UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

DIFFUSION OF INNOVATION: LEVERAGING LEADERSHIP NETWORKS IN A REGIONAL CONTEXT

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

STRAWBERRY-BLUE OLIVE
Norman, Oklahoma
2017

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/52718

DIFFUSION OF INNOVATION: LEVERAGING LEADERSHIP NETWORKS IN A REGIONAL CONTEXT

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE
GRADUATE COLLEGE

BY

_____
Dr. Michel Mumford, Chair

_____
Dr. Paul Bell

_____
Dr. Jorge Mendoza

_____
Dr. Claude Miller

_____
Dr. Lee Williams

© Copyright by STRAWBERRY-BLUE OLIVE 2017
All Rights Reserved.

Dedicated to the memory of Audrey Grace Olive, who believed in me

Acknowledgements

Support is critical in any endeavor, and this dissertation would not have been possible without an amazingly supportive community, without whose input this study would not have been possible. The tremendous support of Creative Oklahoma, Susan McCalmont, the Board of Creative Oklahoma and those who participated in this study. The support of my doctoral committee was invaluable throughout this process. My chair Dr. Michael Mumford provided tremendous insight, guidance and pragmatism during this process, and without his exceptional background and expertise in social innovation, creativity and leadership, this dissertation would not have developed. Dr. Lee Williams was pivotal in keeping me on track, providing support and encouragement throughout the process. Dr. Gary Copeland stepped in and provided administrative support to my original chair the late Dr. Andy Van Gundy. Dr. Claude Miller shared his expertise in vested interest theory and survey design, and Dr. Paul Bell and Dr. Jorge Mendoza provided an open line of communication.

I am eternally grateful for the friendship and support of my family and friends. Audrey, who had the rare gift of making everyone, including her daughters, believe in themselves. My sister in New Zealand who continued our mothers' legacy, and Mike and Cath Mills who provided a refuge from the storm, above and beyond the godparent role. Special friends, cohort members, and fellow Musketeers, Gabi Murry and Tara Mott who were willing to drive long distances in Europe to meet up. Finally, I would like to thank Al.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements iv

List of Tables vii

Abstract ix

Chapter 1: Introduction 1

Innovation and Social Innovation 4

Purpose of the Study 6

Background for Research Questions 9

Research Questions 12

Chapter 2: Literature Review 19

Social Innovation 20

Systems of Innovation 26

Diffusion of Innovation 33

Vested Interest Theory 36

Collaborative and Networked Leadership 39

Chapter 3: Case Study Focus 47

Creative Oklahoma as a Social Innovation Initiative 47

Creative Oklahoma Formation and Structure 48

Creative Oklahoma Early Roots in Education and the Arts 49

Creative Oklahoma as a Leadership Network 51

Creative Oklahoma and Research Support 53

Chapter 4: Research Design and Methodology 54

Sample and Data Collection 58
Structured Interview Protocol and Mapping to Research Question 61
Thematic Analysis 71
Chapter 5: Data Analysis and Results 75
Interview Questions 75
Vested Interest 156
Demographic Short Answer Responses 169
Chapter 6: Discussion and Limitations 173
Limitations 173
Discussion and Theoretical Findings 176
Future Research 190
References 193
Appendix A: Recommendations for Supporting Organization 208
Appendix B: Interview Documents and Protocol 219
Appendix C: Vested Interest Questions 226
Appendix D Letter of Introduction and Supporting Documentation 227
Appendix E: Interview Candidate Email 228
Appendix F Institutional Review Board Description of Study Protocol 229
Appendix G: Informed Consent Form 234

List of Tables

Table 1 Structured Protocol Questions 61

Table 2 Research Questions and Structured Protocol Question Mapping 64

Table 3 Example of Theme Counts 72

Table 4 Example of Theme Count with Higher Unit Count 73

Table 5 Involvement with Creative Oklahoma (Question 1) 75

Table 6 Motivation to Support Creative Oklahoma (Question 17) 79

Table 7 Value/Benefit of Creative Oklahoma (Question 18) 82

Table 8 Creative Oklahoma Success and Future Function (Question 4) 85

Table 9 Importance of New Knowledge and Innovation (Question 14) 90

Table 10 New Partnerships (Question 19) 94

Table 11 Communication by Creative Oklahoma (Question 2) 96

Table 12 The Function or Role of Creative Oklahoma (Question 3) 101

Table 13 Cross Sector Engagement (Question 15) 104

Table 14 Networks (Question 23) 106

Table 15 Cross Sector Engagement (Question 16) 111

Table 16 Definition of Creativity (Question 21) 114

Table 17 Creativity and Economic Growth (Question 24) 120

Table 18 Entrepreneurship and Entrepreneurs (Question 25) 123

Table 19 Resources Needed for Innovation (Question 12) 126

Table 20 The Key Actors and Institutions (Question 5) 129

Table 21 Barriers and Enablers to the Innovation Process (Question 6)..... 132

Table 22 Creative Oklahoma in Other Sectors (Question 20)..... 140

Table 23 Support and Barriers for Creative Oklahoma (Question 22)..... 142

Table 24 Sector and Organization Characteristics (Question 7) 146

Table 25 The Importance of Innovation (Question 8)..... 148

Table 26 Key Organizations and People Driving Innovation (Question 9) 152

Table 27 Main Questions Combined Themes 156

Table 28 Vested Interest and Salience (Question 29) 157

Table 29 Vested Interest and Immediacy (Question 30)..... 160

Table 30 Vested Interest and Probability (Question 31) 162

Table 31 Vested Interest and Self Efficacy (Question 32)..... 165

Table 32 Vested Interest and Risk (Question 31)..... 167

Table 33 Vested Interest Combined Themes..... 169

Table 34 Short Introductory Questions Demographics..... 171

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to examine how social innovation has developed and diffused within a regional context during the first five years of a new initiative. This is a timeframe where elite relationships and networks may be critical to build support and buy in for the innovation in the diffusion process. Using a case study of a single initiative that is focused on community enhancement through creativity, the research explores how the institution operates and navigates community systems through extended leadership networks. The research focused on stakeholder motivations and vested interest to engage and remain involved with a statewide social innovation project, and the barriers and enablers to maintaining and growing the innovation and network. The results indicate that leveraging and building a network of extended relationships is an active process, considered by stakeholders to be critical to personal and business development. The social innovation organization seeks to build networks, particularly leadership networks, in the initial stages. At the same time leaders are seeking to expand their own networks and spheres of influence. Individuals join and remain vested in networks for various reasons, not all of which may align with the vision and mission of the social innovation. The organization should be aware that networks are dynamic, interlinking and may be utilized for different purposes. Therefore, the networks need to be actively managed to ensure stakeholder expectations are assured.

Key words: Social innovation, innovation, leadership and social networks, diffusion of innovation, vested interest, systems of innovation, thematic analysis.

Chapter 1: Introduction

This study examines how social innovation may develop and diffuse within a regional context during the first five years of a new initiative. This is a timeframe where relationships and networks with formal and informal leaders may be critical to building support for the innovation and innovation network. The case study subject, Creative Oklahoma, is focused on community enhancement through creativity. The institution is based around, and operates through, a network of extended relationships that are utilized for different purposes including resources, communication, connections and collaboration. The research explores the motivations and reasons why stakeholders engage and become involved with a statewide social innovation project, barriers and enablers to the process, and what may be critical to retain, maintain and grow the initiative.

Innovation is a complex process that emerges within a convoluted mix of social, economic, cultural and political systems, and can take years to diffuse successfully into the social context. In contrast to technological innovation, which tends to emerge from within an organizational structure, social innovation often emerges outside of an organization, evolving within the community from a group rather than an individual entrepreneur or intrapreneur. A deeper discussion on social innovation will take place in the next chapter. Mouaert, MacCallum, Mehmood and Hamdouh (2013), identify "concerns about the human condition" and the need "to address issues around social exclusion, quality of life, and improved service provision" (p.17) as common threads in the social innovation debate. This requires changing social relationships and dynamics, to what Mumford (2002) sees as, "the generation and implementation of new ideas

about how people should organize interpersonal activities, or social interactions, to meet one or more common goals" (p.253).

The management of innovation initiatives (technological or social) within organizations may be complex (Van de Ven, 1986; Van de Ven, Angle & Poole, 2000), involving formal and informal leadership, networks and collaborations operating within and across organizational boundaries. The inbuilt structures and controls operating within the organization, such as formal leadership, roles and responsibilities, financial drivers, business survival and strategic planning, may support conformity and acceptance of the innovation. Innovations emerging outside of a formal organizational structure, and diffusing as a community based initiative, may have to rely more on interagency alliance and be supported by social capital and social networks. This may require different leadership structures to be effective, especially where there is potential for mutually cooperative relationships.

Collaborative and networked leadership (for a review of extant research see Contractor, DeChurch, Carson Carter & Keegan, 2012; Yammarino, Salas, Serban, Shirreffs & Schuffler, 2012) can shed light on, and may have particular relevance to social innovations that are focused on finding solutions to complex challenges in a region or neighborhood, and operating outside of organizational structures. The location of the innovation within a community context and the broader community stakeholder engagement, not only extends the number and range of potential networks and leaders who may need to engage, but also shifts the powerbases away from a single leader to a broader number of leaders and their sphere of influence.

While there may be multiple individuals involved in developing and implementing the ideas and social innovation (Mumford, 2002), the role of leadership in guiding and developing the innovation is not limited to the exploration and development of the problem to be solved and moving the proposed solution forward. It is also important to attract, recruit and retain relationships with formal and informal leaders within the broader community, particularly those whose support is critical to the diffusion of the innovation. In diffusion, opinion leaders play a critical role in communication, and the innovation develops and refines through user feedback (Rogers, 2004). This extends the ways in which leadership and leaders (both formal and informal) may be involved in a community based social innovation process. It also expands the number of potential leaders who may be involved at one specific time, or throughout the lifetime of the innovation.

In addition to multiple players and multiple roles, there are multiple reasons and motivations why individuals make the decision to be engaged with the social innovation. These include the perception of actual or potential value and importance, as well as the perception of potential risk of being or not being engaged in the initiative. This perception of 'stake' can influence and motivate an individual to move from passive to active support (Crano, 1997) of the social innovation and engage in the social innovation network.

Case studies are particularly relevant where the focus of the study is a social phenomenon that is complex, and the research is exploring it in depth, seeking details to understand 'how' and 'why' (Yin, 2014, p.4). Examining how a social innovation initiative emerges within a specific context and during a specific timeframe can

generate information and details that can provide insight into the preliminary stages of a social innovation. This information can have practical implications for community based innovation initiatives engaging in a community enhancement activity that may also rely upon, and be based around, a network of extended relationships.

Innovation and Social Innovation

At the heart of definitions of innovation is the concept of something (an idea) that is 'new' that is perceived as having 'value', whether that is a new product, process, market, service, or way of doing business (Schumpeter, 1934). This can come from a new business or a business of long standing (Gartner, 2000). The innovation process encompasses the ideation or creativity of a new idea at the front end, through prototyping and refinement to final product and diffusion into the market. The innovation process is complex, and the non-linear nature means that changes and modifications occur throughout the process in response to feedback from the process and the individuals involved (Rogers, 2003).

While social innovation is not a new concept per se, it is a relatively new area of research that has been gaining interest, as a means to deal with some of the complex issues facing the world (Kline, 2013). This is in part due to consensus that there is a need to find new and innovative ways to address the social issues, many of which are a byproduct of technology (Meadows, 1972; Meadows, Randers & Meadows, 2004). Within a systems of innovation framework, Edquist (2006) identified a need to look at social innovation as a separate phenomenon rather than as a byproduct or part of the technological innovation process.

The systems, or series of systems within which the innovation develops and emerges, can affect and be affected by the innovation. Therefore, innovations are not an event that is, or even can be isolated from the contexts and systems within which they emerge. This means that innovation is not only a complex and uncertain journey (Van de Ven, Polley, Garud & Venkataraman, 2008) but enmeshed in a complex tapestry of individuals, organizations, socio-economic, political and cultural contexts that are not static. Change is constant throughout innovation process, the systems within which it emerges, and the impact on the context. The change caused by the innovation occurs at both the individual level in the decision to adopt, and the system level in where the social or cultural change occurs, and the two levels are entwined (Rogers & Adhikarya, 1979).

Innovation can also be explored as a type of innovation (Sternberg, Pretz & Kaufman, 2003), as a model (Marinova & Phillimore, 2003), and at individual, organization, network or system levels (Nicholls & Murdock, 2012). Whether inside an organization as a new business model or process, a new product or update to a product sold in the market place, or a new public private sector partnership to address urban housing issues, innovation develops and emerges in a social context, and this socio-economic context is "multifaceted" (King, 1984a, p.3). Part of the complexity is that the focus of social innovation is on "the human condition", which means innovations cannot be untangled from the social, political, and cultural frameworks within which they emerge, and the initiatives involve cross sector collaboration (Moulaert, MacCallum, Mehmood & Hamdouh, 2013, p.17).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to explore how regional social innovation may develop and diffuse within the first five years of a new initiative. To understand the leadership relationships and networks that may be critical for building elite support for the innovation and innovation network, where these social networks of extended relationships may be utilized for different purposes. The research focus explores the motivations or 'stake' of those in the leadership network, the barriers and enablers to the statewide diffusion of the innovation, and what is critical to engage, grow, retain, and maintain the leadership networks. Innovation and the diffusion of the innovation into the social context take a long time, often decades (Rogers, 1995). With social innovation, this process takes much longer. Mumford (2002) identified this to be due in part to the innovation process emerging from within a group rather than a single leader, and the extensive resources that are needed, including elite support (Mumford & Moertl, 2003). The leadership support that is so critical, may include a broad target group, where individuals are in different agencies or community sectors.

An innovation, to be useful, must get to the intended audience, be accepted, used by the audience, and the message spread through user networks until a critical mass is reached and the process is self-perpetuating. This diffusion process has been identified as universal to innovation, regardless of the type of innovation (Rogers, 1995; Rogers, 2003), and has been described as a critical part of the innovation process (Hall, 2005). Without diffusion, an innovation does not get disseminated into the social context (Strange & Soule, 1998), and moreover, critical changes to the innovation do not occur,

which come from feedback from the innovation, and changes to improve the product (Rogers, 2003).

The importance of opinion leaders in disseminating the message and the need to educate individuals about the new product (process, service) to identify value and mitigate perceptions of risk, led Rogers (1995) to place communication at the heart of diffusion. The process of communicating the information about the new product, process, or service to the point where the innovation is perceived to have value and/or utility, is understood, accepted by the audience, and followed by action to purchase, use, or engage in, would seem to be quite complex. This communication would need to consider the content of the messages as well as how and by whom the message is delivered. While this could be identified as a marketing function, it is also important to the innovation change agents or leaders managing the innovation process, particularly in leveraging social networks and social capital. The challenge is not only how to disseminate a message that will resonate with the audience and gain both buy-in and loyalty, but to also identify the formal and informal leaders whose opinions are valued in the communication network and then get them onboard with the innovation early on, and engage their support.

While innovations can have potential value or ‘fit’, novelty also entails risk and the unknown. Information and education about the innovation and the ability to see it in action, tested or trialed, can provide tangible evidence (Rogers, 2003). This may be even more important where the innovation is intangible, or it is hard for stakeholders to see the value of the innovation, as in the example of social innovation focused on regional creativity. Providing information about the mission and vision may not be

enough to persuade the audience of the value of the innovation, and more importantly, move individuals from interest to actual engagement in the innovation. It is important to also have an understanding of the motivation behind the decision to buy a product or use a service, and what and when attitudes affect behavior (Crano & Prislin, 1995). The behavior of an individual to adopt an innovation can be affected intrinsically as the result of the individuals' attitude and motivation to purchase or join a group. Extrinsically this decision-making process may be affected through the influence of others who have already purchased or joined, in particular those people perceived as having influence in peer groups or networks (Niu, 2002). Therefore, understanding the reason why individuals are motivated, or what motivates individuals to align themselves to a social innovation has value for those within the organization or movement. It can provide information to help match the communication to audience, target the audience as well as manage the innovation process.

Innovation, technological or social, cannot occur without the process of diffusion, which Hall (2005) identifies as one of the three elements needed for innovation to be successful. At the core of any diffusion process is the 'communication' of the idea. This includes how the message is transferred, encoded and decoded, the networks of communication, and the individuals who pick up on the idea and transfer that information to others. The actors in the early phases of diffusion are the change agents, innovators, and early adopters (Rogers, 1995), and, for various reasons, they play a key role in the diffusion process. Innovators, followed by early adopters, are those individuals amongst the first to purchase the new product (e.g., phone), or use the new service (e.g., internet banking) and they are often the opinion leaders within their

community or network. It is these individuals to whom others look for information to mitigate the risk of the new and unknown. Therefore, they are an important cadre with whom the innovation leaders or change agents have an interest in connecting with and getting commitment from.

Greater understanding of why those individuals may have a potential interest or motivation to support the social innovation allows the innovation leader/change agent to craft communications and identify strategies for making the connections leveraging social capital and social networks. Insight in what motivates individuals to remain committed to, or vested in the initiative, enables the innovation leader/s/change agent/s to manage the innovation process more effectively. Capitalizing upon those additional networks and building sustainable support needed to grow the social innovation initiative. Understanding the innovation process emerging within a community context from the perspective of these early stakeholders, and the complex and changing networks that exist, could provide valuable insight into the emergence of innovation in the initial stages. This would not only contribute to the body of knowledge on social innovation, but provide practical information for social entrepreneurs, community action groups, and interagency collaborations engaged in developing community enhancement activities.

Background for Research Questions

Innovation is of local, regional, national and global interest. This is, in part, because of the connection between innovation and economic development, and innovation and social change. There is also an increase in interest from organizations such as United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) as

well as communities in building creative capital through creative cities and creative industries. This may in part be a branding or awareness strategy, where creative cities attract creatives because of the positive image (Rushton, 2013). Creative Oklahoma became a member of the Districts of Creativity Network in 2010, an international creativity and innovation community of thirteen communities forming a collective of dynamic, virtual and physical trans-regional networks. Through these local and international networks, regions collaborate to exchange ideas and best practices, and create a community of knowledge that acts as a stimulus and catalyst, generating entrepreneurship, economic growth, social change, and human capital development. The Districts of Creativity network and community partners believe that engaging creativity and entrepreneurship across domains and regions is a critical driver of social as well as technological innovation. One of their goals is developing and sustaining this innovation network to share and grow knowledge, and build intellectual capital within the creative community.

Creative Oklahoma has a mission of promoting, developing, and supporting creativity throughout the state to achieve a vision to establish Oklahoma as a globally recognized center of excellence. To achieve this, the organization has focused on the three sectors of commerce, education, and culture as the primary stakeholder groups. In developing a community enhancement activity focused on creativity, Creative Oklahoma has sought to establish itself through collaboration and networks. Expanding through a system of extended networks and individuals who have influence within, or access to networks, the initiative has grown through building up, and building upon, relationships with formal and informal leaders. Utilizing the social capital and social

networks that can be leveraged to engage influencers and resources within the community. A key question is, what is the basis for the formation, maintenance, and expansion of that social innovation and its network?

The innovation process is complex. Those leading the initiative face many challenges including "changing goals, learning by discovery, pluralistic leadership and building new relationships" (Ven de Ven, 2017, p.39). For change agents and leaders of social innovation, initiatives may emerge within a network of shifting and changing actors, where the innovation within the community is made of stakeholder relationships and interagency collaborations. These networks consist of actors (or nodes) linked together through a set of ties, such as friendship, kinship, and knowledge/skills, that act as conduits for a flow of information, ideas, or transactions between actors (Borgatti & Halgin, 2011). The networks, the actors within them, and the communication between them, build social capital that comes from network locations (Burt, 2000). Formal and informal leaders may play a critical role in building up, and building on social capital within their own networks. They also act as a bridge to connect other networks and stakeholders that the innovation network may not have access to, or influence within.

