, Peepoople AB, in Sweden. The Peepoo social innovation received significant attention both in business and sustainable development sectors, in Sweden and internationally (Design S, 2019; COOP, 2019). For example, in 2009 the initiating architect was elected as an Ashoka fellow² and the Peepoo-bag was listed on the list of top innovations in Sweden several times (NyTeknik, 2013). Peepoople started operating in the Kibera informal settlement in Nairobi, Kenya in 2008. Over time, Peepoople expanded to other countries, such as Bangladesh and DR Congo, and Peepoo-bags have been used in several locations by humanitarian relief organisations.



Study site in Kibera informal settlement

² A social entrepreneur, with a system-changing innovation to solve deep-rooted social problems, selected and supported by Ashoka network (Ashoka, 2019).

The empirical research for this thesis focuses on Peepoople's main site of operations, Kibera. Kibera has a population of approximately 200,000 people (Desgropes & Taupin, 2011) and is located close to the city centre of Nairobi. Previous research on sanitation in informal settlements has described Kibera as an area that lacks space and has a disorganised layout, making it difficult to build sanitation facilities (Schouten & Mathenge, 2010). In addition, lack of investment in sanitation infrastructure and high poverty rates have led to the extended use of open defecation and shared pit latrines (Isunju et al., 2011). Between 50% and 90% of households in the settlement lack access to adequate sanitation, and child mortality rates are among the highest in the world, with one in five children not surviving beyond 5 years (Schouten & Mathenge, 2010). Lack of proper sanitation is commonly known as a source of disease, and lack of hygiene can cause the introduction of bacteria into food and drinking water (Pettersson & Wikström, 2012).

Sanitation in informal settlements in Sub-Saharan Africa is generally characterised by shared or communal facilities due to the high population density, lack of space, high poverty levels and non-feasibility of constructing conventional sewage systems (Jenkins & Scott, 2007; Katukiza et al., 2010; Isunju et al., 2011). Investments in communal sanitation facilities has proven to be an unsustainable solution, not meeting the needs of inhabitants in informal settlements (Joshi et al., 2013). Studies in similar contexts in Kenya (Schouten & Mathenge, 2010), Uganda (Katukiza et al., 2010, Isunju et al., 2011) and Mozambique (Carolini, 2012) indicate that sanitation facilities have higher use frequencies than they are designed for and suffer from a lack of resources for emptying and maintenance. Physical constraints due to dense housing restrict the emptying of facilities or construction of new ones (Isunju et al., 2011). In Kibera, sanitation is provided through multiple co-existing sanitation service regimes; 1) domestic sewer toilets; 2) shared on-site toilets provided by landlords; 3) communal shared toilets provided by NGOs and community-based organisations; 4) coping sanitation in the form of open defecation and buckets; and 5) container-based dry toilet system, like the Peepoo-bag. These sanitation regimes operate with rather

little coordination between them and constitute a part of the splintered sectoral water and sanitation regime in Nairobi (van Welie et al., 2018).

Through the local office in the outskirts of Kibera, Peepoople provided local residents with Peepoo-bags. This bag solution is similar to the commonly used ‘flying toilet’³ in function. When Peepoople started operating in Kibera, the bags were sold in rolls of 25 bags by women micro-entrepreneurs, a strategy used by Peepoople to create trust within the local community and socially embed the toilet solution. Each bag cost three Kenyan shillings (KSh), of which KSh1 was refundable on return of a used bag. The Peepoo-bags were marketed through street show events and plot parties, where the saleswomen and marketing staff together with village elders demonstrated the use of the bag and carried out training in personal hygiene. In use, the bag could be thread over a plastic container or a tin can and closed with a knot after use. Bags could then be left at drop points or picked up by women who started micro-businesses collecting used Peepoo-bags. The aim from the start was to process the used bags into a marketable fertilizer and thereby close the nutrient loop and finance the production of the bags, making operations free from donor funding.

3 Polythene bag used for defecation, especially in informal settlements, and disposed of in the near-by environment (drainage, roadsides, rooftops, etc.), often causing an environmental and health hazard when in contact with drinking water supplies or humans.



Sack-gardening trials with Peepoo-fertilizer in Kibera

In 2010, Peepoople started cooperating with schools in Kibera. One of the ideas behind the Peepoople School Program was to reach the most vulnerable in society, children, and to increase awareness of sanitation and hygiene, as well as of the Peepoo-bag itself, in the community through the “promotional channel” of children. The School Program grew to cover over 100 schools, reaching more than 18,000 children in Kibera daily in 2015 (Peepoople, 2016a). Schools had an incentive to participate in the free School Program, as they often lacked toilets and had to pay for the use of public toilets or otherwise used poorly maintained pit-latrines. Donor funding enabled Peepoople to provide Peepoo-bags free of charge to schools, where they were used in cabins with the help of a specially designed holder, Peepoo-Kiti. The cabins also contained urinals, serving as soak pits, and hand washing facilities with soap were provided outside the cabins.