Individuals may join the network for a number of reasons. In the role of 'information broker' between groups, opinion leaders as brokers, may be acting in self-interest as exploitive network entrepreneurs whilst also building value or social capital for the themselves and the social network (Burt, 1999). However, an overarching goal is to build collaboration, and enhance the capacity and capability of the network in a number of ways, with individuals potentially having multiple functions or roles. In managing the innovation process, "leading pluralistically" is necessary for "collective

survival" (Van de Ven, 2017, p. 41), and innovation may be necessary for business survival.

Research Questions

In breaking the question down, five main inquiries appear to be relevant to further investigation of the overarching question: Why do individuals become engaged, or what engages them? What do they perceive as important to keep them engaged? What do they see as success (vs. failure)? What are the barriers and enablers to that success? And finally: Are there obvious differences (or similarities) in stakeholder concerns and stakeholder groups? In some respects, this almost follows an innovation process—or life cycle of attract, engage, maintain, and grow—applying to the innovation network and the innovation process management.

Research Question 1: What engages people to become involved in the innovation networks?

A challenge facing any innovation is how to attract individuals. Getting individuals to become invested, particularly in a loose social innovation network, may require extensive understanding of how and why individuals decide to get involved. There could be many reasons why someone decides to become involved. Identifying what motivates a person to become vested in the innovation and the network could include: wanting to make friends, build professional connections or expand business opportunities and networks. Some of the variables that could affect these choices could include the industry, organizational and personal characteristics, social, cultural, economic and political systems, formal and informal leaders and the network structures including geographical boundaries and distances. The perceptions of value and

importance may also shift and change over time or depending upon the context, changing needs and the stage in the innovation.

Networks and leaders play an important role in diffusion of the innovation. The opinion leaders and the communication function are critical to educating and informing people within existing networks about the innovation, providing data to assess issues such as risk and fit (Rogers, 2003). The leader, as an influencer within networks or spheres of influence, has the ability and opportunity to share information, increase awareness, and educate others within the network. Thus, playing a critical role in building and maintaining the network and diffusing the innovation. Insight into how to attract these opinion leaders can provide the innovation leaders and change agents with valuable knowledge to potentially plan or manage the process. Allowing them to craft communication, utilize social capital and social networks in a more targeted way.

The research and interview protocol explored 'stake' (Crano, 1983; Crano, 1995a; Crano, 1995b) or the perception of the value and importance of the social innovation which could lead to the decision to adopt the innovation. The questions also focused on perception of 'fit' of the innovation, and the role of the environment, sector, organization and individual perceptions that might affect the decision to be involved. The individuals who took part in the study were asked for their perception the role and importance of networks, creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship.

Research Question 2: What do individuals see as being critical to maintain that innovation network; what engages them to maintain that network?

While an initial focus in social innovation is gaining support, equally important is how to maintain that engagement. As part of this the organization should try to

increase the value proposition of the innovation for stakeholders as well as improving the value of the initiative. To achieve that, it is helpful to gather data on what the stakeholders need, want or even expect, once they have become engaged. Once identified, then it is important to be proactive and manage those expectations. Managing relationships, as with customer support function and change management, has the potential to create innovation champions.

Stakeholders need to see a perceived benefit or value in not just engaging with the initiative, but in remaining engaged or vested. The motivation to become engaged may have a basis in a number of reasons including, friendship, altruistic or even exploitive opportunities. The value or importance of the social innovation network, which may be very different to the original decision or choice, may rest on other factors that individuals were not aware of, or did not disclose. This includes opportunities to collaborate within or exploit networks, discovery of new knowledge or ideas, formation of new partnerships or business opportunities, connection with specific individuals, and expansion of professional networks. Understanding what is critical to maintain the innovation network, can enable the innovation leader/change agent to be deliberate in focusing on how they can deliver those benefits or perceptions of value.

The interview protocol explored ‘stake’ (Crano, 1983; Crano 1995a), as well as diffusion and “fit” and ‘trialability’ of the innovation (Rogers, 2003). The systems within which the innovation emerges influence the innovation process, and the relationships between the actors and institutions can support or block the innovation (Edquist, 2006). Learning and new knowledge occur through the innovation process. The stakeholders were asked about their perceptions of value and benefit of the

initiative, including any new partnerships or relationships, new knowledge, ideas or innovations that had emerged.

Research Question 3: How would individuals like to see that innovation network expanded or enhanced; how do they perceive that network to be successful or unsuccessful?

Innovations that survive the test of time are those that manage to remain relevant (Mumford & Moertl, 2003). To achieve this, even in the short term, the organization needs to be attuned to the current and future needs of actual and potential stakeholders. This includes not just being deliberate in identifying what is working and what is missing, but acting upon the information. Networks and leadership networks are dynamic and evolving (Cullen-Lester & Yammarino, 2016), and innovation emerges within social, political, economic, cultural systems that are do not remain static (Edquist, 2006). While the innovation pushes out modifications and change, it also pulls in changes from the environment as part of the dynamic, nonlinear process. Part of the nonlinear nature of the innovation process is the feedback loop that comes from the innovation users, back into the innovation process (Rogers, 1995). In this, the adopters of the innovation have a critical role to play in providing feedback, including their expectations that in turn change the innovation.

The research and interview protocol explored stakeholder perceptions of where the social innovation had been successful, where they would like it to develop in the future, who or what was missing, and the 'gap' that existed. As well as exploring how the social innovation had emerged within the social innovation leadership network

overall, stakeholders were asked for perception of the diffusion of the innovation in their own sector, other sectors, as well as key actors and milestones.

Research Question 4: What limits or enhances the success of the innovation and innovation network?

In addition to understanding what individuals are seeking from the innovation network, it is important to understand what stakeholder perceive to be barriers and enablers to the social innovation. Specifically, what is successful, what is not successful and what needs to happen to be successful in the future. This insight provides the organization with practical information. Including what needs to happen not just to maintain the network, but what action to take to increase the effectiveness of the innovation management process.

As previously discussed, innovation emerges within economic, cultural, social and political systems, with actors and institutions that enable and block the innovation process. The networks, relationships and contexts are dynamic. Therefore, barriers and enablers are likely to change. Networks may be homogenous in some parts of the system and heterogeneous in others. The organization will be relying upon individuals and organizations to connect across sectors, other organizations and departments, social, political and cultural contexts.

The research and interview protocol examined stakeholder perceptions of barriers and enablers to the innovation. This included resources, external influences including key actors and institutions in the social innovation network, the individual stakeholder network and knowledge of other sectors.

Research Question 5: Are there differences in stakeholder concerns and stakeholder groups?

While there is a general leadership network, the social innovation emerges within a complex and overlapping system of innovation. This encompasses social, economic, cultural and political systems, and the actors and institutions specific to the time and place within which the initiative emerges and continues to emerge (Edquist, 2006). Within the social innovation network, the stakeholder groups and individuals operate in and across similar and different networks at the same time. In exploring what is the basis for the formation, maintenance and expansion of the creative social innovation network, it is important to understand any sector differences that may impact the network and innovation management. Identifying if there are any differences in motivation, stake, perceptions of success or failure, and barriers and enablers to the innovation. The differences could come from formal and informal leaders, collaboration versus exploitation, social capital and social networks, and who has influence and who they are influenced by.

It is important for the innovation organization to understand how potential stakeholder differences, such as geographical, industry, market, and history, may influence motivations and potential stake in a community enhancement activity at a local and state level. The differences in perceptions of value, success and/or failure of the initiative, as well as barriers and enablers to the initiative, may vary depending upon the sector. Understanding and acting upon differences is important to sustain and grow the initiative. It allows the organization to custom solutions to meet those needs. This includes focused communication, and strategies to enhance the innovation network to

provide the innovation with an advantage. The research and interview protocol examined perceptions of four stakeholder groups. This research question seeks to identify differences that may have emerged in response to the previous four research questions within the data.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Innovation is broad in nature, not just in scope but in application of models and types, (see Damanpour, 1991 for a meta-analysis). Taking the Schumpeter economic perspective, innovation is disruptive and is driven by entrepreneurs. It stems from a novel idea, manifesting as a new product, process, service, new market, new supply source, new business model or the reorganization of an industry (Schumpeter, 1934). In addition to the range and scope, innovation is complex. Emerging within dynamic systems, multiple factors can affect the diffusion into the market or social context as well as affecting the networks and perceived value. This makes the innovation process unpredictable and dynamic in nature. Van de Ven (2017) likens it to navigating a river, at times like white water rafting, where leaders and managers don't have control over the innovation process, but can at best learn to maneuver a course. This changing dynamic of moving parts affects every part of the innovation, whether looking at the communication network in diffusion (Larsen, 2011), shifting leadership relationships (Carter & De Church, 2012; Yammarino, Salas, Serban, Shirreffs, & Schufler, 2012), or the feedback loop changing the innovation (Rogers, 2004). The chapter will briefly explore the relevant literature in social innovation, systems of innovation, diffusion of innovation, vested interest and collectivist and network approaches to leadership.

The focus of the case study is a regional social innovation initiative. Moreover, a social innovation initiative that is focused on creativity. Therefore, it should be acknowledged that the interests of the stakeholders and leadership networks involved may be primarily rooted in organizational innovation with an economic, rather than social focus. Some of that organizational scope could include innovation within

organizations, (Van de Ven, Angle, & Poole, 2000) the depth and breadth of organizational creativity (see Mumford, 2012), stimulating creative climate and culture (see Amabile & Grayskiewicz, 1989; Isaksen, Lauer, & Ekvall, 1999), leadership (Bryne, Mumford, Barrett & Vessey, 2009), competitive advantage and clusters of innovation (Katz & Muro, 2010; Porter, 1998b; Porter, 2000), and open innovation, (Chesbrough, 2006; Chesbrough, 2012).

Social Innovation

Innovation and technology have long been identified as drivers of economic development in industrialized countries, and desirable competencies that countries seeking to complete globally aspire to develop (Kim & Nelson, 2000). While technology has been the dominant force and focus, all innovations have an intended, or unintended, social impact regardless of a technology or social focus. Majumdar, Guha, & Marakkath (2016) comment that there is a tension between technology and economic development on one hand, and social innovation and social change on the other. This is partly due to a mixture of sector mistrust, the dynamic nature of social and economic contexts resulting changing cultures, and observed increase of social inequality caused by access and resources. Four necessary conditions that have been identified for social innovation to succeed include the following: effective demand (pull), effective supply (push), effective strategies to link demand and supply, and learning and adaption to meet changing requirements (Mulgan, Ali, Halkett, & Sanders, 2007).

Innovation is associated with disruption, (Christensen, 2011; Schumpeter, 1934). Nichols & Murdock (2012) identity social innovation as the ‘sixth wave’ of disruption, where paradigm shifts shake up, shape, and change the rules of engagement and move

towards a social focus of innovation. More recently there has been a renewed focus on social innovation to find creative solutions to the huge challenges facing the world (Meadows, Randers & Meadows, 2004). This is recognizing not only the limitations of technology in solving problems, but that technological innovation can actually be the cause of social problems. This has pushed the potential for social innovation to the forefront of social change (Mouleart & Nussbaumer, 2006), with policy makers at the global, national and local level becoming interested in developing innovation polices to address social, economic and environmental challenges. Examples include single nation initiatives such as former White House Social Innovation and Civic Participation, to global partnerships of the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD).

While social innovation may be a relatively new focus in innovation research, social innovation is not new. There are many establishments and practices that are recognize as part of daily life, but are not necessarily connected with social innovation by the general population. Some of these go deep within a social, economic and cultural fabric of society and as such form our world views, interactions, behaviors, and beliefs. Mumford (2002), identifies some of the more common social innovations large and small, such as the Boys Scouts, fire brigade, police force, money, libraries, and forms of government. Flextime work practices and the factory assembly line are further examples of social innovation in restructuring workplace operations which have now become mainstream. More recent examples of social innovation initiatives include micro financing of Akhtar Hameed Khan and Muhammad Yunus, safe drinking water projects of Scott Harrison, footwear of Blake Mycoskie, with many more global and local level

projects ranging from literacy, housing, and sustainable farming. Many social innovations are deliberately based on collaborations and networks, (see Haxeltine, Avelino, Witttmayer, Kemp, Weaver, Backhaus, & O'Riodan, 2013, for examples of twelve social innovation network initiatives). These socially focused innovations are often encompassing social economy or the third sector (Bouchard, 2013), and more often or not these initiatives are associated with, or driven by, social entrepreneurs. A challenge with this automatic connection of social innovation to social entrepreneur is that like innovation and entrepreneur, there is a risk of it becoming an overused term and losing value, (see Dacin, Dacin & Matear, 2010 for overview of research on social entrepreneurship).

Bouchard (2013), reflecting on social innovation initiatives in response to social and economic challenges in Quebec, has identified social innovation as diverse; "ranging from economic development, public sector interagency policy to empowered community lead initiatives to redress social inequalities' (p. 8). This diversity of operations and scope of social innovation means it can be a hard concept to define as it can encompass so much. In simple terms, it can be described as "a novel mechanism that increases the welfare of the individuals who adopt it compared to the status quo" (Young, 2011, p. 21285). However, that may not include some of the complexity of social and economic problems, and the need for collaboration which is captured in "the satisfaction of unsatisfied or alienated human needs; and, innovation in the social relations between the individuals and groups" (Mouleart, Martinelli, Swyngedouw & Gonzalez 2005, p. 1973). In expanding the themes of problems and collaboration, Bouchard (2013), defines social innovation as "an intervention initiated by social actors

to respond to an aspiration, to meet specific needs, to offer a solution or to take advantage of an opportunity for action in order to modify social relations, transform a framework for action, or propose new cultural orientations" (p. 8).

Mouleart, Martinelli, Swyngedouw & Gonzalez (2005) identify four main strands of social innovation research as: management science and improvements in human resources and institutional structures; interaction of management practice and scientific research exploring how commerce and finance can work to achieve social and environmental issues; intellectual and social creativity to find new solutions, and finally territorial and regional development (p. 1974). This provides a very broad scope for initiatives as well as options for stakeholder engagement and potential vested interest. Within the management and corporate arena, social innovation research has focused on innovation capability building of human and intellectual capital as a means of competitive advantage. This management of innovation capability is seen as building core competencies within organizations (Howaldt & Schwartz, 2011). When combined with challenges of maintaining relevance and competitiveness in the global stage that is driving the need for innovative solutions, (Barroso, 2009a, Barroso, 2009b) may be of interest to leaders in the innovation network. The challenge for leaders of social innovation could be identifying what the interest or interests might be, and crafting the communication to match and satisfy those needs.

Social innovation has received a lot of focus as social transformation though development of local community governance within the national and regional development debate, (Moulaert, Martinelli, Swyngedouw, & Gonzalez, 2005). In the broader community context, Adams and Hess (2010) identify that, "personal and

collective wellbeing" linked to social capital research, has relevance with community quality of life and community strengthening ramifications (p. 141). This again leads to social innovation opportunities for practical and policy intervention and grassroots community action to address community based issues. More specifically Moulaert, Martinelli, Swyngedouw, and Gonzalez, (2005a) propose a focus on the processes of "governance and capacity building" over the product of social innovation such as "provision of public service and redistributive measures" (p. 1972).

However, the brilliance or utility of an innovation does not automatically lead to wide level of acceptance. Social innovations may face additional challenges in gaining support and traction due to longer timeframe and need for greater collaboration between agencies. There may also be a higher risk of the innovations failing to gain and retain support. This may occur particularly in the "early demonstration" phase (Hazel & Onaga, 2003, p. 288) where the value proposition may not be readily apparent to individuals and agencies. It is also difficult to implement and sustain social innovation because it is rooted in social change (Hazel & Onaga, 2003). This presents a challenge for those leading and managing an initiative as there is an underlying tendency of people to avoid change, and cling to homeostasis no matter how bad that status quo may be (Kets de Vries & Instead, 1999).

Social innovation differs from technological innovation in that it comes from a group rather than an individual. So, the action is driven by "social groups and/or actors" rather than the market, which in turn extends the stakeholders beyond the organization and research arena (Howaldt & Schwartz, 2010, p. 34). In addition, the complexity of the innovation process and the "multitude of factors involved" means that social

innovation extends beyond an economic process into a socio-economic process (King, 1984, p. 3), affecting the speed of diffusion. This can mean that while an individual may adopt the diffusion, the impact means diffusion occurs at a social level of adoption (Howaldt & Schwartz, 2011), and cultural change occurs (Makumada, Guha, & Marakkath, 2016). This is echoed by Rogers and Adhikayra, (1979) who propose that the individual change and system level change are entwined.

Social innovation is very complex. The length of time it takes to diffuse into society, the number of actors involved, the need for elite support, the exact origin of the new ideas, the dynamic nature of the innovation and management strategies during the diffusion process, means that it is not only resource intensive, but also a difficult phenomenon to research (Mumford & Moertl, 2003). Network construction and membership are important. Particularly the individuals who provide that elite support in the early development of the innovation network. The speed at which a social innovation diffuses can be associated with the topology and tightness of the networks as well as the perceived value of the innovation (Young, 2011).

The research explores why individuals (leaders) become engaged within the innovation network, and what they perceive as value, or potential value of the innovation. Whereas success of technological innovations can be (and often are) measured in terms of patents, copyright and economic success (OECD, 2010b), diffusion of social innovation is identified by the degree to which it is assimilated into the social fabric and institutionalized. This means it is very "context dependent" (Howaldt & Schwartz, 2011, p. 206). The systems of innovation framework discussed in the next segment provides a framework to explore of some of the complex variables

that interact during the innovation process. In addition to being hard to measure, within social innovation discourse, there is a debate as to whether social innovation should have economic success in terms of a measurable commercial outcome or not. This is countered with the view that in reality is that it is possible to satisfy different aims and objectives within the broader stakeholder group (Howaldt & Schwartz, 2011).

Stakeholders may have various reasons and motives for being part of the social innovation, and those expectations may be satisfied in different ways. From a value perspective, what is important is that social innovation "can both create new ways of addressing old issues and accelerate the rates of social change" and this "innovative action can create social value beyond the capability of the existing system" (Adams & Hess, 2010, p. 139). Therefore 'value' can be interpreted on a number of levels. This can occur in many ways, as social innovation is far reaching from "the creation of new kinds of social institutions, the formation of new ideas about government, the development of new social movements" to the "creation of new processes and procedures for structuring collaborative work, the introduction of new social practices in a group, or the development of new business practices" (Mumford, 2002, p. 253). What may be challenging for a social innovation initiative focused on creativity, is how to define and communicate value (as well as novelty and utility) to potential stakeholders.

Systems of Innovation

Environments within which business operate are dynamic. Schumpeter (1934) was one of the first to identify the changing nature of the contexts within which business emerges and how innovation disrupts the environment. Innovation can be

examined through many lenses, and the innovation process is affected by the context, timeframe, actors and what Edquist (2006) calls the "rules of the game." Therefore, it is important to look at an innovation in conjunction with the systems within it emerges. This includes the potential influences on the innovation process, the relationships and leadership networks. Innovations do not exist within a vacuum, but within an expanded, interlinking social, economic, political, and cultural systems populated by individuals, organizations and ways of interacting that affect, and are affected by an innovation. Marinova and Peillimore (2003) identify the systems model as the fourth generation of innovation models. Placing innovation within a model helps to frame the moving parts and integrate the systems and networks.

Examining innovation within a systems framework can occur at a number of levels (Asheim, 2007; Asheim & Gertler, 2006; Lundvall, 2010; Nelson, 1993). For this research project it provides a framework that is helpful in examining a regional or statewide social innovation initiative. Systems of innovation explores innovation operating within and as part of a system at a global, national, regional level, (Mowery & Rosenberg, 1993; Nelson, 1993, Nelson & Rosenberg, 1993), industry or sector contexts (Malerba, 2006), and whether the type of innovation is technological (Nelson & Roseberg, 1993) and more recently social (Stroh, 2015). This framework provides a more holistic and interdisciplinary approach to the innovation process. It widens the focus, and allows the innovation process to be explored and interpreted as the interplay of several inter variables within the meshing of the social, political, economic and cultural contexts that influence the innovation process within a temporal span.

Edquist, (2006) identifies the key elements of systems of innovation as the actors (organizations and individuals), the institutions, and the relationships between the actors and the institutions that affect the actions that occur. The institutional 'rules of the game' can include policies, procedures, legal and financial structures, networks, social capital, knowledge and knowledge bases, cultural and social norms, as well as political and economic climate that affect individuals and how things get done. Understanding what supports and what hinders the innovation process, within the specific contexts or systems within which the innovation emerges, can assist leaders of the innovation move the process forward.

While the case study is not focusing on social innovation through a system thinking framework (such as Stroh, 2015), the researcher felt that including the systems framework and model was important. In particular because it takes into account the complexity not just of innovation, but the interactions of social innovation within systems that may support or hinder the innovation process. It also acknowledges the importance of incorporating systems thinking to help leaders manage the huge complex problems facing society (Meadows, 2008; Stroh, 2015) and organizations (Senge, 1990). Understanding how those systems and variables might affect the innovation process in a positive, negative or neutral manner, can help those leading an initiative consolidate a more effective strategy. It can help to develop a course of action to manage the parts of the process that can be affected, while at the same time understanding the parts that are beyond the innovation process control.

This framework considers the complexity of the innovation process. Where the development, from ideation through diffusion and implementation to use, is a complex

process that far from being divorced from the socio-economic and political systems (Nelson & Rosenberg, 1995) is affected by, and interacts with, the actors and institutions within the time frame of the innovation. While there are commonalities in the framework and variables that exist, systems of innovation acknowledge that there is not a five or ten step plan for a successful innovation process. Each innovation process is to some extent unique to the context and time frame within which it develops. This includes the actors, institutions and relationships within the system and the subsequent learning and changes that occur. The inclusion of diffusion as critical to the innovation process. The non-linear nature of innovation, and the learning that occurs as part of the innovation process (Edquist, 2006), are elements of the systems approach that crosses over into diffusion theory. The innovation adopters provide feedback that plays a critical role in improving and refining the innovation, (Rogers, 1995).

While systems of innovation tends to focus on technical innovation (Nelson & Rosenberg, 1993), it provides a framework with a common language and structure within which to explore and understand the innovation process whether social or technological. Edquist, (2006) challenges the predominant focus on technology, calling for a need to be less exclusive and more inclusive in innovation research, and to move beyond a pure technology focus to encourage research and case studies that target social innovation as a separate phenomenon. This enables the researcher of innovation to cross what is sometimes a technology-social innovation divide.

Innovation is often associated with business organizations, or emerging from within firms (Fagerberg, 2006). Managing it involves collaborating across and outside of organizational boundaries. Social innovation can develop as the result of interagency

action or through new social partnerships operating in a broader context, and what Mumford (2002) defines it as "the generation and implementation of new ideas about people and their interactions within a social system" (p. 261). By exploring a social innovation initiative within a systems of innovation framework, it is possible to explore some of the complexity of the process as well as local nuances in more depth. This includes stakeholder views on what they perceive to be barriers and enablers to the process, who they identify as key players, and what might need to occur to support the innovation.

The framework has appeal within the policy making arena (OECD, 1997), as it provides guidance where interventions may leverage an action or support behavior change, enabling government bodies to be specific with interventions. An example being competence building (Borras & Edquist, 2013). It also allows opportunities to track and measure interventions (OECD, 2010b). Technological innovation has long been the focus at national and international level as a way of driving a raft of initiatives (United Nations, 1968, OECD, 2008). More recently this has shifted to include social innovation (OECD, 2011). The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) is prolific in research and publications, providing strategy recommendations across the global collaborations (OECD, 2010a), as well as analyzing the effectiveness of innovation polices at a national level such as the Directorate-General for Research and Innovation (Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities, 2013). At a more local level, the regional innovation systems can be more effective than national in developing policies that support innovation, in part because of existing regional knowledge (Asheim, 2007). However, the existence of legal mandate and

policy does not preclude effective action, especially in the diffusion and implementation phase, (Harriger, Lu, McKayer, Pruitt & Goodson, 2014) where innovations may still struggle to gain support and traction.

The Creative Oklahoma social innovation process has and is, emerging and interacting within the norms, values, polices, and procedures of the political, economic, social, financial and cultural context of the region. It is also bound within a specific time frame that is influenced by the distant and recent history of events. The frontier and pioneer heritage, the Native American history, the boom and bust of the oil and gas industry are just a few key markers that make for a unique context arising from diverse cultures, entrepreneurship and innovation. This is tempered by memories of the hardship, not only during the depression, but through relocation of peoples and the loss of land, self-respect and confidence across cultures that has accompanied those events. A stakeholder commented, that unlike neighboring Texas, “Oklahoma does not have a lot to feel braggadocios about”.

While conversations that created the path that led to the social innovation took place over a span of five plus years, Creative Oklahoma emerged as an entity at a unique time of change within the city. This coinciding of paths of the more recent history included the centennial celebrations and the development of infrastructure which were associated with the forward facing and future state of Oklahoma. The centennial celebrations enabled Creative Oklahoma to be branded as part of the vision of the state moving forwards into the next 100 years. The Metropolitan Area Projects (MAPS) first project which ran between 1993 – 2004, used public support and sales tax from Oklahoma City to focus on regenerating the downtown area. The vision of government

leaders with public support was focused on creating a city that could operate in the major not the minor league on the global stage. The second project focused on the education sector (MAPS for Kids) and the third project extends the first project on infrastructure and quality of life.

The actors, specifically the individuals and organizations, and the relationships that exist and emerge are unique to the systems and time within which the innovation develops. This is not just within Oklahoma City where the initiative is based, but across the region. Changes in the political landscape was a system variable that resulted in changes in support, such as verbal support to active support, from vested actors. The opinion leaders in education, business and the community, the networks and social capital that can be accessed and utilized play a critical role in the diffusion process within Oklahoma. The importance of these actors, the 'rules of the game' as Edquist (2006) aptly calls the complex mix of institution variables, and the relationships that exist between them, are unique to the innovation and the timeframe within which it is emerging.

The Creative Oklahoma initiative can be viewed as operating within a geographical or regional boundary of Oklahoma State. It is affected by and affecting the complex variables that operate within the geographically defined system that operate to support or hinder the innovation process. In the long term, the initiative seeks to reach a critical mass (Rogers, 1995), stimulating individuals and organizations to use creativity as a catalyst to generate technical and social innovations. This could lead to the development of innovation clusters (Porter, 1998), where the networks, and the knowledge, relationships, motivations in the regional systems can create competitive

advantage and economic development. The state has a number of higher education establishments, and the presence of research universities could be viewed within the context of regional and national systems of innovation (Mowery & Sampat, 2005) with the development of both new knowledge and highly trained individuals entering the workforce.

Diffusion of Innovation

Rogers, (1962) was among the first to clearly tie diffusion to innovation as an intrinsic part of the innovation process, explaining how the innovation gets into, or is diffused into the social context. Innovation needs the invention or creativity that sparks the new idea, the process of turning the concept from a prototype to a product, and finally, the communication and adoption of the innovation by the audience, consumer or market. While diffusion can be defined in very ambiguous terms as describing the "flow of something new within a social system" (Strange & Soule, 1998, p. 226), a more common definition is "the process through which an innovation, defined as an idea that is new, spreads via certain communication channels over time among the members of a social systems" (Rogers 2004, p. 13).

The importance of diffusion as part of social (or technological) innovation is clear. The innovation would not progress from the organization or the individual into the market and social structure, and make a social or economic impact without diffusion (Hall, 2005). Understanding the critical elements of the process and what variables within the broader context affect the diffusion of the innovation can help leaders in the social innovation initiative manage the innovation process more effectively. Diffusion can provide insight into areas that have importance, particularly around who is

important, why they are important, and what message to craft to resonate to sell the innovation and attract stakeholders.

The characteristics of early adopters, the predictability of the shape of the adoption curve from inception to saturation, and the role of communication networks, channels, and sources (Ryan & Goss, 1943) are still key elements of diffusion theory. Rogers, (2003) proposes that the model has been used by many academic disciplines and across a range of social settings with both technological and social innovation. The breadth of investigations span products, processes, services, and concepts from changing farming practices and corn seed (Ryan & Goss, 1943), public health awareness and programs such as HIV and AIDS, (Bertrand, 2004; Singal & Rogers, 2003; Wolfeiler, 1998) or medical libraries (Rogers & Scott, 1997), diabetes (Civita & Dasgupta, 2007), effectiveness of policy in child obesity and wellness programs, (Harriger, Lu, McKayer, Pruitt & Goodson, 2014) or wind energy, (Edsand, 2017).

Innovation, communication, time and social systems have been found to be the four consistent elements of the diffusion model across studies, leading Rogers (2004) to propose that diffusion has merit as a generalized model and as a "universal micro-process of social change" (p. 16). The universal applicability of diffusion across domains and context, (Rogers, 2003) and the fact that diffusion is a critical part of the innovation process, means it has merit in being investigated as a part of the social innovation process. Examining the innovation within the broader systems within which the innovation emerges, allows for the exploration of the existence of influence of actors and institutions on the diffusion process.

Individuals who are among the first or earliest to adopt an innovation (innovators and early adopters), have been identified as having certain characteristics, traits or experiences including, cosmopolitan, well-travelled, affluent, and educated (Rogers, 1995). These characteristics and experiences may lead these individuals to be more open to change and assess the potential benefits of the innovation, as well as having experiences which may partly contribute to the level of influence or power base they have within their network. For leaders of an emerging social innovation, identifying those elite individuals who are likely to support the initiative and through their networks, position, influence within the community is important.

The decision to adopt is influenced by internal and external factors (Young, 2009). Information from peers and trusted individuals plays a critical role in finally deciding to adopt an innovation, and opinion leaders are instrumental in educating others within their network and spheres of influence. The education is not just limited to providing information which helps mitigate risks associated with new ventures, but adopters themselves play a role in demonstrating value of the innovation (Young, 2009) as new users themselves. Novelty is not enough. For diffusion to occur, the idea must be perceived by the audience as a combination of new and having value or benefit, otherwise what is the motivation to change? However, new carries risk and uncertainty. The risk involved in deciding when and if to adopt a new idea leads to the importance of communication networks and the information-exchange that is central to the diffusion process. Rogers, (2004) identified five areas that could influence the decision to adopt. These are: the perceived advantage of the innovation compared to what was before, the 'fit' or compatibility, complexity, the testability or trialability and

observability or post-test evaluation. Hall, (2005) calls these influencing factors the benefits, the costs, the industry or social environment, and the level of uncertainty and available information. In an innovation initiative focusing on creativity which may be perceived as ambiguous, the challenge for the social innovation leadership may be threefold. How to define and clarify creativity as a value proposition that connects with the needs of diverse stakeholders, how to demonstrate creativity as a tangible outcome, and how to communicate that effectively to diverse stakeholders.

Vested Interest Theory

Diffusion theory helps to explain some of the variables that affect the motivations to adopt an innovation, including whether to buy a new product, use a service, or join a new type of social group. Although opinion leaders play a critical role in educating potential adopters on the value and allaying concerns on risk, this communication is only part of the decision-making process. There is another component that could influence the individual along the path to action and adoption, and that is the 'stake', or vested interest in the innovation (Crano, 1983). In the preliminary stages of an innovation process, deeper understanding of *what* could motivate opinion leaders to support the innovation, could help identify those individuals and organizations. In addition to focusing the innovation communication towards those individuals who are more likely to be vested in, or have a stake in the innovation, it could also allow the leaders of the innovation to adjust the communication to take in a wider stakeholder group.

Taking the step from being interested in, or even strongly associating with something, to taking the action to being engaged can be explained by attitude-behavior

consistency (A-B-C; Crano, 1997). The connection between attitude and subsequent behavior, or vested interest, depends upon the extent to which individuals believe they are personally affected, how hedonically relevant the attitude object is to them, and how subjectively important they perceive the attitude-relevant behavior to be (Crano, 1995a; Sivacek & Crano, 1982). One without the other does not strongly predict vested interest in the attitude object (Lehman & Crano, 2002).

If a stakeholder has a high-level of vested interest in the innovation, believes that it is important and affects them personally in some way, then it is possible to predict that the attitude towards the innovation will be consistent with and followed by behavior to engage with and support the creativity initiative. Vested interest theory studies have looked at overestimating assumptions of consensus of support (Crano, 1983), disaster preparedness (Miller, Adame, & Moore, 2013), effective risk communication (De Dominicis, Crano, Cancellieri, Mosco, Bonnes, Hochman, & Bonaiuto, 2014), and predicting the use of non-stimulant drugs (Donaldson, Siegel, & Crano, 2016).

According to vested interest theory, the degree of stake or vested interest one perceives is moderated by four factors; salience, certainty, immediacy, and self-efficacy (Crano, 1995b). These can be explained as the following: The extent to which the attitude-object is important to the individual, or salience; the level of confidence that an individual has that by behaving in a certain way, there is a probability something will or will not happen, or outcomes certainty; the timeframe between behaving in a certain way and the expected outcome, or the immediacy of outcomes; and finally, the ability of the individual to behave in a certain way, or self-efficacy. The combination of all

four can help explain the level of risk, or extent to which the perception of loss or gain, and the degree to which the attitude-object is vested, will affect behavior. This vulnerability, or degree to which the individual is vested and thus susceptible to risk, could help those leading the social innovation initiative to understand some of the critical variables. This has relevance to diffusion, where information, compatibility, complexity, trialability, advantage and visibility of results (Rogers & Scott, 1997) help adopters judge risk among other things, and come to a decision. When viewed together with vested interest or 'stake,' can help explain stakeholder perceptions of value and importance. Sternberg, Kaufman, and Pretz, (2003) also note that with leaders, innovation decisions are more likely to be driven by analysis of risk and opportunities than any other motivating factor.

Incorporating vested interest could help manage the innovation process more effectively. This could have value throughout the innovation diffusion, resulting in more effective targeting of an actual and potential market. In addition to identifying individuals or stakeholder groups, understanding the importance of stake could also assist with aligning the communication message to meet different stakeholder needs. This includes crafting the message and providing education about the innovation, as well as understanding how the broader social, economic, political and cultural context may influence the degree of stake and support for the innovation.

Within diffusion and vested interest, the value, or the perceived value of the innovation, is an important variable in the decision to adopt or join the social innovation or social innovation network. Perceived and actual value, or return on investment can be tangible and intangible, and it may be complex to try and measure and monitor the

value of innovation or social innovation focused on creativity. Innovation has tended to be measured by patents, copyrights, and other trademarked signs (OECD, 2010b). Within the education sector value of new ideas and research can be monitored and measured through successful commercialization and publications. Social initiatives or social innovation may be more complicated, sometimes with intangible and long-term return or outcomes. DiPietro (2003) has looked at how to measure the economic benefit of creativity. However, identifying value or return on investment of a social innovation initiative focused on community enhancement through creativity may be challenging for some stakeholders. Especially those who may be used to dealing with more tangible measures, using analytics, and tracking through dashboards and scorecards.

Managing the innovation process may include educating and informing individuals of how creativity can provide value across a broad spectrum as well as tools to measure creativity. This could include the assessment tools used to assess creative climate (Amabile, 1983; Amabile, 1988; Amabile & Grysciewicz, 1989; Isaksen, Lauer, & Ekvall, 1999). Assessment has long been at the individual level seeking to develop and measure creative potential or skills (Sternberg, 2012). Torrance Test of Creative Thinking (TTCT), is a well-known tool for individual creativity. There are also models for creative problem solving such as the Parnes-Osborn model, creativity training (Meadow & Parnes 1959), returns on training in general such as the Kirkpatrick Model (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006).

Collaborative and Networked Leadership

The management of innovation initiatives is complex (Van de Ven, Angle, & Poole, 2000; Van de Ven, 1986), involving formal and informal leadership, networks

and collaborations operating within and cross organizational boundaries. Van de Ven, (2017), reiterates that managing the dynamic innovation process requires, "leading pluralistically, and running in packs with others to create new relationships and institutions for collective survival" (p. 41). This is against a backdrop where innovation may be necessary for business survival with individuals highly vested in pursuing innovation opportunities. Leaders and leadership within community based activities can potentially be very complex due to the involvement of multiple individuals. The roles of individuals, as either formal or informal leaders, may shift and change depending upon who is in the network and the needs of the innovation network at any point in time. A more collective and networked approach to the role and relationships of leaders would fit with social innovations emerging within community contexts, where the innovation may be driven, from a group rather than a single individual (Mumford, 2002). Elite support is one of the critical resources (Mumford & Moertl, 2003), and focusing on leaders and leadership networks may be a priority in order for the innovation to travel.

Within leadership research there is a growing focus of leadership as more collectivist concept of shared influence and networks of relationships (Carter & De Church, 2012; Friedrich, Vessey, Schuelke, Ruark, & Mumford, 2009; Yammarino, Salas, Serban, Shirreffs & Shuffler 2012). This shift in focus recognizes a more complex leadership proposition, where leaders operate within a dynamic environment of relationships and contexts, at multiple levels, and with changing leadership roles and responsibilities (Cullen & Yammarino, 2014). This extends the lens on leadership from, the single leader and dyad relationship of leader-follower influence (Hunter, Bedell-Avers & Mumford, 2007; Yukl, 2006), to the many. It takes into consideration the more

complex environments and challenges that are facing organizations, communities, governments, and the need for new (creative and innovative) solutions. Central to this expanded leadership perspective are the many ways that collectivist leaders can manifest, the importance of networks, and the dynamic nature of the overlapping systems within which leaders and networks operate and function.

Yammarino, Salas, Serban, Shirreffs and Shuffler (2012), in an overview of collectivist leadership, identify the five key concepts in this leadership perspective as: team leadership, networked leadership, shared leadership, complexity leadership and collective leadership. This indicates the very broad sweep of application that ranges from a single leader with multiple connections, multiple leaders, multiple leaders and multiple roles, single leader and multiple roles, as well as the social networks, communication and inter-network connections. It also reshapes leadership as "collective social behaviors" that is applicable to multiple contexts, whether in organizations, community based action, collectives and collaborative action (Cullen-Lester & Yammarino, 2016, p.174).

In the examination of leadership, the lines blur between the formal leader, the emergent leader, the informal leaders and the many leadership roles. The lens becomes a "network of influence relationships in which multiple people participate" (Chrobot-Mason, Gerbasi & Cullen-Lester, 2016, p. 29). Furthermore, this is a dynamic network where leadership, leaders and teams overlap and intertwine. This collectivist leadership perspective is where leadership is "a *network* of dynamically shifting patterns of leadership relationships involving multiple actors", in other words collectivist leadership *as* a network rather than just individuals *with* networks (Carter & DeChurch,

2012, p. 412). This shifts the perspective to the whole network, the dynamics of the actors within the networks and social capital that the individuals and network can generate, and how that can help manage the innovation process.

For change agents/leaders of social innovation, initiatives may emerge within a shifting network of connecting networks and changing actors, that is facilitated through stakeholder relationships and interagency collaborations. Networks and exploration of social networks and network analysis at individual, organizational, community and national level can provide insight into a broad range of issues (See Cullen-Lester & Yammarino, 2016; Li, 2013; Scott & Carrington, 2011 for extensive exploration of social networks and social network analysis). Leaders actively seek to build and develop social capital and the associated value it brings, and some of the key elements of networks are the relationships between actors who are embedded in the networks, form connections and create social capital (Balkundi & Kilduff, 2006).

These networks consist of actors (or nodes), linked together through a set of ties such as friendship, kinship, knowledge and skills, that act as conduits for a flow of information, ideas, or transactions between actors (Borgatti & Halgin, 2011). Formal and informal leaders may play a critical role in building and building on social capital within their own networks. They also act as a 'bridge' to connect to other networks and stakeholders that the innovation network may not have access to, or influence within. In the role of 'information broker' between groups, opinion leaders may be acting in self-interest as exploitive network entrepreneurs, building value or social capital for themselves and the social network (Burt, 1999).