Peepoo Kids Clubs promoted hygiene and agriculture through competitions and trainings. Schools and day-care centres involved in the School Program were provided with the toilet cabins required for privacy and with training in hygiene and handwashing. The handwashing and personal hygiene component of the Peepoo-toilet solution was seen by Peepoople as an essential component of the measure to obtain a change in the local community. Older students also received training in life skills, including information about menstruation and sex. Peepoople staff, a mix of young men and women, mainly recruited from Kibera, together with school staff also familiarised parents with the Peepoo-bag and its possible use as a home toilet. Any used bags not applied as fertilizer in school gardens were collected by Peepoople (Peepoople, 2015a).

In November 2015, the Peepoople office in Sweden was closed due to difficulties with financial viability as a result of drastically decreased donor funding (Peepoople, 2015b). The brand Peepoople and the rights to the Peepoo-bag were transferred to a Swedish NGO, International Aid Services (IAS), as a result of earlier cooperation and shared value grounds (Peepoople, 2016b). IAS has now scaled down production and reduced costs by returning to semi-manual production of the bag in Kenya. Currently, bags are delivered to a handful of schools in Kibera and it is no longer possible for individual households to purchase the bag.

Research aim and questions

The aim of this PhD dissertation has been to advance knowledge of the social innovation process, which social entrepreneurs engage in to transform society. My interest in better understanding this was triggered by the insights gained while studying the empirical case of Peepoople. The social innovation process that Peepoople engaged in unfolded as complex, made up of multiple actors and layers. It eventually also led to a failure to create transformative change. However, in literature and policy, social entrepreneurship and social innovations are recognised as tomorrow's systems changers, transforming societies into more sustainable ones.

The aim was fulfilled with the help of the following research questions:

- What are the dynamics of the multiple levels of context, when developing and implementing a social innovation?
- How can these dynamics be understood and how do they form the social innovation process of creating transformative change?

To answer these questions I conducted five field visits to the study site Kibera informal settlement in Nairobi, Kenya between 2012 and 2018. I used different research designs for the four research papers that constitute my dissertation. For Paper I conducted a survey with 124 respondents consisting of Peepoo-bag users as well as three focus group interviews; Paper II is based on 15 qualitative in-depth interviews; in Paper III, the empirical material consists of observations and 69 individual interviews; and finally in Paper IV we used empirical material gathered during the entire research project and complemented it with 25 additional in-depth interviews, observations and document analysis.

Findings

I will here provide short summaries of the four papers and some key findings of each paper.

Paper I

Lagerkvist, C-J., Kokko, S. & Karanja, N. (2014). Health in perspective: framing motivational factors for personal sanitation in urban slums in Nairobi, Kenya, using anchored best-worst scaling, *Journal of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for Development*, vol. 4(1), pp. 108-119. DOI: 10.2166/washdev.2013.069.

The purpose of this paper was to understand the driving factors for sanitation adoption and use, more specifically for the adoption of the

Peepoo-bag. The underlying assumption of this study was that the decision to adopt and use a specific sanitation solution is driven by individuals' motivation (Jenkins & Curtis, 2005). The result of such an assumption is the view that the individual is driven by the need to satisfy specific personal needs and wants, in this case through the adoption and use of the Peepoo-bag.

Key findings

- In the context of sanitation for the poor, motivational factors related to safety, comfort, cleanliness and convenience are important for end-users, suggesting that overall well-being beyond health can drive the adoption and use of low-cost sanitation solutions. This should be acknowledged by technology developers and implementers and communicated to raise awareness and encourage adoption of improved sanitation in informal settlements.
- Understanding the motivational needs for personal sanitation, like user preferences, based on information on why households adopt personal solutions can guide sustainable sanitation planning and public health management, and facilitate the marketing of low-cost sanitation solutions to the poor.

These findings lead us to suggest that interventions targeting individual motivations can be complementary to infrastructure-oriented interventions, when aiming to change sanitation practices. The findings may help develop policies that aim to increase the demand for sanitation and which can be better directed to meet the needs of people in the contexts of urban informal settlements, like Kibera.

Paper II

Kokko, S. & Lagerkvist, C-J. (2017). Using Zaltman Metaphor Elicitation Technique to Map Beneficiaries' Experiences and Values: A Case Example

from the Sanitation Sector. *American Journal of Evaluation*, vol. 38(2), pp. 205-225. DOI: 10.1177/1098214016649054.