Within the management and corporate arena, social innovation research has focused on innovation capability building of social capital as a means of competitive advantage. This management of innovation capability is a way to build core competencies within organizations (Howaldt & Schwartz, 2011). Where clusters of innovation are important in building local knowledge and completive advantage, it is interesting that social capital may or may not have an impact in regional innovation (Barrutia, Echebarria & Lopez, 2010). This may be affected by the dynamics and structures of networks and potential for network development at local levels, as well as the influence within those networks.

In collectivist leadership the actors play an important communication role within the network (Friedrich, Vessey, Schuelke, Mumford, Yammarino & Ruark, 2014). The social networks, the actors within them, and the communication between them, build social capital that comes from and through those in network locations (Burt, 2000). Social capital can provide value at an individual and collective level, (Tan, Zhang, & Wang, 2015). In building social capital within the leadership network, those within and joining the network may be considering building social capital for themselves. This may be considered both important and valuable to leaders, and a reason to have a 'stake' or become 'vested' in the social innovation.

For those leading the innovation, the importance of networks, formal and informal, inside and outside of the organization go beyond just building and leveraging networks, it includes also managing them (Ballinger, Craig, Cross & Gray, 2011; Cross, Nohria, & Parker, 2002). To be successful, leaders need to both accurately assess networks, and be actively engaged in managing the networks and the relationships

(Balkuni & Kilduff, 2006). Where a social innovation initiative may take decades to fully travel into the social-economic context, engaging and maintaining engagement in the social innovation and social innovation network may require anticipation of short and long-term prospects. Stakeholders may see value in waiting for long term payoffs, and may have expectations that the payoff will occur. Managing the innovation will include managing those expectations.

In managing the innovation process, Van de Ven (2017) proposed that "leading pluralistically" is necessary for "collective survival" (p.41). For many organizations this is critical, especially where innovation may be necessary for business survival. The challenges of managing and fostering innovation include the multiple roles of those leading innovation and creative people (Mumford, Scott, Gladdis, & Strange, 2002) as well as leadership skills (Mumford & Licuanan, 2004; Mumford, Hunter, Eubanks, Bell, & Murphy, 2007). Some of the skills required to successfully navigate the dynamic environment and innovation process are social and political networking skills, which Stenmark, Shipman, and Mumford, (2011) identified as being particularly important in the latter stages of the innovation process. The same skills are important in diffusing the innovation where leveraging those "interpersonal channels" of networks is important to spread the innovation (Rogers, 2004, p.19). How fast the social innovation diffuses relates to the topology and tightness of the networks (Kreindler & Young, 2013; Young, 2011), and the opinion leaders and the social influence they have within their networks are important in communicating the information to their peers (Rogers, 1995).

In managing the network, the change agent or innovation leadership efforts are also at some level, focusing on the direction, alignment and commitment of those within the network to the innovation and moving the innovation forward (Drath, McCauley, Palus, Van Velsor, O'Connor, & McGuire, 2008). In this respect, the actors (nodes) function as 'ties' in the network, and can play a significant role in strengthening the bond and creating a synergy (Borgatti & Halgin, 2011), which in turn supports and reinforces the leadership efforts at alignment. Those trust based relationships that develop can lead to an altruistic spirit within the networks (Portes, 2000). Which for a regional community based social innovation initiative could mean leaders become vested in a community rather than personal goal.

While there is tremendous value with collaborative leadership and leadership networks, there may also be risks associated with the network. Forming an in-group or elite may have the advantage of speeding up the diffusion. However, unless individuals within those groups are connected to other groups, and (this is important) those groups are also cohesive (Morris, 2000) and close knit (Young, 2011) then the topography of the social network will not effectively diffuse or disseminate the social innovation. The connection to other networks will not be successful and the innovation will not travel. So there needs to be connection, cohesion and 'noise' or communication (Kreinfler & Young, 2013; Young, 2011). Without that, the network might become a 'club' and service the social capital of the individuals rather than diffusing the innovation throughout the regional or down to the grass roots level.

It is worth noting that unlike social innovation where the practice is ahead of the theory and research (Mulgan, 2012), collectivist leadership is the opposite. Yammarino,

Salas, Serban, Shirreffs and Shuffler (2012) comment that theory is ahead of practice, and there needs to be more research not just in general but in areas such as social networks, communication, and inter-network connections.

Chapter 3: Case Study Focus

This chapter will examine the background of the organization, the initiative as a social innovation, as collectivist leadership network, and support from the organization for the research study.

Creative Oklahoma as a Social Innovation Initiative

The Creative Oklahoma initiative is an example of a social innovation, and displays a number of characteristics that distinguish the initiative from a technological innovation. While technological innovation tends to emerge from within an organization, social innovations such as Creative Oklahoma typically develop outside of the organizational framework. Rather than seeking to gain competitive advantage in the market place and driving or being driven by market demands, social innovation typically materializes in a social context, where it is driven by a group seeking to change the status quo rather. The Creative Oklahoma origins lie in a group of educators who were deeply concerned and dissatisfied with an education system, primarily around the issues of a system that failed to address the need for art within the K-12 system. This initial problem and quest to find solutions eventually emerged into the social innovation being explored in this study; a social innovation initiative seeking to address the need for creativity at a system level, to include business, education and cultural sectors throughout Oklahoma. Social innovations take a long time to emerge and are the result of more than one individual. The action therefore was, and still is, being driven by social actors/group rather than external market forces or internal organizational commercial drivers seeking leverage in business. This drives the focus of the innovation

away from the individual within an organization, to the group need and a broader stakeholder group outside of an organizational context.

Creative Oklahoma seeks to be an umbrella with a diversity of operations (Bouchard, 2012) that range from forums to community based initiatives across the stakeholder groups of education, culture and commerce. In this study, this action occurs outside of the typical organizational firm context. The organic nature of the development of the innovation though the leadership network and collective board of directors aligns with the idea that social innovation is, “the generation and implementation of how people should organize interpersonal activities, or social interactions, to meet on more common goals” (Mumford, 2002, p. 253).

Creative Oklahoma Formation and Structure

Creative Oklahoma has some unique features that warrant focus as a case study. The importance of creativity as the central tenant of the community wide initiative originated in the roots of the organization. The organization was formed in 2006 as a nonprofit 501 (c) (3), with the statewide mission of "establishing Oklahoma as a world-renowned center of creativity and innovation in education, commerce and culture” (Creative Oklahoma website 2015). The aim was, to support the development of vibrant and entrepreneurial economy within the state of Oklahoma and improve quality of life. Emerging at the same time as the government initiated Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area Projects (MAPS) that focused on urban renewal and quality of life and the Oklahoma Centennial celebrations, the Creative Oklahoma initiative was able to dovetail into existing projects and build on a vision of the future for Oklahoma and Oklahomans.

In addition to the leaders of universities, schools, and other individuals with influence in the education sector, Creative Oklahoma sought support from leaders in the commercial and cultural sectors as well as policy makers and political figures. These were the leaders whose buy in was critical in getting the innovation started in the first five years of the initiative. This early time frame and the leadership networks is the focus on this research paper. The organization has a very small administrative staff who do not have a leadership or decision-making role. The strategic planning is done through the collaboration of a board of directors. The board membership is flexible, but at the time of the data collection comprised of 56 individuals from leadership roles or positions of influence representing the three stakeholder groups in Oklahoma. Three sub-committees, representing the education, commerce and culture stakeholder groups, work collaboratively on initiatives that are relevant to the sector. This includes projects to form new partnerships and build new knowledge. A second layer of leadership support exists through creativity ambassadors. Like the board, these are identified and selected by the organization as influential individuals who can act as 'ambassadors' or representatives and promote the organization statewide in a marketing, branding and networking role.

Creative Oklahoma Early Roots in Education and the Arts

As the name of the organization suggests, creativity is a central tenant of the initiative. This came from early discussions among leaders in the Oklahoma education community. These individuals felt not only was it important to include art in the curriculum, and failing to do so ignored the larger impact on creativity development in students. While this early discussion of education leaders and likeminded individuals in

Oklahoma focused on K-12 education within their own geographical area, it echoed the broader discussion happening in other countries with regards to the lack of art and creativity within the education system (Harris, 2016; Robinson, 1993). This is part of a global discussion on education shortfalls, and echoed a broader, ongoing conversation within the education sector on how the system is preparing students with the skills for the current and future workplace and life (Pring, 2015; Robinson, 2011; Robinson & Aronica, 2016a; Robinson & Aronica, 2016b).

The development of creativity in children is embedded in the overlapping social system of education, community and family (Runco 2007), and suppressing creativity in education, could have a negative impact on the skills associated with creativity such as curiosity, inquiry, and critical thinking (Engle, 2015). This connected the importance of creativity in education to a perception of the failure of the education system to develop critical thinking, creative problem-solving skills and performance required by industry (Robinson, 2011). This larger discussion focused on the gap between the education system and what industry needs. This connects with concerns around workforce and workforce development. The need to equip a current and future workforce with the skills to perform successfully in organizations operating in a changing and dynamic social, economic, political and cultural landscape. The importance of human capital development, creativity, innovation, entrepreneurship and economic development and the interconnectivity between them, has been long recognized at the federal and state government level. This includes policies emphasizing the creativity and innovation as critical levers in economic development, attracting and retaining human capital, and gaining competitive advantage in a competitive global arena (OECD, 2001). USA has a

long history of policies emanating from the White House, and though membership of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) part of a global network of initiatives.

Given the educational roots of Creative Oklahoma, it would follow that the earliest support and largest membership of the social innovation network would be found in the education sector leadership network. The movement away from an education only focus came as a direct result of Creative Oklahoma reaching out to Sir Ken Robinson (K. Robinson, personal communication, January 19, 2013). With his own experience in education and education policy in England (Robinson, 1993), and continued connection with creativity including community building in Northern Ireland, he advised expanding the scope of the creativity innovation beyond just K-12 education to encompass commerce and culture as well. This created the concept of a three-legged stool on which to launch a statewide creativity initiative into the areas of education, commerce, and culture as part of a broader social innovation initiative.

Creative Oklahoma as a Leadership Network

In 2010, newly formed Creative Oklahoma became a member of the International Districts of Creativity (DC) Network, an international creativity and innovation community. Founded in Flanders, this is a global innovation initiative with 13 members positioned throughout the world. Scotland, Hong Kong, Catalonia, Baden-Wuttemberg, Lombardia, Noord-Brabant, Karntaka, Central-Denmark, Rio de Janeiro, Rhone-Alpes, Shanghi, Tampere and Oklahoma. As a member of the International Creative Districts, Oklahoma is the only District of Creativity (DC) member in North America.

The Districts of Creativity form a collective of dynamic, virtual and physical trans-regional networks. Through these networks regions collaborate to exchange ideas and best practice, seeking to create a community of knowledge that acts as a stimulus and catalyst, generating entrepreneurship, economic growth, social change and human capital development. This international network and community partners believe that focusing on creativity across domains is a critical driver of social as well as technological innovation. This forms a form a robust network of economic development, education, and cultural leaders.

Unlike other members who focus primarily on the business sector, economic development and innovation, Creative Oklahoma retains a strong focus on creativity, believing that releasing creativity in individuals is the path to a creative state. To this end, the social initiative is the only member to broaden the stakeholder focus to include, commerce, culture and education. By focusing on creativity and the three stakeholder groups, the innovation has taken a not for profit route. This is different than the other organizations in the network who tend to focus on entrepreneurship, innovation and economic development primarily and have government and policy support as well.

At a more local level, and resulting from the 2010 World Creativity Forum held in Oklahoma, Creative Oklahoma has spearheaded the National Creativity Network (NCN). This is a network that links cities in 15 regions throughout US and Canada. As a member of the International Districts of Creativity (DC) and founding member of the National Creativity Network of North America, Creative Oklahoma continues to establish itself through a network of leaders. In addition to hosting World Creativity

Forum in 2010 and 2015, Creative Oklahoma holds an annual creativity forum, which provides a tangible offering for those interested in creativity and networking.

Creative Oklahoma and Research Support

The leadership of Creative Oklahoma has been extremely supportive. A letter of introduction was sent from the Dean of the Graduate College of the University of Oklahoma to the Chairman of the Board of Directors, who in turn sent out a letter of support to the Board Members. In addition, the President of Creative Oklahoma briefed the Board of Directors about the proposed project. Creative Oklahoma is interested in the research because it will offer process insight and practical outcomes, not just for the Oklahoma initiative but other areas who are seeking to follow their example and develop creativity initiatives. This would apply to current and future members of the National Creativity Network in North America and Canada.

Chapter 4: Research Design and Methodology

The decision to use a case study approach was pragmatic. It was driven by the research questions that needed richer data and stakeholder perspectives. The nature of the research focused on gaining an understanding of what was happening during the social innovation process. In particular, how the innovation has and is emerging, and why individuals decide to engage and remain with Creative Oklahoma. These types of questions, the evolutionary nature of a social innovation in real time, and the complexity of the initiative were criteria best explored through a case study methodology (Yin, 1981). In addition, Edquist (2006), identified the need for more empirical research focused on social innovation using multiple case studies. Meyer (2004) noted a similar need for qualitative case study research in diffusion. The limited resources and logistics resulted in the decision in this research to focus on a single case study rather than a multiple case study approach. Although the latter would provide more generalizability (Yin, 2016), the purpose of case study is "analytic generalizations", where the data provides insight on theories rather than statistical probability (Yin, 2014, p. 21).

Creative Oklahoma is the only North American member of the international Districts of Creativity Network (DC Network). The focus on one member of the network enabled a deeper investigation into the complexity of the social innovation process, getting richer and more detailed information from the perspectives of the individuals engaged in the first ten years of the initiative. It would have been resource intensive to explore the innovation process of all the international members of the

network, not least because of language and geographic location, but also because of the diversity within the group in regard to size, stage of development, and focus.

From a systems of innovation framework, the range includes cities such as Rio de Janiero and Shanghai, geographic regions within countries such as Flanders, and Lombardia, and entire countries such as Scotland. It would have been interesting to study how a global social innovation network and innovation system framework operates in this context. However, this could be the focus of future stud which could examine the uniqueness within each social innovation due to the differing temporal frames within which each innovation process emerges. The complexity of a national system, and large countries versus smaller countries, was beyond the scope of this inquiry.

At the time of the research study, it was understood that Creative Oklahoma was the only initiative to take the three pronged more inclusive approach to encompass education and culture as well as the commercial sector. Based on material available on the network website and observations of at least one other network member (Flanders) during a world creativity forum, the other initiatives have led with a predominantly commercial and entrepreneurial impetus. This included being located within innovation clusters, driven by technology and intellectual capital in Karnataka, or mobile technology in Tampere. To include these initiatives could have moved the research focus away from social innovation to technological innovation and into what Edquist (2006) calls, a focus on technologically driven change. Investigation of innovation clusters and their networks within the regional system of innovation would have provided value. This could have expended research in innovation and economic

development in clusters of innovation (Porter, 1998) or in the policy arena (Muro & Katz, 2010), but would need to be part of follow up research. This follow up research would preferably take the form of a longitudinal study to examine the depth and breadth of the innovation, exploring how and why a statewide creativity initiative like Creative Oklahoma would have a long term broader effect on economic development. It could also be part of separate research on how other Districts of Creativity network members impact innovation in their regions. This could include the difference between a socially focused innovation and more technologically economic development initiatives within the same global network have impact within various socio-economic contexts.

The three-part structured interview protocol was designed by the researcher. Prior to the interviews, the survey was tested upon a group of seven research graduate and post-graduate students at University of Nebraska Omaha, Centre for Collaboration Science, College of Arts and Science, I/O Psychology department. The individuals volunteered to act as test interviewee candidates and provide peer level feedback on the survey. The first section of the predefined protocol focused on short introductory demographic questions. The second section use qualitative questions and explored the development of the social innovation initiative. The final section focused on vested interest using a mixture of qualitative and quantitative questions, requiring short sentences, and 5-point Likert scale responses. All interviewees were asked the first and last sections on demographics and vested interest respectively. The questions in the second section were the same for the stakeholder groups of education, commerce and culture, with some questions worded slightly differently for the founding member group to account for sector nuances. The questions in all three sections of the interview

protocol were designed to overlap to triangulate data, and to gain different perspectives or views of a question. The questions in the interview protocol were mapped to the five research questions and tied to the theories of collectivist leadership as leadership networks, diffusion, vested interest and systems of innovation.

The data was gathered using a structured interview protocol with a two-hour interview. The sampling frame was grouped by the four main stakeholder groups of commerce, culture, education which represented the three areas that the organization developed, and the founding members. The criteria for selection was based upon length and level of engagement with the Creative Oklahoma initiative, and the potential insight into the innovation process. This narrowed the group of potential interviewee candidates down to 50 individuals who had been consistently associated with Creative Oklahoma for a long timeframe. All 50 were contacted and 43 agreed and were able to take part in the study, which was an 86% response rate. Scheduling challenges accounted for the remaining 7, or 14% who did not take part. Although most of the individuals who were interviewed were involved with the development of the concept and organization, the founding members were identified as a small subgroup of individuals who had been involved with the organization from the beginning.

The four stakeholder groups represented a range of sub sectors. Often individuals represented more than one sector due to the dual-hatted nature of their position, or positions held in more than one sector. While most of the sample was located within the geographical region of the Oklahoma City or Tulsa metropolis, interviews were conducted throughout the state, and two interviews conducted outside of the region. Education represented public, private, and nonprofit, including

universities, K-12, government, and educational development and think tanks. The commercial sector represented the private and public business sector; moreover, government, industry, and culture represented the public, private and nonprofit sector.

The primary data source was the structured interviews, which were recorded and coded post interview by the interviewer. The interviews were transcribed by a professional team and checked for accuracy by the interviewer. The data were then analyzed using thematic analysis. This is a commonly used qualitative analysis method that has the advantage of being universal and flexible (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Sample and Data Collection

Since personal connections were important to gain access to the sampling frame, the Dean of the Graduate College at the University of Oklahoma sent a personal letter of introduction to the President of the Board at Creative Oklahoma. The President of the Board in turn wrote a letter of introduction in support of the study to the members of the board who included the sampling frame. The package that was sent out to each interviewee contained; a copy of both letters, the interview protocol, consent form and the letter asking individuals to agree to be interviewed as part of the survey. The interviews were set up and a copy of the questionnaire was forwarded in advance, when requested. The two-hour interviews were scheduled to take place at a location and time identified by the interviewee and was recorded with the consent of the interviewee.

The interviews were coded post interview by the researcher and transcribed by a professional team. The transcriptions were checked by the researcher for accuracy against the original interview recordings before being analyzed using thematic analysis. The analysis identified the salient themes that developed from the interviews. The

combination of the three sections in the survey, the four stakeholder groups, the large number of questions and interviewees produced a large amount of data to be processed. The themes were limited to adequately reflect the textual data. The interview questions were tagged to guide the analysis, and the researcher expected to adjust the coding during the analysis as the themes were identified.

The sample was taken from individuals associated with the Creative Oklahoma innovation initiative. These individuals were all board members. This would be what Rogers (1995), would call the opinion leaders or 'innovators', who are the first to support or buy into the innovation or new idea. Mumford (2002) would identify them as the 'elite' whose support is critical for the success of the innovation. As board members, these individuals through feedback and input, were also helping to structure and develop the social innovation. What Cullen and Yammarino, (2014) identify as the multiple roles existing within a leadership network. The annual forum attracted members of the public from around the globe, but the broader grass roots individuals would not have provided insight into the development of the innovation initiative and network.

The 50 individuals who were approached to be part of the research were identified based on time engaged with the initiative and level of engagement with the initiative. This sampling strategy targeted those who could potentially provide the greatest insight on the early stages of the development of Creative Oklahoma and the richness of data that is important in a case study. The breakdown of the 43 interviewees who agreed to take part were; 15 education stakeholders, 10 commerce stakeholders, 10 culture stakeholders, and 8 founding members. One interview was with a founding

member who acted in an external consultancy role and the data set was not used in the thematic analysis. The final total was 43 interviews, with 42 used for analysis. The criteria for selecting individuals to be interviewed was aimed at getting data richness, so selection criteria included level of engagement and length of time involved with the Creative Oklahoma initiative. The 'length of time' of the sampling frame caused some confusion. While the fourth stakeholder group was comprised of founding members, many individuals associated themselves with the founding of the organization. This could be expected where social innovation emerges from a group, and the origin of the innovation is often hard to identify (Mumford, 2002), therefore multiple individuals may identify with that role.

The individuals in the sampling frame were leaders or influential people within their sectors, who could have the knowledge or experience that could provide valuable input into problem solving and solution generation for the innovation. Since the roots of the movement were within education, most of the sample was within higher education, or more specifically individuals in a leadership position within education. Given the boundary spanning nature of some individuals, or the cross-sector nature of the organization, some individuals identified themselves as being in more than one stakeholder group. Where the answers reflected more than one sector, the primary category was identified by the responses given. Founding members were associated with education (three individuals), culture (two individuals), and commerce (two individuals), which would make the interview numbers for the complete sample 18 education, with 12 individuals in commerce and culture respectively. Creative Oklahoma identifies the three stakeholder groups in the social innovation initiative as

being culture in the broader context, commercial sector and education sector. The sampling frame was the three stakeholder groups of commerce, culture and education together with a fourth group, the founding members. Within each group there was a mix of public, private and nonprofit representatives.

The unit of analysis was the group rather than individual, and the four groups were education, commerce, culture, and founding members. The group level of analysis also included the vested interest questions, which are normally analyzed at an individual not group level. There was an overlap of questions within and between the three questionnaire sections. This was to gain deeper insight, and to triangulate the data on perception of the emergence of the social innovation within different sectors and various aspects of communication and motivation. Some of the variables were addressed in more than one question, either within the section or in a different question format, this was to triangulate the data and explore an area or topic in more depth. Specific areas included networks, involvement with other sectors, resources, motivation behind involvement, perceived value, industry, organizational and personal characteristics, and ability to influence innovation and others.

Structured Interview Protocol and Mapping to Research Question

The questions in the interview protocol were tied to the four main research questions and the fifth overarching research question. The overlapping nature of the questions resulted in some questions mapping to more than one research question.

Table 1 Structured Protocol Questions

Questions for Education, Commerce and Culture Stakeholder Groups
Q1 How and why did you become involved with the initiative?
Q2 Explain how Creative Oklahoma communicated

Q3 What do you see as the function or role of Creative Oklahoma and how has that been successfully managed?
Q4 What has been most successful, or beneficial for you regards Creative Oklahoma? What is the gap and where you think it should go in the future?
Q5 Who have been the key people (actors) in the initiative?
Q6 What have been the barriers and enablers to the initiative?
Sector and Organization Characteristics
Q7 How would you describe your industry or business sector, your organization and characteristics?
Q8 How important is innovation in your sector, where does it manifest (come from)?
Q9 What or who are the key organizations or people in your sector who influence innovation?
Q12 Innovation can be resource intensive, what are the key resources needed?
Q13 What are the main influences affecting innovation in your sector?
Q14 How important is it to generate new knowledge and ideas in your sector?
Q15 Are you involved with any other sectors and if so in what way?
Q16 Are the other sectors that you are involved in innovative and involved with the innovation?
Q17 What motivated you and your organization to join the innovation?
Q18 What benefits, or value do you get from association with the innovation?
Q19 Have any new partnerships or ideas merged as a result of Creative Oklahoma?
Q20 How did the innovation emerge in different sectors?
Q21 How do you define creativity and what does it mean?
Q22 What have been the main barriers and or enablers to the innovation in your sector?
Q23 How important are networks?
Q24 How can creativity lead to entrepreneurship, innovation, economic growth and competitive advantage?
Q25 What do you see as being an entrepreneur and entrepreneurship?

Vested Interest Questions
Q 29 Awareness of innovation (salience) Scale is 1 = low - 7 = very high
Personal, organizational and sector
A How often is innovation on the agenda /how often is it discussed in your organization (sector)?
B How concerned are you about the need for innovation?
C How topical is the Creative Oklahoma initiative (as part of innovation)?
D How much are policy makers talking about/aware of the Creative Oklahoma initiative?
E How much are people in the community talking about/aware of the Creative Oklahoma initiative?
F How much are people in education, commerce and culture sectors/organizations talking about (how aware)?
Q 30 (2) How often and soon innovation occurs (immediacy) Scale is 1 = low - 7 = very high
Personal, organizational and sector
A How often does innovation occur (do products and processes change)
B How long do you think it will be before new innovations/innovative ideas emerge in your organization (sector)?
C Do you anticipate results will be in the near future or in the distant?
D How long do you think it will be before new innovations/innovative ideas emerge from affiliation with Creative Oklahoma?
E Thinking about the association with Creative Oklahoma are you anticipating results will come soon (short term) or will come in the future (long term)?
Q 31 (3) Probability of innovation occurring (certainty): Scale is 1 = low - 7 = very high
Personal, organizational and sector
A How likely is it that innovation leads to competitive advantage in your sector?
B How likely is innovation to occur in your sector?
C How certain are you that innovation is a factor in positive outcome or success?

D How certain are you that lack of innovation is a factor in negative outcomes?
Creative Oklahoma
E In terms of, innovation, how confident are you that involvement with Creative Oklahoma could bring benefits (new knowledge, new ideas, and new relationships)?
F What is the probability of new innovations/innovative ideas emerging from affiliation with Creative Oklahoma?
G What is the probability of no new innovations/innovative ideas emerging from affiliation with Creative Oklahoma?
Q32 (4) Ability to affect innovation (Self-Efficacy) Scale is 1 = low - 7 = very high
Personal, organizational and sector
A To what extent are you instrumental (how effective are you) in driving innovation (policies, procedures, vision)?
B To what extent has your involvement with Creative Oklahoma affected the generation of innovation (new ideas, relationships, and new ways of doing business)?
Creative Oklahoma
C How effective are you at using Creative Oklahoma to generate innovation?
Q33 (5) Risk of not innovating (Stake/Risk) Scale is 1 = low - 7 = very high
Personal, organizational and sector
A How vulnerable is the sector to innovation from competitors?
B What is the risk of not innovating?
Creative Oklahoma
C What is the risk of not being involved with the Creative Oklahoma initiative for you?
D What is the risk of not being involved with the Creative Oklahoma initiative for the State of Oklahoma?

The initial nine short answer questions focused on individual, industry and organizational questions that provided insight into networks, innovation, diffusion and leadership theory. The questions that focused on characteristics and experience included the number of years in sector and current role, the level of education, and perceived leadership status by self and others. Other questions looked at cross sector engagement, and the size of the organization the individual worked in, and how that compared to the sector norm. Some of these questions were addressed again in the second section of the interview protocol, to triangulate data and gain more insight into the area. The questions were tied to the five research questions and supporting theory, and sometimes theories interlinked.

Creative Oklahoma is emerging and diffusing in a network structure. The exploration of the development and management of the social innovation through that

perspective results in all the questions ultimately being network questions and themes within the individual interview protocol overlap all five research questions. However, in the initial mapping of the interview protocol to the research questions, the predominant focus of each question was taken for mapping purposes. The table below shows how the interview protocol questions were mapped to the research questions

Table 2 Research Questions and Structured Protocol Question Mapping

Research Question 1		Research Question 2		Research Question 3		Research Question 4	
Motivation to join social innovation and network		Motivation to stay in social innovation and network		Perception of success and gaps of social innovation, social innovation network		Enablers and barriers to the social innovation and network	
RQ 5 Stakeholder differences		RQ 5 Stakeholder differences		RQ 5 Stakeholder differences		RQ 5 Stakeholder differences	
Q1	Original involvement	Q2	Communication in network	Q3	Function or role of social innovation and success	Q6	Barriers and enablers to social innovation, social
Q7	Industry, organization, own characteristics	Q5	Key actors in initiative	Q4	Perception of success and the gaps	Q20	innovation in other
Q8	Importance of innovation in own sector	Q12	Innovation resources	Q15	Engagement with other sectors,	Q22	sectors and own sector
Q17	Motivation to join	Q14	Value of new ideas/knowledge	Q19	Emergence of new partnerships and new ideas	Q9	Key actors who influence innovation in own sector
Q21	Creativity defined	Q18	The benefit or value of the social innovation			Q13	Sector influences innovation and innovation/barriers and enablers
Q24	Creativity link to economic development	Q23	Importance of networks, key networks			Q16	Cross sector innovation and other sectors
Q25	Entrepreneurship						
Vested Interest		Vested Interest		Vested Interest		Vested Interest	
Q29	Salience of innovation	Q29	Salience of innovation	Q29	Salience of innovation	Q29	Salience of innovation
Q30	Immediacy of innovation	Q30	Immediacy of innovation	Q30	Immediacy of innovation	Q30	Immediacy of innovation
Q31	Certainty of innovation	Q31	Certainty of innovation	Q31	Certainty of innovation	Q31	Certainty of innovation
Q32	Self-efficacy and innovation	Q32	Self-efficacy and innovation	Q32	Self-efficacy and innovation	Q32	Self-efficacy and innovation
Q33	Risk and innovation	Q33	Risk and innovation	Q33	Risk and innovation	Q33	Risk and innovation
Theory: Leadership networks, diffusion, systems of innovation, vested interest		Theory: Leadership networks, diffusion, systems of innovation, vested interest		Theory: Leadership networks, diffusion, systems of innovation, vested interest		Theory: Leadership networks, diffusion, systems of innovation, vested interest	

The communication around the innovation is a critical element of the diffusion process (Rogers, 1995). That communication is perceived by the audience as having greater credibility when it comes from a credible source, or someone whose opinion is valued within the community (Rogers, 2003). Within organizations there is typically a single overall leadership figure, a CEO, who may drive innovation driven from the top down, albeit supported by executives. The innovations in these contexts align to organizational goals as part of strategic planning. Individuals perceived as a leader by

others, perceiving themselves as a leader or an individual with influence could be critical for Creative Oklahoma to engage with in the initial stages of the innovation initiative. One of the characteristics of opinion leaders includes high level of education (Rogers, 2004), which was addressed by a demographic question.

The association with other sectors and the potential for bridging across sectors to spread the innovation through networks (Burt, 1999; Rogers, 2004) was followed up in the second section with questions on interviewee involvement with other sectors and cross sector awareness of Creative Oklahoma. Communication through heterogeneous networks that straddle boundaries such as geographical, industry and organization, it thought to facilitate the innovation process by reaching a larger audience (Rogers, 2003). Therefore, leveraging heterogenous networks (Young, 2009) and engagement with networks outside of the social innovation initiative could broaden the diffusion of information about the Creative Oklahoma initiative and attract greater support. Stakeholders were asked about the length of time in their role and in the role or job they were currently in. Social innovation emerges from a group process, specifically individuals whose longevity within an industry or organization, gives them experience and tacit knowledge to generate new solutions (Mumford, 2002). This could be a motivation for stakeholder in the community identifying issues needing to be resolved, and therefore become engaged in the Creative Oklahoma project and lead to an innovation strategy to move the initiative forward.

Mumford and Moertl (2003) identify financial capital, human resources and the need for elite support as being some of the primary requirements, which they indicate may be beyond the capability of small organizations. This may be applicable to

organizations seeking to manage large initiatives, such as regional wide initiatives. The size of an organization is often associated with availability of resources, and the short demographic question on organizational size was followed up in the second section with a question on perceptions of resources needed for innovation. (Question, "innovation can be resource intensive"). The size of the organization in relation to industry sector and geographical context (district or state) could also relate to potential influence of the organization within the network. Size could also relate to level or volume of innovation and organizational leaders perceived as having influence within the community. This question was linked with long questions in section two of the interview protocol which asked about the environment and key influencers or opinion leaders within the stakeholder sector.

The main body of the questionnaire from which the themes were developed followed in the second section. This section explored the social innovation process and tied to the theories of leadership networks, diffusion, vested interest and the framework of systems of innovation. The questions focused on what the researcher felt to be key aspects of the development of the Creative Oklahoma innovation initiative through leadership networks. This included the development, role and purpose of the organizations, understanding and consensus around the communication messages and audience, critical resources, perceptions of success and gaps, potential value of the initiative, and motivation to be involved at an individual, organizational and industry level. Individuals were also asked about their work environments and industry, why they became involved with the initiative, perceptions on the mission, message and value of the initiative to themselves and their organizations, perceptions as to key individuals,

barriers and enablers of the innovation process as well as within their own industry and other sectors they were involved in, and the role of networks.

The questions were fine sliced and repeated to triangulate the data. To gain a broader perspective, the questions targeted the perception of the interviewee of the Creative Oklahoma creativity project as well as perceptions about the communication of and acceptance of the initiative (diffusion). The questions that specifically targeted the Creative Oklahoma initiative focused on interviewee perceptions on the role, aims, objectives and future of the organization, barriers and enablers, communication strategies, innovation and creativity, diffusion of the initiative in the different sectors and factors influencing engagement and perceptions of value or benefit of the innovation. Questions on the interviewees' industry sector or organization focused upon environment, barriers and enablers to the innovation process. There was a group of questions based around creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship (diffusion) and competitive advantage and value. Specifically, the understanding of, relationship between, and perceptions of those topics. The purpose was to see if there was continuity with the understanding of the meaning (diffusion) and value (vested interest) of creativity within the overall innovation network.

The questions in the first and last section were the same for all four stakeholder groups. However, within the second section there were some minor differences based upon the founding member role. Where the questions were different between the founding members and the three stakeholder groups this allowed for the potential of any different perspectives. The founding members were asked to explain the purpose of the organization, barriers and enablers, communication targets and understanding of

message and the value of the organization to stakeholders. Education, commerce and culture were asked to provide their insight on the same questions to see if the perceptions of the innovation drivers and the innovation targets matched.

The terms creativity and innovation are often used interchangeably, (Runco, 2007), and in addition, creativity is often associated with the artistic community while innovation is often associated with business. This can result in some confusion over the definition of the term, not just in general usage but within this study. The Creative Oklahoma initiative focused on the need for creativity. Creativity is an intangible concept rather than a tangible product or service, and a term that can be associated with a specific sector in the community and can mean more than one concept. In the questionnaire, two questions were focused on creativity. One question focused on the interviewees understanding or definition of creativity, followed by a question on the perception of the value of creativity in developing innovation, entrepreneurship and economic growth within the state of Oklahoma. The term innovation rather than creativity was used throughout the interview. This was in part to avoid confusion with the name of the organization. Creative Oklahoma has a vision of a 'state of creativity' where creativity is developed and recognized throughout the geographic boundaries of Oklahoma. Though the development of creativity in the three sectors of education, commerce and culture, the initiative focus is that individual and organizational creative potential will be developed, generating creative ideas, from which innovation, entrepreneurship and economic development will follow. The study does not examine how Creative Oklahoma achieved the vision of a state of creativity, but the social innovation process.

The third section of the predefined interview protocol looked at vested interest of innovation rather than creativity. This last section of the interview protocol aimed to take a deeper look at the perceived stake, potential gain or loss, and the motivational drivers behind individual choices to support or be involved with the Creative Oklahoma innovation initiative. Understanding of the level of vested interest and where there is high, moderate or low vested interest could provide valuable information when crafting the message, targeting the individuals as well as information on the potential value of the innovation initiative. Vested interest studies have used scenario based format to gather data on the attitude-behavior consistency of individuals to a specific topic or event, such student lifestyle or study (Crano, 1983; Crano & Prinslin, 1995). However, Miller, Adame and Moore, (2013) developed a scaled response questionnaire to explore attitude and behavior consistency in tornado and hurricane areas. The vested interest questions in this research design were developed using the same format to develop a short question survey tool, but using the researchers own questions and an addition of short responses questions added to each scaled question. The extension of the scaled response to include a matching qualitative response to each question aimed to provide not only additional richness and depth, but support to see if the two responses the quantitative scaled and qualitative matched. For example, with question 27b, interviewees were asked " on a scale of 1-7 with 7 being highly concerned, how concerned are you about the need for innovation". Response was an answer on the 1-7 Likert scale. Individuals were then asked, "Can you expand on that?" and the follow up response was a short sentence or few words to provide clarification.

The vested interest questions were broken down into five question blocks with between nine and three questions per section. The blocks were perceptions of stake associated with innovation: salience, proximity, susceptibility, and efficacy (Crano, 1983; Miller, Adame & Moore, 2013). The first four groups of vested interest questions combine to look at stake and risk. However, the researcher added a separate group of questions to address risk separately. The questions focused on the importance of innovation at sector, organizational and individual levels, the connection between innovation and survival, the importance of the Creative Oklahoma innovation initiative to personal, organization, sector and state survival. The five groups of questions looked at awareness of innovation at the individual and organizational level (salience), how often and soon innovation may occur (immediacy of outcomes), the probability of innovation occurring (outcomes certainty or level of confidence that something will/will not occur), and the ability to affect innovation (self-efficacy and response efficacy). These first four tie into the risk, or perceived risk. However, to pull out the risk, the protocol specifically asked questions that addressed the risk of not innovating (vulnerability or susceptible to risk).

The individuals were asked to scale their responses from 1-7 and then provide a brief sentence to expand upon the scale. The qualitative responses were predominately single word responses with some short sentences. The count of themes was the same as for the long form questions, the number of times the theme was represented in the response if the response was longer that a few words. The researcher made the decision to not use the scaled quantitative responses for two main reasons. The first was that in the analysis phase the scaled responses when compared to the verbal response showed a

discrepancy. An example of this is where responses such as “critical” and “survive or die” were predominantly scaled at 7, but were also scaled at a 5 by stakeholders within the same group and across stakeholder groups. This variation could have affected the analysis and not reflected the verbal responses. The second reason was that the unit of analysis for the protocol questions was the group not individual. Vested interest studies, such as Miller, Adame and Moore, (2013) typically use the individual as the unit of analysis not a group. In addition, incorporating a mixed methodology in a case study that had a strong qualitative focus was felt to be slightly disconnected, therefore, only the verbal responses are discussed in this paper. However, it should be noted that the use of the scaled response followed by the verbal response potentially provided unforeseen value in that the time lag possibly gave stakeholders to think about the question and reflect before providing a qualitative response.

Thematic Analysis

The data was analyzed using thematic analysis to identify and categorize the main themes within the interview text. Boyatzis (1998) describes three paths that a researcher can follow in developing themes and codes from the data. Two of which come from previous research and theory, where themes and codes are driven by theory, or driven by prior research. This research followed the third route. This is where the themes and codes are identified from the data. This is a partly emergent and inductive process, using a bottom up approach to encode the data.

To identify the occurrence of the themes, the difference in perceived importance of the themes by stakeholder groups, and identify differences between stakeholder groups, the themes need to be accounted for consistently. Boyatzis (1998) identifies the

following: themes can be scored, scaled or clustered depending upon the type of study and whether the qualitative data needs to be converted to provide a quantitative output. The purpose of counting themes in this study was to provide more comprehensive insight into the data and response to the research questions. After weighing the merits of counting the theme as a single occurrence per unit of coding regardless of the number of times the theme occurred, or counting the theme every time it occurred within the unit of coding in a different context, the latter counting method was selected. Every time the theme was mentioned within a response, within a different context or nuance, the occurrence was counted. An example would be if a response if the theme occurred once, it was counted as 1, if it occurred six times within a question response as long as the nuance was slightly different it was counted as 6. In the first example below, there was an occurrence of the theme from all stakeholders in the theme. For the education, there were 17 occurrences of the theme 'personal contact', from 15 different interviews. In the commerce there were 13 occurrences of the theme from ten interviews, and from culture there were twelve occurrences of the theme from ten interviewees.