The main aim of this paper was to obtain an understanding of the legitimate interests and sanitation consumers' understanding of the societal challenge associated with the lack of access to sanitation in the school environment in the informal settlement of Kibera in Nairobi, Kenya. In this study we mapped sanitation consumers' (with and without experience of the Peepoo-bag) mental models of the complex problem of sanitation, with the help of Zaltman Metaphor Elicitation Technique (ZMET). Mental models have been defined as cognitive structures that influence consumer behaviour. They include attitudes, emotions and feelings, actions, symbols, goals, personal values, images, memories of past events, anticipated events, and sensory images (Christensen & Olson, 2002). Mapping out chains of sanitation consumers' reasoning on the challenge of sanitation was the core issue studied in this paper.

Key findings:

1. A comprehensive hierarchical value map of different types and levels of insights into parents' thoughts and feelings on school sanitation and their child's well-being, often expressed as desired values, goals, or end states.
2. Finding out what matters, rather than answering questions may help to capture the worth of a program or intervention by what is valued by the beneficiaries using their language, context, and standards.
3. ZMET is a useful tool for understanding the local context and users' needs, enabling a better fit of a program, intervention, product or service with the local reality.

The findings of this study lead us to suggest that understanding mental models is relevant for programs and interventions that aim to change people's behaviour as mental models affect people's decision-making and, thus, behaviour. Understanding mental models can reveal possible problems

in design and implementation as well as unexpected factors needed for successful intervention.

Paper III

Kokko, S. (2018). Social Entrepreneurship: Creating Social Value When Bridging Holes. *Social Enterprise Journal*, vol. 14(4), pp. 410-428. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/SEJ-01-2018-0003>.

The aim of this paper was to understand how social value is created in a context characterised by institutional complexity. Peepoople was used as a case of social entrepreneurship, to identify key stakeholders in the venture and their logics, which guided their expected and experienced value from participating in the venture. We could see that the stakeholders were embedded in strongly tied networks (Granovetter, 1973) adhering to distinct institutional logics (Thorton & Ocasio, 2008; Greenwood et al., 2011). At the same time, a rather neat representation of a weak tie-network could be traced across these stakeholders and the social groups to which they belonged.

Key findings:

1. Bridging networks and their distinct value logics addresses gaps in knowledge and can lead to social value creation.
2. The co-existence of different logics can be a key factor for successful social value creation in social enterprises, if the competing logics are turned into complementary sources of innovation. A common goal may facilitate the co-existence of different logics.

The paper contributes to practice by suggesting that acknowledging and addressing gaps in knowledge and resources can lead to social value creation if social enterprises remain open to different logics. Like previous studies in social entrepreneurship, the findings in this study suggest that the value

created by social enterprises is experienced subjectively (Guclu et al., 2002; Austin et al., 2006; Zahra et al., 2009) implying subjective, context-driven, and potentially competing understandings of what is valuable to the different stakeholders (Lepak et al., 2007, p. 183). This may pose challenges for evaluating the success of social enterprises, especially when the tendency is to use evaluation approaches from the for-profit sector, focusing on an economic logic.

Paper IV

Kokko, S. & Fischer, K. A practice approach to understanding the multilevel dynamics of sanitation innovation, Manuscript submitted to Technology in Society (June 2020)

The aim of this paper is to advance knowledge on how radical niche innovations can create sustainable societal change. We use the empirical example of the Peepoo-bag to analyse how the new practices encouraged through radical Peepoo sanitation innovation entered into and interacted with the wider societal and institutional structures of the system (the regime), and the already established sanitation practices embedded within it. We identify scales of practice by bridging everyday (sanitation) practices (Reckwitz, 2002; Schatzki, 1996; Strengers & Maller, 2014) and wider socio-technical systems that facilitate or hinder specific practices (Koehler et al., 2017), which can help explain the failure of the innovation to create change (Bloom & Chatterji, 2008, p. 25). To change the dominant practices, radical changes entering at niche level must be able to spread into multiple dimensions of the regime (Markard et al., 2012; Westley, 2018).

Key findings:

- 1 The division of practice into elements of material, activities, competence and meaning facilitates a detailed analysis of the ways in which an innovation interacts with the existing regime.

- 2 Social innovators may need to act as activists in order to align regime actors' meanings ascribed to the practice at hand, to those of the social innovation.
- 3 Understanding the different elements of practice helps identify lock-ins at the regime level, which hinder niche social innovations to break through.