Table 3 Example of Theme Counts

Personal contact		**Stakeholder involvement was through personal contact, a personal request, or invitation to be involved**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	17 (15)	I was invited ….they had actually come to us
Commerce	13 (10)	I got a call… director ask me to join….. I was asked….we got a call…
Culture	12 (10)	Personal invitation… ….they said we want you involved…… (she) recruited me

In the second example below, there is a higher number of occurrences of the themes but from a smaller number of interviewees. Without the number of respondents in brackets, it may look as if there is a disproportionately higher response. This allowed

for a potential difference in the perceived importance of the theme based on a higher frequency of occurrence vis a vis a theme with few occurrences within a single question.

Table 4 Example of Theme Count with Higher Unit Count

Awareness		**Success in raising awareness and the need to continue to reach out to expand awareness, this could also include educating individuals**
Education	12(5)	If Creative Oklahoma focused on the mission of spreading the gospel of creativity and not worry about becoming an operating agency…. it's broadened the base of people being able to connect the dots…more of a facilitator and awareness role…
Commerce	11(6)	Putting creativity on the radar as something that is important, creativity and innovation is now much more frequently part of a dialogue in our community….I'd like to see it be more of a grassroots, fingers in our communities…..
Culture	5(2)	The heightened awareness has helped spawn some additional efforts here in Tulsa…..we are seeing more awareness as a community about what is creative (it's) broken down some barriers…….
Founding member	7(5)	We have got a whole cadre of educated people who don't really understand this notion of creativity and how you practice it, so we have to educate them….one of our big jobs is to introduce this into schools ….Oklahoma has been introduced in a very positive light.…failing is that the uh folks at the everyday level have not been involved and informed yet…

The stakeholder groups were not of equal size. Of the 42 individuals who agreed to take part in the study the breakdown was 15 education stakeholder group, 10 commerce stakeholder group, 10 culture stakeholder group and 7 founding members stakeholder group. Therefore, to provide additional clarity, the number of responders is also noted in parenthesis. To provide an example. If a theme occurred 20 times from 6 education stakeholders it would be marked as 20(6). This also allowed for a differentiation to be made between the stakeholder groups, and if there was a higher or lower count or number of occurrences of a theme in one stakeholder group versus another. If there was a high recurrence of the theme with a few members of the stakeholder group, this would be apparent. This supported the fifth research question

and the differences and similarities of concerns and perceptions of themes across the four stakeholder groups. Where there were low counts within the same theme across all stakeholder groups, the theme was counted as being convergent or no difference between stakeholder groups.

Chapter 5: Data Analysis and Results

Rather than presenting the analysis and results of the interview protocol questions in the order of the actual interview, the questions have been grouped together by question area or topic to allow for a better flow. The demographic questions are at the end of the section. While there maybe themes that are similar in the grouped questions, the order of questions and groups in this chapter does not reflect the order in which they were analyzed by the researcher.

Interview Questions

Three first three questions looked at involvement with Creative Oklahoma focusing on why and how individuals became involved, the motivation to become involved and the perception of the value or benefit of the Creative Oklahoma initiative.

Table 5 Involvement with Creative Oklahoma (Question 1)

Long Questions		
Q1 How and why did you become involved, and what has your level of involvement been?		
Theme	*Count*	*Definition and Quote*
Personal contact		**Stakeholder involvement was through personal contact, a personal request, invitation to be involved**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	17 (15)	I was invited ….they had actually come to us
Commerce	13 (10)	I got a call… director ask me to join….. I was asked….we got a call…
Culture	12 (10)	Personal invitation… ….they said we want you involved…… (she) recruited me
	Count	*Quote*
Personal interest		**The stakeholder interest or decision resides at the personal level or internal motivation.**
Education	12(8)	Because of my interest in creativity ….. …..
Commerce	10(8)	I was attracted to what they're trying to accomplish…..pure curiosity and genuine interest…to me personally it was very interesting…I felt it was important..
Culture	6(5)	Being interested in the creative process…… I wanted to be involved in something unique
Manifest business interest		**The stakeholder interest or decision resides or is motivated in potential or actual business opportunity**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	4(4)	To advance the institution … a big part of the job was developing links with private companies
Commerce	6(4)	Was a real advantage for us to have our name associated with …. ….it was a contract….. to leverage it as a small business owner

Culture	4(4)	(she) was always open to our idea and our projects so I though like I wanted to participate…they (Creative Oklahoma) asked us to host a meeting…
Organizational interest		**The stakeholder interest or decision resides or is motivated at the organizational level of interest**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	9(8)	Immediately personally attached and attached that university to that process…
Commerce	4(4)	Our CEO said he was really interested in the organization,
Culture	2(2)	It was encouraged that I attend on behalf of our agency and project…we want, and Native Americans need to participate in some way…
Contact with creative people		**Wanting to connect with creative people or being a creative person that others would connect with, where there is value in creative people**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	3(3)	Having contacts relative to others who are pursuing innovative directions……I love to be in groups where they try to make it better ……
Commerce	2(2)	I became involved because of the stimulation of the people that were involved…..
Culture	1(1)	I think they were looking for somebody who had some creativity
Concern with economic development		**Motivation is routed in broader economic development at the state or beyond**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	2(2)	Opportunity to assist our State and positioning strategically, strategically positioning in a global market place
Commerce	2(1)	There are economic development opportunities because Oklahoma is part of the International Districts of Creativity
Culture	1(1)	I know for many it is commerce and education but not for me…
Potential for human capital development		**Stakeholder concern or recognition of the importance of developing human capital**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	3(2)	We had such substantial resources in the state, not financial but human, that were simply not connecting and this was a baby step in the direction
Commerce	3(2)	To be successful in the new economy we need to have the ability for the workforce to think creatively....
Culture	1(1)	I thought that I could have some influence on young people
Chance to promote the state		**Altruistic motivation to support the development of the state**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	5(3)	We are committed ages and stages in life, to give back and invest in a mission or commission worthwhile.…and this region was in a definite need to have presence globally
Commerce	2(2)	Its development and kind of emerging nationally as a more respected city
Culture	1(1)	I became involved *because* I understood it was a very good organization for the entire state
Involved with the innovation		**Motivation to support the development of the organization, or being seen as a resource to support the development of the organization**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	2(2)	To develop offerings for Creative Oklahoma to further creativity
Commerce	2(2)	The idea of helping an organization with that kind of mission…
Culture	4(3)	Because of my statewide presence I could help connect the dots for the organization just sort of be a resource for them

The question asked how and why individuals became involved with Creative Oklahoma, and the extent of that involvement. This mapped to the first research question and stakeholder motivation to engage with social innovation networks. While extent of involvement could overlap into the second research question, the researcher felt that it explored the vested interest of the stakeholders to become engaged, rather than continued engagement. The following themes were identified from the stakeholder responses. Individuals became involved through: a) direct personal contact and personal networks. The reasons they became involved included: b) personal interest, c) organizational interest, d) a manifest business interest, e) contact with creative people, f) concern with economic development, g) the potential for human capital development. Finally, altruistic themes included: h) a chance to promote the state, and i) involvement with developing the innovation, which included being a resource for the organization.

Research Question 5 explores differences between stakeholder groups. Overall culture had lower counts of responses and commerce slightly higher. There appeared to be very little divergence in the themes between the three stakeholder groups, and the stakeholder balance across the themes indicated a common reason or motivation to become involved with Creative Oklahoma. Commerce stakeholders had a slightly stronger personal interest and education and culture had a slightly higher interest in contact with creative people. The former could be connected to leaders in commerce perceived as driving innovation in organizations, so a personal interest in the social innovation could support organizational interest. The latter would fit with the perceptions of the artistic community as creative, and the education community who are in the business of research and new ideas.

The first four themes, personal contact, personal interest, organizational interest and business interest slightly overlapped but were split out as themes. The dominant theme within the responses and across all stakeholder groups was involvement through direct personal contact, or leveraging social and professional networks. In the demographic short questions individuals predominantly perceived themselves, and were perceived by others, as leaders. The direct contact by a founding member or personal connection, would indicate that Creative Oklahoma had a vested interest in individuals who were leaders; preferably leaders connected to leadership networks, as valuable assets to add to the social innovation network. Personal interest, organizational interest, and business or potential business interest were the next three themes. Personal interest was primarily work role or interest in creativity, with organizational interest as a networking, social capital and interest in creativity. The latent or real business interest resided not only with the individual or organization, but as a potential object of business interest for Creative Oklahoma seeking resources from stakeholders.

In diffusion, Rogers (2003) identified perceptions of 'fit' of the innovation as being one of the criteria used by adopters in the decision-making process. The three themes of interest in creative people, personal and organizational interest could all could be seen as personal or organizational 'fit'. Another variable is information about the innovation that comes from communication opinion leaders. Individuals who are opinion leaders within their own networks and communities are important in diffusion process as they can provide elite support (Rogers, 1995; Mumford & Moertl, 2003). Face to face or direct connection is identified by Rogers, (2003) as a key element of the

communication process to explain the complex ideas, sell the mission and gain support and buy in.

Vested interest, or motivation leading to the behavior to become engaged (Crano, 1983) was both inward and outward facing. Individuals had a vested interest or motivation to align with Creative Oklahoma either through personal interest, business interests with new business or developing their own organizational interests. Likewise, Creative Oklahoma had a vested interest in the stakeholders, for connections and as part of diffusion, but also as resources for partnerships, business arrangements, sponsorship and networking.

Table 6 Motivation to Support Creative Oklahoma (Question 17)

Long Questions		
Q17 What motivated you and your organization to join with Creative Oklahoma/		
Theme	*Count*	*Definition and Quote*
Personal connections		**Networking, through personal connections and making personal connections**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	5(3)	I saw Creative Oklahoma as my foot in the door to set the get to know the people who would make things happen….needed to somehow bridge the creativity and commerce
Commerce	4(3)	I knew getting involved with the inner circle would be good …. a favor for a friend
Culture	3(3)	Invited to join….(she) called me
Founding member	3(3)	I think those who aligned with this see it as something to be associated with first of all. ……it is just an association that you think parallels your personality
Business Interest		**Opportunities for business or fit with business interest**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	9(8)	There was a lot of overlap...90% of us are in creative zone most of the time…..resource….any opportunity to interface with a state level organization
Commerce	5(4)	There was a contract involved.…there was some branding exposure we could get...being aligned with Creative Oklahoma says we either aspire to be or are creative….. to help cultivate support for an initiative I was working on
Culture	6(4)	They were going far and we needed to be part of it….if there is greater dialogue with the community we are going to plug in at sometime …help them and at the same time they help me
Founding member	3(2)	But I think others want to see if they are successful, Creative Oklahoma to be successful
Creative connection		**Connecting with creative people, or an interest in creativity that aligned at the personal or organizational level**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	11(10)	They spoke my language ...my interest in creativity…..you want to be part of a creative mass…..to be around people who are also innovative

Commerce	7(4)	I believe in the overall concept of creativity …our core values are very much about challenging the status quo and trying new things and being innovative
Culture	7(6)	I'm involved in creativity…curiosity…this is fun…it sounded interesting…I wanted to be part of it
Founding Member	3(2)	I think we all want to think ourselves as creative, but most of us do not think we are
Motivators were altruistic		**Individuals wanted to give back in some way or to support a large goal outside of individual or organizational benefit**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	3(2)	was interested in the idea of, and I hate using this term, but some degree of giving back …any organization that could do great things for our state is ok
Commerce	4(4)	I could bring something to it, make a contribution…I wanted to help…wanted to help for our state
Culture	5(4)	We needed to support them in what they were doing …trying to make sure that we're participating in and helping with the broader community…
Founding Member	5(4)	To make a difference …it's been much more altruistic and much more hopeful about that uh this is a good thing for everybody…there is an excitement element to that and we're part of something bigger

The question mapped to the first research question and focused on what motivated the individual and their organization to join with Creative Oklahoma. The following themes were identified from the stakeholder responses: a) personal connections, b) business interest, c) creative connections, d) altruistic wanting to give back. These themes were also present in the previous question exploring how stakeholders became involved with the social innovation network.

As with the previous question there was not a great deal of divergence between the stakeholder groups. Education identified less with personal connections and altruistic motives and higher with creative and business connections. Commerce and culture identified with creative contacts and business contacts slightly more than personal and altruistic motivations. The education theme count was slightly lower in altruistic motivations. This may or may not have major relevance in a sector that many see themselves as engaging in service with the public in the form of delivering education. There was an area where there was a slight disconnect between what the founding members thought motivated stakeholders and what stakeholders reported. The

founding members identified the stakeholder motivations as being more altruistic, or wanting to be involved in making a difference whereas networking, connection with creative people, business interest was where the motivation lay.

Contact with creative people (including stakeholders viewing themselves as creative) and business interest or perceived 'fit' were two main themes with the stakeholder groups. Personal connections, business interest and contact with creative people or creativity did in some respects overlap as networking themes ranging from getting a "foot in the door", "bridging", or being used as a "resource". Personal connections included gaining access "to get to know people who would make things happen" or "would be good", as well as being "invited" or as a "favor". Business interest was seen as "a lot of overlap", "contract" or "90% of us are in creative zone most of the time". From an altruistic motivation, stakeholders were motivated by "being part of something bigger" and being able to contribute. Networking or connections is part of the perceived value, and leadership networking activity that is complex, altruistic, as well as exploitive with both the social innovation and individuals seeking to build social capital (Burt, 2000).

In diffusion, the 'fit', or extent to which the stakeholder or adopter feels that the innovation meets their actual or potential needs, is one of the important variables in the decision process to adopt or not adopt the innovation (Rogers, 2003). The extent to which stakeholders perceive Creative Oklahoma as a match or fit, may be one of the reasons to align with or adopt the innovation. The degree to which individuals attach both importance and value to something, predicts the attitude-behavior consistency or vested interest (Crano, 1983). The extent to which the themes identified by the

stakeholders have both value and importance, may also indicate the extent or level of vested interest in aligning with or adopting the innovation.

Table 7 Value/Benefit of Creative Oklahoma (Question 18)

Long Questions		
Q18 What benefits, or value do you get from association with Creative Oklahoma, what have been the outcomes in your organization or sector		
Theme	*Count*	*Definition and Quote*
Personal networking		**The stakeholder perception of value is networking through personal connections, or making personal connections**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	3(3)	It's the relationships and the people I've met
Commerce	4(4)	Some of the personal connections…. I'm not sure I met anybody that I didn't already know
Culture	2(2)	It's going to be networking
Founding member	2(2)	Getting different people in the education community talking to each other… networking
Business networking		**The stakeholder perception of value is at the business level, through actual or potential networking, making business connections or generating value for the business**
Education	9(7)	They have given us recognition and creativity status…potential for business collaboration
Commerce	5(4)	Helped me elevate my organization….how creativity can make me more successful and our community more successful
Culture	10(6)	It did enlarge our audience….worked together on some projects and that's been positive …businesswise again the networking of people
Founding member	4(3)	bring the three sectors together…. they wanted to help their businesses,
Involved with stimulating people		**Value or benefit is perceived as interaction with, or involvement with people or situations, that are exciting, provide stimulation, to include creative people**
Education	5(5)	It's the interaction, outside of the fact you learn things…vitality…fun group of people to be around
Commerce	6(5)	New exciting people… it's fun to be part of a highly motivated and excitable group of people
Culture	0	
Founding Member	3(2)	They were all hungry for something….they were also hungry for innovation….
New knowledge, ideas or learning		**Value or benefit is perceived as access to or gaining new knowledge, anew ideas and helping build human capital (self or others)**
Education	5(5)	You know human capital to figure out how to do it…..you learn things…value is (not the people) it is the ideas
Commerce	4(4)	there have been learning opportunities with the world forum …it's the people I have met and the new knowledge
Culture	3(3)	Make me think () and keep on learning…I discovered a completely new skill set
Founding Member	3(3)	Helping to educate people on the creative process….increased awareness of creative process…I think education
Resources		**The benefits include access to resources or providing resources, or no benefit**

Education	2(2)	(the) organization has helped Creative Oklahoma more than (they) have helped us
Commerce	4(4)	We have definitely put out more resources (than Creative Oklahoma)
Culture	5(5)	Bringing in people from outside the state (to speak at the forum)…nothings really happened
Founding member	3(2)	(bringing) a collection of really smart people together…a collection of really smart people as a resource
Reputation or image		**Stakeholder perception of value or benefit is changes to or affecting reputation or image at an individual, organizational or state level**
Education	6(4)	I have more of a reputation (for creativity) it has given me a voice at home… they give us recognition and certainly some status
Commerce	0	
Culture	2(2)	They are getting their brand out there, they were interesting, they were getting notices in Oklahoma
Founding member	2(2)	Several of us felt like that we need to give the State, the people of the State a new identify
Ability to give back or support in some way		**Value was found in the ability to give back in some way or to support a larger goal outside of the individual or organizational benefits such as the initiative or State**
Education	2(2)	You want it, you want to believe in that and you support that idea (to make Oklahoma a better place)
Commerce	4(3)	I can help promote
Culture	1(1)	and I've discovered a passion for it, so I would just love for other people to get involved with organization
Founding member	1(1)	They provided enough money for ten schools to take part in that that had never had the money before

The question asked what benefits or value was gained from association with Creative Oklahoma and mapped to Research Question 3 and where was the social innovation perceived to be successful or unsuccessful. The following themes were identified from the stakeholder responses: a) personal connections, b) business connections, c) involvement with stimulating people or situations, d) new knowledge, ideas or learning, e) resources, f) reputation or image, g) ability to give back or support in some way.

The value of personal and business networking and opportunities were the themes with the highest count, particularly from the culture stakeholder group. The benefits and/or value included "some improved relationships", "networking", "potential for business collaboration" and "it did enlarge our audience". This could be because

stakeholders in both those stakeholder groups are ultimately involved in business. As a culture stakeholder commented, “I’m in the business of art”. In looking at Research Question 5 and differences between the stakeholder groups, there was some divergence across stakeholder groups. Commerce had a slightly higher count or more benefit from “involvement with stimulating people” and “new knowledge or ideas” which would possibly align with a business culture where ideas could be linked to innovation. Culture had a slightly higher count of “benefit” as well as “no benefit” in the theme of ‘resources’.

There was one theme where both the culture and commerce stakeholder count were zero. Without further research, it is not possible to say if this had significance as the themes may have been supported under another survey question. Culture had a zero theme count in meeting stimulating or creative people, and commerce had zero count in theme of reputation or image, which would possibly run counter to those stakeholder norms. This could be because culture already closely identify with creativity and the creative community. Likewise, the commercial sector awareness of reputation and image may be part of competitive advantage and so already part of the strategy and supported by other elements of the organization. Altruistic motives, while mentioned, had the lowest count in the stakeholder responses.

The themes of perception of value or benefit from association or engagement with the social innovation overlapped with the previous two questions in this section. The extent to which a stakeholder attaches value or importance or has a vested interest in personal and business networking, or in wanting to connect with stimulating or creative people, may help the decision-making process. The perspective of the founding

members was similar to the other three stakeholder groups. The value or benefit was identified as networking (personal and business connections), new knowledge or ideas from creative or fun people, access to resources and reputation or image. The perception of the 'fit' of the innovation, and the extent to which the innovation provides value or meets a need or unmet need, are factors influencing the decision to adopt in diffusion of innovation (Rogers, 2003). In addition to fit, or perception of fit, the perception of value and importance or vested interest (Crano, 1983), can affect attitude-behavior consistency, which can be of importance to a social innovation seeking to build membership and buy in.

The next three questions asked about perceptions of success of the social innovation initiative. This included asking where the initiative should move to be successful in the future. Stakeholders were also asked about the importance of new knowledge and ideas, and whether new partnerships or ideas had emerged through the social innovation. These interview protocol questions map to two research questions. Research Question 3 where was the social innovation perceived to be successful or unsuccessful and Research Question 2 what was perceived as critical to maintain the social innovation.

Table 8 Creative Oklahoma Success and Future Function (Question 4)

Long Questions		
Q4 What has been most successful for you regards Creative Oklahoma and what is the delta or gap with where Creative Oklahoma is now and where you think it should be.		
Theme	Count	*Definition and Quote*
Creative Connection		**Connecting with creative individuals or lack of connecting with creative individuals.**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	3(2)	I was able to have had people who have creative ideas go to the meetings and they leave encouraged they draw ideas...they could foster other small meetings (and) have those innovation conversations

Commerce	4(3)	We are horrible at engaging with creative people and we have to change that….creative people are kind of drawn to each other
Culture	1(1)	We are reinventing the wheel and (the initiative is) not doing anything creative
Founding member	2(2)	Joining the creative network, being a creative district…getting businesses to buy into the fact that they have creative workers (and) creative people in their businesses
A resource for people		**A resource for education, information and support that individuals and organizations can come to, or pull from**
Education	10(8)	This organization has been a resource….maybe 20 years down the road there could be a center for creativity, a center where people who want to do things could go and have resources
Commerce	4(2)	Being a point of reference for people who want to learn more about being innovative…becoming this large enough think tank of possibility for people come to and look for help and answers and directions
Culture	6(4)	there are so many resources in the state that could be connected and Creative Oklahoma could be the hub…a resource for business, education and cultural community
Founding member	3(2)	I envision that we have a physical space where we can convene creative educational sessions
Awareness		**Success in raising awareness and also the need to continue to reach out to expand awareness, which could also include educating individuals**
Education	12(5)	If Creative Oklahoma focused on the mission of spreading the gospel of creativity and not worry about becoming an operating agency…. it's broadened the base of people being able to connect the dots…it's starting to go global already
Commerce	11(6)	Creativity and innovation is now much more frequently part of a dialogue in our community….I'd like to see it be more of a grassroots, fingers in our communities, and a presence outside of just Downton Oklahoma….it could be perceived as a real asset by the chamber and other economic development entities
Culture	5(2)	The heightened awareness has helped spawn some additional efforts here in Tulsa…..we are seeing more awareness as a community about what is creative (its) broken down some barriers
Founding member	7(5)	We have got a whole cadre of educated people who don't really understand this notion of creativity and how you practice it, so we have to educate them ….Oklahoma has been introduced in a very positive light…failing is that the uh folks at the everyday level have not been involved and informed yet
Networking		**Success in raising awareness and also the need to continue to reach out to expand awareness, this could also include educating individuals**
Education	10(6)	Gives you a platform to have access to the international universities, and he innovation and inventiveness….it is good for the college because wherever I am visible the collage is visible (it needs) that kind of interconnectivity
Commerce	3(2)	It helped to bring people together
Culture	8(3)	We are looking for some assistance could you put us in contact (with international leaders), those in terms of networking that's important …the one-day thing (forum) is not the same as kind of like ongoing broad networks
Founding Member	4(3)	Becoming part of the world creativity movement…a lot of the movers and shakers across the map have been involved
Influence and advocate		**The current or future ability for the initiative to have influence, or be an advocate including a change agent role.**
Education	10(7)	It really could be a driver of policy and cultural/business activity….a role model for other states and countries….a change agent….

Commerce	3(3)	It could be perceived as a real asset by the chamber and other economic development entities…if we could be for creativity what (the) Kauffman Foundation is for entrepreneurship…..change agent
Culture	3(1)	If Oklahoma is going to be a state of creativity and going to be a leader in this for the country we got to be setting some new paradigms
Founding Member	6(3)	The influence of what it does should be such a part of life that people don't even know it is there….the role of change agent…..a voice
Providing events		**Role in event management, providing events such as forums and the speakers, or tangible outcomes such as events that are seen as valuable**
Education	8(5)	If they want to be more that a large event planner of the forum they have to have a broader reach…the forum show casing what people are doing bringing together like-minded people it's energizing…
Commerce	5(4)	They've done well executing the forums, getting people together…..it shouldn't be an event centric organization
Culture	6(2)	The world forum was a nice catalyzing event….the forums….a big attendance at the annual event (is not the same as an) ongoing broad network
Founding Member	4(3)	Hosting one of the major world conferences only two years after we joined it….the world forum is probably the apex

The question asked how Creative Oklahoma was successful, and the gap between the current and future success of the social innovation. This question mapped to Research Question 3. The themes were: a) creative connections or contact with creative people, b) a current of future resource for people, c) raising awareness, d) networking, e) the organization as an influence and advocate, and f) providing events. The occurrence of themes within individual responses was higher for the themes of Creative Oklahoma as a resource and a role in raising awareness which supports the literature on diffusion (Rogers, 2003). A gap was the need to expand the network, to be more heterogeneous as suggested by Young (2009). The themes of 'resources', 'events' and 'raising awareness' had some overlap. Given the intangible nature of creativity, 'events' could be seen as a resource or networking and raising awareness. The themes of, 'contact with creative people' could be a subset of 'networking', but the themes were separated out as in previous questions.

There was not a great deal of difference in the count between the themes or between stakeholder groups. The main themes, or those with the largest counts,

identified Creative Oklahoma as raising awareness, being a potential resource, and an influencer or change agent. The organization was felt to play a continuing role in raising awareness about creativity and the innovation. Education stakeholders, and to a lesser extent culture, thought the initiative could become a resource; for example, a resource center for individuals and organizations. Education thought the organization could have a role as an influence, advocate and change agent role. Commerce and founding members saw Creative Oklahoma as both being successful, or needing to focus on, raising awareness and educating people and organizations about creativity and the mission.

The themes spoke more to what had been successful rather than gaps or changes that needed to be made. The success of the innovation at a personal level were identified as connections, such as networking and connecting with creative people, and providing events and speakers. The organization was felt to have had success in creating awareness or raising awareness about creativity, leading to raising awareness of the innovation and the region. One area of success was in proving tangibles such as events. Commerce identified a lack of connection with creative people. This lack of creative focus could result from the early stages of the social innovation initiative focus on leveraging social capital and leadership networks as part of the diffusion of the innovation. Therefore, the leadership attributes of individuals within networks and the leverage they could bring to the innovation could be seen by change agents/innovation leaders as more important criteria than any creative components. Culture identified a lack of creativity and creative ideas. This could be related to sector norms. What is cutting edge and new in sectors that lack exposure to a certain type of creativity and

creative expression, may be viewed as everyday within other sectors or the artistic community. Innovation in business engaged in developing a new product or service for the market, may involve design thinking as well as creative problem solving and tools during the innovation process. The technological elements of the product or service may not always be an obvious creative element. Conversely, within the culture subset of artists, the creative element may be a very visible part of the product.

Within the stakeholder groups there were instances of higher counts from a few interviewees; for example, education and 'awareness' and culture and 'networking' showed a high count in single units of coding. This resulted in a higher count of themes relative to the number of units of coding in that unit of analysis or stakeholder group. Success with raising awareness, and the gap in raising awareness, was a theme where the commercial stakeholders provided more occurrences of the theme, and more occurrences within the theme. Some of the comments were directed at the need to expand awareness to "grassroots", "local level", and "outside of just downtown Oklahoma".

The diffusion of an innovation, particularly social innovation is a slow process, starting with the opinion leaders and communicating and educating individuals about the innovation through their own, often homogeneous, networks (Rogers, 2003). The themes identified the need to connect with a different audience, to broaden the diffusion of the innovation through a more diverse audience and broader mission, including rural communities. As more and more individuals are contacted, the message should spread through the networks of the opinion leaders and their sphere of influence. As more people hear about Creative Oklahoma, become interested in it, attend the forum, and

then join the network. The forums and tangible outcomes of the social innovation can be likened to 'trialability'. Identifying successful outcomes as well as gaps, provides insight into the perceived 'fit' of the innovation, and together with perception of value and importance can indicate vested interest and decision to adopt the innovation.

Table 9 Importance of New Knowledge and Innovation (Question 14)

Long Questions		
Q14 How important is it to generate new knowledge and ideas in your sector. Where does it come from and has anything emerged as a result of association with Creative Oklahoma		
Theme	*Count*	*Definition and Quote*
Changing environment		**New knowledge, ideas, innovation was important due to change and changing industry, organizational environments, or driven by change**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	8(4)	It's extremely important just because knowledge changes so quickly….we need to change…what we are researching today will be in the textbooks in the future….everything is changing, that is part of the problem that we don't know where it's going to come from
Commerce	5(3)	As things change ideas and knowledge need to expand and change with the environment…. I think if you don't have the new knowledge, if you don't adapt… economic development has changed over the past fifteen years, radically
Culture	2(2)	Because we have a challenging history we have to have new ideas about telling that story…if contemporary art is going to be relevant to our time or to people, to capture any essence of the world, or dealing with our times, it has to be innovative
Founding member	0	
Business survival		**The importance of new knowledge, ideas and innovation as part of business and business survival**
Education	5(4)	We are supposed to be the place of ideas… we have got to do it in order to be economically viable today…crisis is a good motivator
Commerce	5(3)	This is the business of ideas; you have to come at your client with ideas, new ways to address their needs…if I come into a community and I'm just doing the same old things they have always done, why do they need me? ……I think if you don't have the new knowledge, if you don't adapt, if you're not adapting and leading you're falling behind
Culture	2(2)	To separate yourself from someone else it is absolutely mandatory to generate new knowledge and new innovation and to be innovative…..when someone does something kind of off the grid (then) people are just hungry for it
Founding member	0	
An intrinsic part of the business or sector		**Creation of new knowledge, new ideas, and innovation was seen as an intrinsic part of the organization or business- the role, function or culture of the organization**
Education	5(5)	We traffic in knowledge that is our business and the creation of new knowledge is very important to us ….this is a research university and research is about generating new ideas and improving teaching is about generating new ideas……we are supposed to be the place of ideas

Commerce	2(1)	This is the business of ideas ….I would say because creativity is my business
Culture	2(1)	We are always creating new ideas in this organization….(artists and organizations) have unsettledness and feeling of urgency of some sort, so to push past complacency, to push past stasis
Founding member	0	
Connections		**New knowledge or ideas as a result of connecting with people or organizations, networking, collaborating or communicating**
Education	7(6)	Have been able to create several relationships and kind of strategic alliances…engaging with the DC Network members….the president saying "get innovative" is not going to do squat...the intersection among them, yes, it's not just the individual, it's the collective consortia collaborative outcomes
Commerce	3(2)	Its more trying to make connections across disciplines… a few introductions to people that have been very valuable
Culture	7(5)	Artists are super supportive of each other…networking and best practice…knowledge and new ideas is really so important because as Native people we connect it back to who we've always been
Founding member	4(3)	A new network of people to interact with …new combinations of people
Awareness		**New knowledge and ideas as a result of new awareness, learning or education**
Education	1(1)	New knowledge of ourselves has definitely emerged;
Commerce	2(2)	Learning about economic development workforce processes and policies of our international partners (International Districts of Creativity)
Culture	1(1)	The way the arts are used in the forums (sometimes) crazy ideas, all that releases the mind so that other ideas
Founding member	3(3)	The new knowledge was that people realized there were other people like them, that there were other organizations like them

The question asked how important was it to generate new knowledge and ideas, where those ideas and knowledge came from, and if and where ideas and knowledge had emerged because of Creative Oklahoma. This question mapped to Research Question 2, and stakeholder perception of what is critical to maintain the social innovation and social innovation network. The following themes were identified from the stakeholder responses: knowledge and ideas were, a) an intrinsic part of business b) business survival and came from c) changing environments d) connections, and e) awareness.

There was little difference between the stakeholder groups, slightly more focus on changing environment, and business survival from commerce stakeholders. This could be attributed to the more volatile, changing industry environments, or the local

competitive landscape and financial and other resources. However, as a counterpoint, in the vested interest questions all stakeholder groups identified innovation, competition, survival, and change as key themes. New ideas and knowledge as an intrinsic part of the business or sector was, as might have been expected, slightly more prevent in the education sector because, “we are supposed to be the place of ideas”, and therefore “the creation of new knowledge is very important to us”. New knowledge and ideas resulting from networking, collaborating or communicating, had slightly higher count and potential importance for stakeholders in the culture sector. That could be because in some of the earlier responses culture sector identified themselves as being in the art of business, ranging from working with different businesses as nonprofits, collaborating with the education sector, or being engaged in education. This could indicate a cross sector tendency and working across domains within that sector. New knowledge resulting from that collaboration and intersection, whether from client need, proactive seeking new knowledge or serendipity. Collaboration through “new networks” and “new combinations” was specially identified by founding members of Creative Oklahoma as to where the new knowledge and ideas would occur.

The themes were consistent for the most part across the stakeholder groups, and the generation of new knowledge/new ideas or innovation was seen has hugely important despite the not significantly high count of themes occurring within the units of analysis. The similarity of responses across stakeholder groups included comments such as: “huge”, “important” “absolutely vital”, “critical”, and “essential”. The indication from stakeholders was that this generation of new knowledge, new ideas or innovation was either critical to their organization or was central to what their

organization was about. The new knowledge was driven by a need from the changing environment and an intrinsic part of business in all stakeholder groups, and emerged from connections and networking, and awareness. Edquist (2006), in an observation of systems of innovation, highlighted the generation of new knowledge and learning as an important part of the innovation process. Rogers (2003) also identified learning as part of the feedback into the innovation that was part of the nonlinear nature of the innovation process.

Understanding what stakeholders identify as important, and where there may be a personal or organizational fit, such as connecting creativity with the generation of new ideas, knowledge or learning that have value, may help identify potential 'stake' (Crano, 1995b) in the innovation. This question, the following question on partnerships, and some of the themes, link with the vested interest questions at the end of the interview protocol. Question 30 asked how often innovation occurred (immediacy of outcomes), specifically b) and c) how long before innovation and new ideas emerged in the stakeholders' organization, and d) and e) through association with Creative Oklahoma. Question 31 focused on the probability of innovation occurring e), confidence that involvement with Creative Oklahoma bring benefits of new ideas, new knowledge, new relationships and innovation, and f) the probability that is would or g) would not occur. The perception of the 'fit' and trialability of the innovation or social innovation are variables that can lead to the decision to invest in, or adoption of the innovation (Rogers, 2003). The value of knowledge and the ability of the network to deliver new knowledge could be perceived as matching or fitting the needs of the stakeholders.

Table 10 New Partnerships (Question 19)

Long Questions		
Q19 In the other sectors you are involved in, have any new partnerships or ideas (innovation) emerged as a result of Creative Oklahoma		
Theme	*Count*	*Definition and Quote*
Networking		**Networking opportunities and potential connections, partnerships or alliances**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	3(3)	A combination of the networking and the reputation we have….it did bring together the three sectors I was already working with and I really saw the value
Commerce	5(4)	One of the greatest things that Creative Oklahoma did was to identify someone like me, as somebody who could do something, and help enable me by introducing me to people who could make these things happen
Culture	3(3)	The relationships with Creative Oklahoma, just another string to connect the dots…..our relationship with him has been grown over the year, and it started before creativity (Creative Oklahoma) but it was enhanced through that mutual involvement…I guess build better professional relationships
Founding member	1	I could point to a variety of things, and they have been very innovative and successful, did we cause it? It is hard to know
Awareness		**Potential or actual role of the initiative in increased awareness, change in perception (and branding) at a local, national and international level**
Education	3(3)	So that really put us on the lips in the mouths of the world finally
Commerce	2(3)	I think we have done a pretty good job of making creativity relevant, more relevant in business which I think has been really important
Culture	1	There is certainly more of a push now for entrepreneurs and creativity, and so forth, I am certainly aware of that, what has driven that I am not exactly sure…
Founding member	0	

The question asked stakeholders to think about the other sectors they were involved in, and if new partnership or ideas had emerged as a result of Creative Oklahoma. This mapped to Research Question 3, and the perception of the social innovation as successful, unsuccessful, limitations and potential. In the demographic short question stakeholders were asked if they were involved with other sectors, and indicated involvement. There were two themes identified from the stakeholder responses, a) networking and b) awareness and changed perception. There was minimal difference between the stakeholder groups on both themes. Networking, the importance of networking, and expectation and emergence of results were questions that were

specifically addressed as a separate question in both the structured protocol and the vested interest questions.

The development of new partnerships that could lead to innovation was minimal. Given the time that it takes to develop networks and relationships, and for innovations to emerge, this could be a future manifestation. However, the emergence of a new musical school at a university was identified as the result of a conversation at a Creative Oklahoma event. The role of individuals bridging sectors and networks had not produced substantial evidence of new partnerships or innovations, despite earlier responses that indicated that the individuals interviewed were well connected across organizations and sectors. The role of the opinion leader in communicating information about the innovation through their network is a critical element in the diffusion process and the subsequent decision to adopt the innovation (Rogers, 2003). The diffusion also depends upon heterogeneous networks, and the ability to bridge and link across from homogeneous networks (Young, 2009).

As with the previous question, this question and some of the themes link with the vested interest questions at the end of the interview protocol. Question 30 asked how often innovation occurred (immediacy of outcomes), specifically b) and c) how long before innovation and new ideas emerged in the stakeholders' organization, and d) and e) through association with Creative Oklahoma. Question 31 focused on the probability of innovation occurring e), confidence that involvement with Creative Oklahoma bring benefits of new ideas, new knowledge, new relationships and innovation, and f) the probability that this would, or g), would not occur. The responses were similar to the comments supporting the themes in this question. Stakeholders

noted that they were hopeful for future emergence of ideas and partnerships, indicating a long-term payout. In the short demographic questions, stakeholders were specifically asked if they were involved in other sectors and in what way, and in the second section of the interview protocol there were questions that focused specifically on cross sector engagement.

The following questions focus on communication of the social innovation initiative.

Table 11 Communication by Creative Oklahoma (Question 2)

Question 2 How did Creative Oklahoma communicate, how was the mission communicated and has that changed		
Theme	*Count*	*Definition and Quote*
Personal communication		**Communication with stakeholders from the initiative was through personal, one on one, word of mouth channels or some form of personal connections**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	15(12)	If you had some kind of connection to the board or in the developing group you knew about it, but the general public had no clue…… was very personal to me, one on one
Commerce	11(6)	just across the table conversation and that is what got me on board obviously …it seems to be more meaningful when it can be a spoken word face to face ….a lot of personal interaction....a small circle of people that meet regularly
Culture	14(9)	A lot of it is kind of interpersonal, direct invites-type and kind of word of mouth strategy
Founding member	13(7)	For the influencers it took a one on one…it was one on one and then getting them to hear from their peers how important this was…started (with) some existing networks….sitting one on one with CEO's and managers and VPs to talk about the initiative
Lack of clarity with the message		**The messages being communicated were and/or are not clear or easily understand. A lack of clarity around what to say and how to say it**
Education	8(5)	We struggled a lot and we went through two or three or four different efforts to try and communicate what it was we were doing…it is a very hard thing to talk to people about because they don't people don't know what it means….I am still fuzzy what is the mission () and that ties into the fact that the concept of creativity is a fuzzy concept
Commerce	7(5)	There was a lot of debate over what we were going to do and all that…the challenge has been trying to create that elevator speech …..it is challenging sometimes to get your arms around "what is this"?
Culture	7(5)	It is such a nebulous topic when you try to pin down creativity …..one of their greatest challenges has been quote 'selling the organization' or defining their mission to the community….I am not sure it is easily defined, because creativity itself is not easily defined
Founding member	2(2)	It was kind of "I don't get it" …..I don't think we have done a very good job honestly (with web/social media)

Communication and events		**Communicating about events and using events to communicate, focusing communication around events and event management where tangibles may be easier to communicate**
Education	7(5)	I think the events, the forums that have been held periodically, have been probably the most effective thing we've done…..there was a lot of communication about the forums, especially in the metro areas
Commerce	4(2)	we've got to have an event every year because it gives the organization something concrete to sell
Culture	4(3)	Their annual forum (has) played a big role in their ability to communicate in the public's understanding of what this organization is about
Founding member	0	
Mass communication		**Mass communication or communication disseminated to or available to the public through social media and other channels**
Education	3(2)	I heard a lot of people were looking for information on the forum and couldn't find it. ..their website is difficult to navigate
Commerce	2	through our website or through these big conference type things we do…I guess the general public is seeing it #1 on the internet and #2 is probably social media
Culture	0	
Founding member	4(4)	We do not have a regular newsletter, we do not have a regular communication/s coming out…..we will not do large statewide town hall meetings….different tools based upon who you are communicating with
Use of targeted communication		**Communication was targeted either to specific people, goals, sectors, or social or geographic boundaries, which may/may not identify communication boundaries**
Education	5(5)	Initially it was an insular group……if you had some connection to someone on the board ..the general public had not a clue
Commerce	3(3)	Never reached out to younger people…….we've got to go out and talk to people to raise funds …it was just this board of directors this close knit group that kind of closely held thing and people were on the outside looking in
Culture	1	The very diverse board () come from so many of Oklahoma's large companies and key organizations, it's a kind of 'who's who'
Founding member	26(7)	Initially trying to convince influencers of how important …the ones that give money they were clearly a target list…if you wanted education involved you had to get the leaders of education involved….you didn't necessarily want that fourth grade teacher (because) they couldn't really bring much…
Communication limitations or range		**Communication or diffusion of message defined by geographic configurations**
Education	1	There was a lot of communication about the forum, primarily in the metro area
Commerce	1	Its goals and objectives did not reach outside of Western Oklahoma
Culture	1	Continue to be Oklahoma City centric
Founding member	1	One of the most challenging targets has been to pull in the other metropolitan area in a true partnership…
Focus on leaders and leadership networks moved to targeted communication		
Founding member	3(3)	It took some social interactions too with those leaders…..the fund raising in the corporate world is if you asked me for money and I do not give it to you, you're sure not going to give it to me (that's) the way is works…Oklahoma is a small place, it really is all about relationships, it comes down to relationships

The question asked how Creative Oklahoma communicated to stakeholders, how the mission was communicated, and if there had been any changes. This question

mapped to Research Question 2, and what was perceived as critical to maintain the social innovation and social innovation network. The following themes were identified: a) personal communication, b) communication and lack of clarity with the message, c) communication of events or tangible events, d) type of communication to include mass communication, e) targets of communication, f) social or geographic boundaries of communication and g) leadership and leader targets.