These findings lead us to suggest that changing the practices of more resourceful actors in different dimensions of the regime, especially policy, is necessary in order to move beyond experimental settings of social innovation. The results from this study support Seyfang and Haxeltine's (2012) findings, leading to the suggestion that deeper engagement with resourceful regime actors is often necessary to enhance regime influence. It is not enough that solutions are locally adapted and embedded in the market. The dynamics are more diverse and complex and social innovation needs support from other regime actors.

Conclusion

The longitudinal engagement with the empirical case enabled greater understanding of the complexity of the social innovation process, which Peepoople engaged in. I call the Peepoople case a failure as it did not succeed in creating a real change in Kibera, at least thus far. The market-based model followed by Peepoople, with a focus on market diffusion of the social innovation, turned out to be a deceptive strategy for Peepoople to create change in the regime, the local sanitation problem domain. The failure of Peepoople, however, provides a setting in which the differences between actors at multiple levels and their dynamics can be contrasted and some lessons can be learned about the social innovation process.

The main contributions of this dissertation have been both theoretical and methodological, providing a future research agenda for the field of social

entrepreneurship and innovation. However, the dissertation generates some specific contributions in relation to policy and practice, and the current paradigm shift in sanitation in the Global South, where social entrepreneurs, NGOs, international development agencies and governments show increased interest in solving the problem of sanitation through market-based social entrepreneurial approaches (Diener et al., 2014), like Peepoople. These include

- The diffusion of new ideas of behaviour and practice to higher levels of society requires context-specific adaptation, just like in the local market, in order to mobilise ideas. The mobilisation of ideas can create policy demand and higher-level engagement for social innovation in society. This involves developing a cultural demand for the new idea.
- The policy domain may need to shift its focus from understanding the success of social innovation and social entrepreneurship in economic terms, such as through the number of beneficiaries reached and the diffusion of products, services and entrepreneurial activity geographically, to understanding change as the logics and practices of institutions and the deeper structures of society. This, however, creates a challenge for the measurement-fixated context in which social entrepreneurs act (Antadze & Westley, 2012), as changes in the deeper structures cannot be fully understood and accounted for with simple metrics on outcomes and activities.
- Multiple approaches are needed to understand the social innovation process that social entrepreneurs engage in. The use of singular approaches to understand the complex contexts in which social entrepreneurship is enacted and the complex structures in which the social innovation process unfolds provides only partial and narrow answers. Consequently, they may direct practice and policy unfavourably in relation to deeper structural changes.

- Similarly, narrow approaches, and resulting narrow practices, may favour simplified understandings that are easy to grasp and compare, like metrics and measurements (Paper I). Thus, they risk limiting the understanding of underlying causal explanations (Paper II) or constructed understandings of phenomena (Paper II and IV), which determine peoples' behaviours and practices as well as how these can change. Approaches that accommodate multiple theories and methods have been suggested to be useful for creating understandings of and managing issues that may seem logical in isolation, but contradictory in connection (Lewis & Grimes, 1999, p. 696).
- Actors involved in solving the sanitation problem may benefit from widening their frames of the sanitation problem. Specifically, they should actively acknowledging the need to consider the new ideas of sustainable sanitation, beyond technical solutions for the market, including new mind-sets and meanings of sanitation for different actors in the sanitation regime, especially in terms of developing new forms of social organisation in sanitation, to create transformative change.
- Insights gained from this specific empirical case of a socio-technical systems challenge, may be useful for social entrepreneurs in other contexts, where radical bottom-up social innovations provided by social entrepreneurs are increasingly expected to contribute to solving complex problems, like those in energy, transport and agriculture, through transformative systems change.

References

- Ashoka (2019). About Ashoka. Available at: <https://www.ashoka.org/en-SE/about-ashoka> [2019-02-06]
- Austin, J., Stevenson, H. & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: Same, different, or both?. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, vol. 30(1), pp. 1-22. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.5700/rausp1055>
- Beveridge, R. & Guy, S. (2005). The rise of the eco-preneur and the messy world of environmental innovation. *Local Environment*, vol. 10(6), pp. 665-676. DOI: 10.1080/13549830500321972
- Bloom, P. N. & Chatterji, A. K. (2008). *Scaling social entrepreneurial impact*. Durham, NC: Fuqua School of Business, Duke University. Available at: http://faculty.fuqua.duke.edu/~ronnie/bio/BloomChatterji_090108.pdf [2019-03-13]
- Carolini, G. Y. (2012). Framing water, sanitation, and hygiene needs among female-headed households in periurban Maputo, Mozambique. *American Journal of Public Health*, vol. 102(2), pp. 256-261. DOI: 10.2105/AJPH.2011.300399
- Cherlet, J. (2014). Epistemic and technological determinism in development aid. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 39(6), 773-794.
- Christensen, G. L. & Olson, J. C. (2002). Mapping consumers' mental models with ZMET. *Psychology & Marketing*, vol.19, pp. 477-501. DOI: [doi:10.1002/mar.10021](https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.10021)
- COOP (2019). Änglamärkspriset 2012. Available at: <https://www.coop.se/vart-ansvar/samhallsansvar/anglamarkspriset/anglamarkspriset-2012/> [2018-02-07]
- Dees, J.G. (1998). *The Meaning of Social Entrepreneurship*. Working paper, Graduate School of Business, Stanford University. Available at: e145.stanford.edu [2019-03-13]

Desgroppes, A. & Taupin, S. (2011). Kibera: The Biggest Slum in Africa?. *Les Cahiers de l'Afrique de l'Est*, vol. 44, pp. 23-34. Available at: <https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00751833> [2019-03-20]

Design S. (2019). Tidigare Vinnare. Available at: <http://design-s.se/tidigare-vinnare/2010-2/> [2019-02-07]

Diener, S., Semiyaga, S., Niwagaba, C. B., Murray Muspratt, A. Birane Gning, J., Mbéguéré, M., Effah Ennin, J., Zurbrugg, C. & Strande, L. (2014). A value proposition: Resource recovery from faecal sludge—Can it be the driver for improved sanitation?. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, vol. 88, pp. 32-38. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2014.04.005>.

Dorado, S. & Ventresca, M.J. (2013). Crescive entrepreneurship in complex social problems: Institutional conditions for entrepreneurial engagement, *Journal of Business Venturing*, vol. 28(1), pp. 69-82. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2012.02.002>.

Eischler, G. M. & Schwarz, E.J. (2019). What Sustainable Development Goals Do Social Innovations Address? A Systematic Review and Content Analysis of Social Innovation Literature. *Sustainability*, vol. 11(522), p.1-20. DOI: 10.3390/su11020522

Emilsson, A. (2015). *Design in the space between stories. Design for Social Innovation and Sustainability – from responding to societal challenges to preparing for societal collapse*. Doctoral thesis. Malmö University

[European Commission](#) (2012). *Strengthening Social innovation in Europe, Journey to effective assessment and metrics*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. DOI: 10.2769/53098

European Commission (2014). *Social Innovation, A Decade of Change*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. DOI: 10.2796/27492

Fejerskov, A. M. (2017). The New Technopolitics of Development and the Global South as a Laboratory of Technological Experimentation. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 42(5), 947-968

- Ganz, M., Kay, T. & Spicer, J. (2018). Social Enterprise Is Not Social. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*
- Gawell, M., Sundin, E. & Tillmar, M. (2016). Entrepreneurship Invited into the (Social) Welfare Arena. In Lundgaard, L., Gawell, M. & Spear, R. (eds) *Social Entrepreneurship and Social Enterprises: Nordic Perspectives*. London: Routledge, pp. 216-231
- Geels, F.W. (2004). From sectoral systems of innovation to socio-technical systems: Insights about dynamics and change from sociology and institutional theory. *Research Policy*, vol. 33 (6–7), pp. 897-920. DOI:10.1016/j.respol.2004.01.015
- Government of Sweden (2018). *Regeringens strategi för sociala företag – ett hållbart samhälle genom socialt företagande och social innovation*. Stockholm: Näringsdepartamentet.
- Graf, J., Kayser, O. & Brossard, S. (2014). Designing the next generation of sanitation businesses. Paris: Hystra Consulting. Available at: <https://www.susana.org/en/knowledge-hub/resources-and-publications/library/details/2099> [2019-03-20]
- Granovetter, M. (1973). The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 78(6), pp. 1360-1380.
- Greenwood, R., Raynard, M., Kodeih, F., Micelotta, E. & Lounsbury, M. (2011). Institutional Complexity and Organizational Responses. *The Academy of Management Annals*, vol. 5(1), pp. 317-371. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2011.590299>
- Guclu, A., Dees G. & Battle Anderson, B. (2002). *The Process of Social Entrepreneurship: Creating Opportunities Worthy of Serious Pursuit*. Version: (A) 10/24/02. Fuqua School of Business
- Hargreaves, T., Haxeltine, A., Longhurst, N. & Seyfang, G. (2011). *Sustainability transitions from the bottom-up: Civil society, the multi-level perspective and practice theory*. CSERGE Working Paper, No. 2011-01, Norwich: University of East Anglia, The Centre for Social and Economic

Research on the Global Environment (CSERGE). Available at: <http://hdl.handle.net/10419/48796> [2019-03-21]

Hegger, D. L. T., Van Vliet, Jenneke, & Van Vliet, B.J.M. (2007). Niche Management and its Contribution to Regime Change: The Case of Innovation in Sanitation, *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, vol. 19(6), pp. 729-746. DOI: 10.1080/09537320701711215

Howaldt, J. & Schwarz, M. (2010) *Social Innovation: Concepts, research fields and international trends*, Sozialforschungsstelle: Dortmund, ZWE der TU-Dortmund

Huybrechts B. & Nicholls A. (2012). Social Entrepreneurship: Definitions, Drivers and Challenges. In: Volkmann C., Tokarski K. & Ernst, K. (eds) *Social Entrepreneurship and Social Business*. Wiesbaden: Gabler Verlag, pp 31-48

Isunju, J.B., Schwartz, K., Schouten, M.A., Johnson, W.P. & van Dijk, M.P. (2011). Socio-economic aspects of improved sanitation in slums: A review. *Public Health*, vol. 125(6), pp. 368-378. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2011.03.008>

Jenkins, M.W., & Curtis, V. (2005). Achieving the 'good life': Why some people want latrines in rural Benin. *Social Science & Medicine*, vol. 61(11), pp. 2446-2459. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2005.04.036>

Jenkins, M.W. & Scott, B. (2007). Behavioral indicators of household decision-making and demand for sanitation and potential gain from social marketing in Ghana. *Social Science & Medicine*, vol. 64(12), pp. 2427-2442. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2007.03.010>

Joshi, D., Fawcett, B. & Mannan, F. (2011) Health, hygiene and appropriate sanitation: experiences and perceptions of the urban poor. *Environment and Urbanization*, vol. 23(1), pp. 91-111. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956247811398602>

Katukiza, A. Y., Ronteltap, M., Oleja, A., Niwagaba, C.B., Kansiime, F. & Lens, P.N.L. (2010). Selection of sustainable sanitation technologies for urban slums—A case of Bwaise III in Kampala, Uganda. *Science of the Total*

- Environment*, vol. 409(1), pp. 52-62. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2010.09.032>
- Larsson, M. & Palmberg, J. (2015). Vad Betyder Social i Sociala Innovationer?. Stockholm: Entreprenörskapsforum
- Lepak, D.P., Smith, K.G. & Taylor, S.M. (2007). Introduction to Special Topic Forum: Value Creation and Value Capture: A Multilevel Perspective. *The Academy of Management Review*, vol. 32(1), pp. 180-194. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2007.23464011>
- Lepoutre, J., Justo, R., Terjesen, S. & Bosma, N. (2013). Designing a global standardized methodology for measuring social entrepreneurship activity: the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor social entrepreneurship study. *Small Business Economics*, vol. 40(3), pp. 693-714. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-011-9398-4>
- Lewis, M.L. & Grimes, A.I. (1999). [Metatriangulation: Building Theory from Multiple Paradigms](#), *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 24(4), pp. 672-690. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1999.2553247>
- Lindberg, M. & Berg Jansson, A. (2016). Regional social innovation – pinpointing socially inclusive change for smart, inclusive and sustainable growth in European regional development policy. *International Journal of Innovation and Regional Development*, vol. 7(2), pp. 123-140. DOI: [10.1504/IJIRD.2016.077888](https://doi.org/10.1504/IJIRD.2016.077888)
- Mair, J. & Martí, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, vol. 41(1): 36-44. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.09.002>
- Mair, J., Robertson, J. & Hockerts, K.N. (2006). Introduction. In: Mair, J., Robertson, J. & Hockerts, K.N. (eds) *Handbook of Research in Social Entrepreneurship*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 1-13
- Markard, J., Raven, R. & Truffer, B. (2012). Sustainability transitions: An emerging field of research and its prospects. *Research Policy*, vol. 41(6), pp. 955-967. DOI:10.1016/j.respol.2012.02.013

McEwan, C., Mawdsley, E., Banks, G., & Scheyvens, R. (2017). Enrolling the private sector in community development: magic bullet or sleight of hand? *Development and change*, 48(1), 28-53.

Millard, J. (2014). Development theory. In: Howaldt, J., Butzin, A., Domanski, D. & Kaletka, C. (eds) *Theoretical approaches to social innovation: A critical literature review* (D1.1), chapter 3, deliverable D1.4, SI-DRIVE. Available at: https://www.si-drive.eu/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/D1_1-Critical-Literature-Review.pdf [19-03-14]

Millard, J. (2018). Social Innovation in Africa: Huge Diversity, but Common Themes. In: Howaldt, J., Kaletka, C., Schröder, A & Zirngieb, M. (eds) *Atlas of Social Innovation, New Practices for a Better Future*. Sozialforschungsstelle, TU Dortmund University: Dortmund, pp. 142-143

Moore, M-L., Riddell, D. & Vocisano, D. (2015). Scaling Out, Scaling Up, Scaling Deep: Strategies of Non-profits in Advancing Systemic Social Innovation. *The Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, vol. 58, pp. 67-84. DOI: 10.9774/GLEAF.4700.2015.ju.00009

Murray, R., Mulgan, G. & Caulier-Grice, J. (2008). *How to Innovate: The tools for social innovation*. London: Young Foundation

Nicholls, A. (2009). We do good things, don't we?: 'Blended Value Accounting' in social entrepreneurship. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, vol. 34(6-7), pp. 755-769. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2009.04.008>

Nicholls, A. & Collavo, T. (2018). The Concept of Social Entrepreneurship. In: Howaldt, J., Kaletka, C., Schröder, A & Zirngieb, M. (eds) *Atlas of Social Innovation, New Practices for a Better Future*. Sozialforschungsstelle, TU Dortmund University: Dortmund. pp. 30-32

Norström, A., Lüthi, C. & McConville, J. (2011). State of Urban Sanitation. In: Lüthi, C., Panesar, A., Schütze, T., Norström, A., McConville, J., Parkinson, J., Saywell, D. & Ingle, R. (eds) *Sustainable Sanitation in Cities. A Framework for Action*, Sustainable Sanitation Alliance (SuSanA) &

International Forum on Urbanism (IFoU), Papiroz Publishing House, The Netherlands, pp. 20-33

NyTeknik (2013). Skickar en miljon toaletter till Filippinerna. Available at: <https://www.nyteknik.se/startup/33-listan/skickar-en-miljon-toaletter-till-filippinerna-6401463> [2019-02-08]

OECD (2013). *Policy Brief on Social Entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial Activities in Europe*. Paris: The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

O'Keefe, M., Lüthi, C., Tumwebaze, I. K., & Tobias, R. (2015). Opportunities and limits to market-driven sanitation services: evidence from urban informal settlements in East Africa. *Environment and Urbanization*, vol. 27(2), pp. 421–440. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956247815581758>

Osburg, T. & Schmidpeter, R. (2013). Social innovation – Quo vadis. In Osburg T. & Schmidpeter, R. (eds) *Social innovation – solutions for a sustainable future*. Heidelberg: Springer, pp. 317-321

Peepoople (2015a). How we work. Available at: <http://www.peepoople.com/how-we-work/schools/#navigation> [2015-08-12]

Peepoople (2015b). Peepoople AB in Sweden is closing down. Available at: <http://www.peepoople.com/news-media/news/0/> [2019-02-07]

Peepoople (2016a). Kibera School Project. Available at: <http://www.peepoople.com/kenya/kibera-slum-school-project/#navigation> [2016-07-29]

Peepoople (2016b). IAS becomes the new owner of the Peepoople brand. Available at: <http://www.peepoople.com/news-media/news/0/> [2019-02-07]

Peredo, A. M. & Chrisman, J.J. (2006). Toward a Theory of Community-Based Enterprise. *The Academy of Management Review*, vol. 31(2), pp. 309-328. DOI: 10.2307/20159204

Petterson, J. & Wikström, J. (2012). Good shit? Household effects of ecological sanitation in Mali. Conference Paper. The 4th International Dry Toilet Conference 2012 Available at: <https://www.susana.org/en/knowledge-hub/resources-and-publications/library/details/1618> [19-03-21]

Phillips, W., Lee, H., Ghobadian, A., O'Regan, N. & James, P. (2015). Social Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship: A Systematic Review. *Group & Organization Management*, vol. 40(3), pp. 428–461. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601114560063>

Pol, E. & Ville, S. (2009). Social innovation: buzz word or enduring term?. *Journal of Socio- economics*, vol. 38(6), pp. 878–885. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2009.02.011>

Rawhouser, H., Cummings, M. & Newbert, S.L. (2019). Social Impact Measurement: Current Approaches and Future Directions for Social Entrepreneurship Research. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, vol. 43(1), pp. 82–115. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1042258717727718>

Reckwitz, A. (2002). Toward a Theory of Social Practices: A Development in Culturalist Theorizing. *European Journal of Social Theory*, vol. 5(2), pp. 243–263, DOI: [10.1177/13684310222225432](https://doi.org/10.1177/13684310222225432)

Richez-Battesti, N., Petrella, F. & Vallade, D. (2012), L'innovation sociale, une notion aux usages pluriels: Quels enjeux et défis pour l'analyse ?. *Innovations*, 2012/2 (n°38), pp. 15-36. DOI 10.3917/inno.038.0015

Short, J.C., Moss, T.W. & Lumpkin, G.T. (2009). Research in Social Entrepreneurship: Past Contributions and Future Opportunities. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, vol. 3(2), pp. 161–194. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/sej.69>

Seyfang, G. & Smith, A. (2007). Grassroots innovations for sustainable development: Towards a new research and policy agenda, *Environmental Politics*, vol. 16(4), pp. 584–603. DOI: 10.1080/09644010701419121

Seyfang, G. & Hazeltnine, A. (2012). Growing grass-roots innovations: exploring the role of community-based initiatives in governing sustainable

- energy transitions. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, vol. 30(3), pp. 381-400. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1068/c10222>
- Schouten, M.A.C. & Mathenge, R.W. (2010). Communal sanitation alternatives for slums: A case study of Kibera, Kenya. *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth*, vol. 35(13), pp.815–822. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pce.2010.07.002>
- Smith, B.R. & Stevens, C.E. (2010). Different types of social entrepreneurship: The role of geography and embeddedness on the measurement and scaling of social value. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, vol. 22(6), pp. 575-598. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2010.488405>
- Smith, A., Voß, J-P. & Grin, J. (2010). Innovation studies and sustainability transitions: The allure of the multi-level perspective and its challenges, *Research Policy*, vol. 39(4), pp. 435-448. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2010.01.023>
- Thomas, G. (2011). A Typology for the Case Study in Social Science Following a Review of Definition, Discourse, and Structure. *Qualitative Inquiry*, vol. 17(6), pp. 511–521. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800411409884>
- United Nations (2018).The World's Cities in 2018—Data Booklet (ST/ESA/ SER.A/417), United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division (2018).
- van der Have, R.O. & Rubalcaba, L. (2016). Social innovation research: An emerging area of innovation studies?, *Research Policy*, vol. 45(9), pp. 1923-1935. DOI: [org/10.1016/j.respol.2016.06.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2016.06.010)
- van Welie, M. J., Cherunya, P. C., Truffer, B., & Murphy, J. T. (2018). Analysing transition pathways in developing cities: The case of Nairobi's splintered sanitation regime. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, vol.137, pp.259-271. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2018.07.059>

Westall, A. (2007). *How can innovation in social enterprise be understood, encouraged and enabled?* A social enterprise think piece for the Office of Third Sector, November 2007.

Westley, F., Zimmerman, B. & Patton, M. Q. (2006). *Getting to maybe: how the world is changed*. Toronto: Random House

Westley, F., & Antadze, N. (2010). Making a difference: Strategies for scaling social innovation for greater impact. *Innovation Journal*, vol. 15(2), pp. p1-19. Available at pdfs.semanticscholar.org [2019-03-20]

Westley, F., Antadze, N., Riddell, DJ., Robinson, K. & Geobey, S. (2014). Five Configurations for Scaling Up Social Innovation: Case Examples of Nonprofit Organizations From Canada. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, vol. 50(3), pp. 234– 260. DOI: 10.1177/0021886314532945

Westley, F. (2018). Social Innovation and Resilient Societies. In: Howaldt, J., Kaletka, C., Schröder, A & Zirngieb, M. (eds) *Atlas of Social Innovation, New Practices for a Better Future*. Sozialforschungsstelle, TU Dortmund University: Dortmund, pp. 22-25

WHO & UNICEF (2017). *Progress on Drinking Water, Sanitation and Hygiene: 2017 Update and SDG Baselines*. Geneva: World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

World Bank (2015). *World Development Report 2015: Mind, Society, and Behavior*. Washington DC: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank

Zahra, S.A. Gedajlovic, E. Neubaum, D.O. & Shulman, J.M. (2009). A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges. *Journal of Business Venturing*, vol. 24(5), pp. 519–532. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2008.04.007>

Social entrepreneurship and innovation are expected to take on a growing role in solving global problems of sustainability. This DDB examines the case of a social entrepreneur in the sanitation sector in Kenya. By studying the dynamics of the multiple actors and levels of context involved, it sheds light on how social entrepreneurship can lead to transformative societal change.

Socialt entreprenörskap och innovation förväntas få en allt viktigare roll i lösningen på globala hållbarhetsproblem. Denna DDB studerar ett fall av socialt entreprenörskap inom sanitetssektorn i Kenya. Genom att undersöka dynamiken kring relevanta aktörer och kontextnivåer belyser studien hur socialt entreprenörskap kan leda till transformativ samhällsförändring.

This is a Development Dissertation Brief (DDB), where EBA gives recent PhDs the opportunity to summarise their dissertation, focusing on its relevance for Swedish development cooperation. If you are interested in writing a DDB, please contact us: ud.eba@gov.se



The Expert Group for Aid Studies – EBA – is an independent government committee analyzing and evaluating Swedish International Development Aid.
www.eba.se