With the exception of the founding members, there was little difference between the stakeholder groups on count across the different themes, and a very slight difference in count within the themes. The founding member count of the theme on the use of targeted communication, was very high. This was the only group to focus on leaders and leadership networks and have no count on communication of events. The two prominent themes across all four stakeholder groups were personal communication or networks and clarity of communication. The latter was specifically with regards to creativity, the meaning of creativity, and the mission of the organization. Within those two themes, there was a very slight difference in focus which was interesting. Founding members had a higher count in the use of personal communication, and a lower count in the clarity of the message and understanding of creativity compared to the other three sectors.

All four stakeholder groups identified the personal communication with the use of networking and personal connection to contact them, with face to face meetings to explain the mission and subsequent communication. This supported the dominant theme in the first question, where stakeholders became involved with Creative Oklahoma through a direct personal connection in the social network, or introduced via mutual

connection. This indicated leverage and building of social networks and social capital. For the founding members, the targets of the communication were identified more specifically as leadership, opinion leaders, individuals with influence and individuals with resources including financial resources. The use of "some existing networks" and "strong affiliations", where "it took some social interaction with those leaders", and "for the influencers it took a one on one" or "sitting one on one with CEOs and managers and VPs to talk about the initiative".

The second main theme was the challenge of understanding and communicating the message and mission. This is important for the diffusion of the innovation, and growth of the initiative. There was an emphasis on personal communication to explain the innovation. This included, "in order for me to understand what it was, what is Creative Oklahoma, it was a conversation". However, there was still a lack of clarity in the three stakeholder groups of commerce, culture and education with the communication and communication message. Explaining and understanding the mission was identified as a challenge, "trying to create that elevator speech for Creative Oklahoma", when it is "challenging to get your arms around what is this". Part of this challenge was the perception that creativity is a complex topic. It is possibly that the intangible, "fuzzy" and "what is this?" aspect is hard to understand and explain not just at the personal level, but in diffusing or communicating the message out as part of the diffusion process. This has implications for the diffusion of the innovation as communication is seen by Rogers (2003) as so central to the diffusion of innovation. It also has implications for the effective functioning of the network, as part of the network function is communication of information (Borgatti & Halgin, 2011).

There was consistency across the responses that communication was primarily at a personal level, leveraging networks, with the communication and social innovation network targeting “influencers”. The level of involvement was “if you had some form of connection”, but outside of that elite network the “general public had no clue” and individuals outside of leadership “couldn’t really bring much”. The communication occurred through one on one conversations with leadership and through the group mechanism of the board, (which is comprised of leaders, or opinion leaders). The communication was targeted (theme), and the focus of communication was leaders and opinion leaders, and those who could be a resource for the innovation and the diffusion of the innovation. While mass communication (theme) did occur, it was primarily to inform the public about events, especially the annual creativity forum, potentially operating as more of an advertising, marketing or event management function.

In the diffusion process, Rogers (1995) identified the communication to be at the heart of innovation process. This depends upon opinion leaders educating those in their network about the innovation, and explaining the new product. In the early stages of the diffusion process face to face, or one on one communication is important. In addition to communication, opinion leaders and those who adopt the innovation, also provide critical information and feedback about the innovation which in turn change or develop the innovation (Rogers, 2003). This makes networking and the use of social capital part of the diffusion process. The actors, their networks, the leverage and how that supports or blocks the innovation process will be unique to the system of innovation in which the innovation is emerging.

Table 12 The Function or Role of Creative Oklahoma (Question 3)

Q3 What do you see as the function or role of Creative Oklahoma and how has that been successfully managed.		
Theme	*Count*	*Definition and Quote*
Educating about creativity		**Role in educating people and organizations about creativity, and the value of the social innovation initiative**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	5(5)	to instill this notion that everyone has some creative ability….to educate everybody about the importance of creativity and innovation and how these need to be in our workplace all the time…to explain to people what does the word creativity mean
Commerce	6 (6)	The first is education, for Oklahomans to even understand what creativity is and to put it in a 21st century economy context…..know exactly what Creative Oklahoma is trying to do…the commerce leadership doesn't understand how creativity can be part of a business model
Culture	4(4)	Having to teach a lot of people, not only Oklahomans but other people, what we are trying to do…. changing the perception of Oklahoma
Founding member	5(4)	We also need to teach about creativity...educate people to understand how creativity works ..it is an education effort
Raising awareness		**The function or role of the social innovation is perceived to be raising awareness and showcasing creativity**
Education	14(8)	More than anything to drive awareness of creativity to different sectors….to raise awareness of the creativity and innovation in Oklahoma…able to showcase some really spectacular talent …it has to be this advocacy group
Commerce	9(7)	They can be an activist…by showing examples of creativity in so many wide ..identifying creative hotspots best practices for the state… to be a protagonist for creativity when it comes to leadership and policy makers
Culture	5(5)	Everyone became much more aware…. changing the perception of Oklahoma…it's challenging people to say what is creativity and how can I be more creative in my job
Founding member	4(3)	Stimulating creativity ….spreading the word…our awards and grants program's very successful..…to empower people
Resources and support		**The function or role as a resource, resources and support for the creative initiative and for creative people**
Education	6(5)	To encourage individuals….a facilitator and an encourager and energizer……it is there to encourage, facilitate….a hub for creativity
Commerce	9(8)	To nurture creativity in whatever ways we can…they view themselves as a supporting organization…identifying creative hotspots best practices for the state and being able to support and develop those
Culture	7(6)	A venue for creative mindsets () to come together to learn to…a genesis to bring ideas together…..have people sharing what they are doing…the support is there
Founding member	5(3)	Nurturing the creative process……continue to create and foster an environment that allows people to do things 'out of the box'…. our awards and grants program's very successful
Leadership connections		**Connections or networking with leaders and influencers or the importance of individuals and organizations (actors)**
Education	5(4)	This has tremendous support from leaders of the community and state… there was an effort to make decision makers, state leaders understand that creativity was an essential part of economic development
Commerce	2 (2)	We've only really connected with people that are already very successful…you get people on board who are decision makers in parts of their community, (or) are very influential
Culture	1	The support is there

Founding member	0	
Business or economic development		**Directly or indirectly relating to business, business development and economic development to include supporting individuals, businesses and the state**
Education	4(4)	Strategically posturing in giving Oklahoma competitive advantages….aiding to the prosperity of Oklahoma, in the future of Oklahoma.
Commerce	4(3)	Instrumental in aiding to the prosperity of Oklahoma…..and giving Oklahoma competitive advantage... if it could be positioned and perceived as a real asset by the chamber and other economic development entities…the next generation of creatives (who) want to go out and start companies
Culture	2 (1)	How can I be more creative in my job, whether it is urban planning or architectural or running a business of any kind, how can I be more creative...
Founding member	2(2)	Can't compete internationally unless we are creative
Change or change agent		**Role of initiative in change, as a catalyst, or as a change agent**
Education	7(4)	It is slow, it's a culture change, changes don't come quick….it has been a catalyst, people are sitting up and saying, "hey we are creative" ...to encourage a renaissance
Commerce	4 (2)	To create change and really engage people with possibilities …can be a catalyst
Culture	2(2)	We're trying to promote, we want not just children, but we want adults to be creative…how they can change things
Founding member	2(3)	It's acting as a catalyst…..the role is to be a change agent for the state…..(build) working collaboratives around change, societal change
Branding or rebranding role		**Branding or rebranding role to include changes in reputation, perception, image or brand at individual, organizational and regional level**
Education	3 (3)	Branding Oklahoma…so be proud of it and tell others, get noticed, your own companies noticed and the state notices…they are building a brand
Commerce	1(1)	It's a real pride thing, it makes Oklahomans feel good after a long history of not feeling so good about being from Oklahoma
Culture	2(1)	Re-braining Oklahoma….changing the perception of Oklahoma that is their mission
Founding member	2(2)	Being accepted into the International District of Creativity gave huge credibility to the idea that Oklahoma was creative…we got international recognition for that
Value of events		**Tangible outcomes such as events are seen as valuable**
Education	9(7)	The creativity forum, arguably is the biggest awareness and fundraiser event …..the conferences have been a big hit as a resource
Commerce	6 (5)	The commitment to the annual event is part of the right solution…. the world forum (it) brought a lot of attention to us
Culture	8(8)	The most important thing that Creative Oklahoma has done is the annual conferences because people are hungry for information.….the creativity conference was the greatest….international speakers
Founding member	5(3)	Our creative sparks ….I think the events have been quite successful, hosting the world creativity forum

The question asked how stakeholders saw the role of Creative Oklahoma, and how that had been successful. It was mapped to Research Question 3 how would stakeholders like to see the social innovation network expanded, and where have they

seen the social innovation to be successful. The following themes were identified from the stakeholder responses: a) education, b) raising awareness and showcasing creativity, c) support for creative initiatives and people, d) connection and networking with leaders and influencers (importance of individuals and organizations), e) relating to business and economic development, including support, f) role in change and as change agents, g) rebranding or branding role, and h) the value of events.

The responses were fairly evenly spread. The main themes were the role of Creative Oklahoma in educating or raising awareness of creativity, being a resource and providing support for creative initiatives and people, providing value through events such as the forums and speakers and acting as change agents. There was little difference between the stakeholder groups. A longer-term role was identified as driving economic development. The events were an important role or function for Creative Oklahoma. This was seen as attendee exposure to new ideas, knowledge and stimulation through meeting new people, listening to experts and gaining insight. There was also a subtheme of networking within the events. This was identified as meeting people, building social networks and social capital for personal and business interests including solidifying existing relationships, as well as being able to bridge or broker across networks to build personal social capital. Meetings such as the creativity forum, were identified as more effective and efficient ways of meeting people and gathering content and provides tangible content and value for an area of interest that can be intangible. The events could also be linked to the themes of raising awareness, branding or rebranding through positioning Oklahoma in a positive light, and leadership networks, social capital and influence connections.

This question expanded the previous question on communication from how did the communication occur to what do the stakeholders understand because of the communication process. The decision to adopt an innovation may also be affected by the extent to which the innovation is a good fit to meet known or unknown needs. Being able to see the innovation in action provides a tangible demonstration. With an intangible concept such as creativity, the forums, speakers, awards and showcasing of creative individuals and organizations. This could provide tangible examples of what Rogers (2004) identifies as trialability, which together with the perceived fit of the innovation, can influence the decision to adopt.

Table 13 Cross Sector Engagement (Question 15)

Long Questions		
Q15 Are you involved with any other sectors and if so in what way		
Theme	*Count*	*Definition and Quote*
Professional connections		**Connections and networking, or involvement with other sectors or organizations as a function of organizational, business or professional role**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	15(15)	We actively engage, and sometimes pursue boards…We are constantly talking to every industry sector at some point…I am involved in the political and economic development sectors….clearly in commerce, a lot of tech-commercialization, so a lot of startup companies that we are trying to do
Commerce	11(8)	Involved in all of those different industries…mostly nonprofit and the boards are in education, heavy arts and culture, some education, but lots of different things in that way
Culture	10(9)	We work with communities in very diverse ways….we work with them in the health fields all across Oklahoma… ….partnering with education
Level of connection is at the leadership level		**Leadership networks, where connections, level of engagement, and type of engagement with the other sectors at leadership level, such as board, chair of board or strategic planning to include government**
Education	10(8)	We actively engage, and sometimes pursue boards…I have been on numerous city boards and non-profit boards…..at my level we serve on nonprofit board……I am chairman of our local Board of Chamber of Commerce, I've been president of our local fine arts institute
Commerce	3(3)	I'm involved on boards of directors in community organizations as well as national and statewide organizations….I've served on about 30 boards
Culture	2(2)	I sit or a lot of tribal boards, and I'm on art boards, and retirement boards, and interfaith alliances….we have a seat on the State Indian Education Advisory Task Force and we have a point of input into advisory into areas

The question asked if and how stakeholders were involved with other sectors, and mapped to Research Question 3, the success of innovation and innovation network and how it could be expanded or enhanced. There were two clear themes: a) cross sector networks as a function of organizational role and b), the level of connection was at the leadership level.

There was little difference between the stakeholders with regards to cross sector engagement, and all individuals identified being involved other sectors. The connections were predominantly in a professional capacity. Involvement with other sectors was identified as part of normal business routine, due to the role of the organization and the role of the individual within the organization. It appeared that organizations actively pursued cross sector engagement, encouraging staff to expand professional and social networks. This would be in line with leadership behavior, and entrepreneurial behavior of actively seeking to grow professional networks and personal social capital identified by Balkundi and Kilduff, (2006). This could encompass self-interest or altruistic motivations supporting Burt, (1999), which could have relevance in the individual, organizational and Creative Oklahoma innovation networks.

The potential roles of all the individuals as bridging across sectors, and occupying leadership roles in more than one network, would be of value at multiple levels. This could provide insight on leveraging heterogenous networks described by Young, (2009) as well as the multiple roles of leaders in the network discussed by Cullen & Yammarino, (2014). This question expands upon the demographic short question at the start of the interview that asked individuals if they were involved in other sectors and in what way. It also added to a previous question on emergence of

new partnerships. The themes replicated the earlier stakeholder responses. Connections with other sectors in many cases included all three sectors. The level of engagement was identified as predominantly operating at the board level or leadership level, and included social as well as professional networks. In diffusion, Rogers, (1995) identifies that the opinion leader plays a critical role in the communication process. This includes informing and educating peers and other individuals in their sphere of influence about the innovation. Individuals who span networks, can play a critical role in spreading information moving outside of their own networks (Burt, 2000; Young, 2009) and leapfrogging across barriers that might prevent the spread of information in otherwise homogeneous networks.

Table 14 Networks (Question 23)

Long Questions		
Q23 How important are networks. What have been the key networks, and what networks have emerged as a result of Creative Oklahoma		
Theme	*Count*	*Definition and Quote*
Connection with influence		**The value or role of networks in providing connection with influential individuals, leaders and organizations including building personal and professional networks**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	8(5)	Had a lot of high rollers on the board ….. nationally it has given us a presence, given us influence
Commerce	6(3)	Movers and shakers….(need to) broaden that network to a different type of influencer….. it has brought them national recognition
Culture	7(4)	Figureheads in all those sectors ….fifty different leaders …they are all networkers, they are all professional people
Founding member	5(3)	A board member is a center of influence somewhere else in some other area, participating in the creativity process is influencing the network that he or she belongs to
Communication function of networks		**The importance of networks in communication, information, educating, and support**
Education	10(7)	The network has to be charged with telling your brand and explaining your story and being your brand champion in lots of ways…. It was truly trying to establish that kind of awareness…..the opportunity to show the movers and the shakers in the business community how important this concept was
Commerce	9(3)	The purpose of (the National Creativity Network) is to facilitate…it's constant idea sharing….you have to participate so other people feel like you can give something back and that when you start getting a two-way street of communication and value

Culture	10(7)	These organization or the networks really help to gather, share ideas but also gather inspiration and to really make connections and try things externally….they play a chief role in educating the community who Creative Oklahoma is…… it gives you representation
Founding member	7(4)	Of utilizing existing networks to spread influence as well as to raise money as well as to send a message … what Creative Oklahoma is doing is trying to manage networks of networks... we try to feed the networks as much as we can with new knowledge, with new information
Network scope or range		**The scope or range of the network, geographical and other markers**
Education	10(5)	A great network for the state to connect people together…there is a world of academia and there's a world of investors and then there's a world of business and a world of medicine (and) they are all very different worlds and should bring us all to the table….nationally it has given us a presence, given us influence … this cannot be Oklahoma City metro Creative Oklahoma, it won't work
Commerce	7(4)	Well that would be the big one (National Creativity Network) an avenue to share ideas North American wide and in some cases worldwide and it's brought them national recognition…(not enough effort) with some of the younger sectors …(needs to) reach out to rural Oklahoma
Culture	5(4)	(benefits) are going to probably be in the education field more than anything else….its primarily an Oklahoma City thing… I don't see important networks in the cultural sector (involved with Creative Oklahoma)…they belong to an international network
Founding member	7(6)	The network has largely been Oklahoma City based network, this has not reached out to the rest of the state as nearly as effectively as we wanted to…. The new National Network has been good, but maybe not born much fruit yet ……the formal networks of the World Creativity have been good
Network scope as inclusive or exclusive		**The scope and range or networks and inclusion and or exclusion, or perceived as inclusive or exclusive**
Education	6(4)	You have your elite … there are tons of creative people in Tulsa (and) Tahlequah, but they don't feel linked, they don't feel connected
Commerce	4(3)	Well the public at large isn't part of this, right? They don't have or part of this networking accessibility you know… (need to) get rural people involved
Culture	4(2)	Everyone has got to be represented …it depends upon how it is formed, if it is forged to be inclusive or if the purpose is as a group to keep people out
Founding member	3(2)	There are problems with the traditional network system in Oklahoma…..it is only here in Oklahoma City, Tulsa never embraced it
Networks as resources		**The use of networks as resources to create synergy, avoid duplication and to provide financial support**
Education	5(5)	It's to align resources and align strengths (and) the different networks that they bring…. needed them (the board) to pull the resources….. sharing resources….even when you are fund raising it is friend raising
Commerce	5(4)	A bias toward, are they going to be able to either connect us to or themselves bring some money to the table to fund the organization…..maybe some of them are just lending you their name…. they'll write you a check
Culture	6(3)	(leaders) each had something to contribute, specific knowledge and experience to contribute.…(benefits) are going to probably be in the education field more than anything else … that was a good networking opportunity
Founding member	6(3)	We use all those same traditional networks to raise money, to get people interested, to bring them along….we don't have the resources to manage those networks effectively
Personal networking and value		**Building and accessing networks for individual or organizational purposes, but connections are at the individual level (social capital)**

Education	17(8)	Whoever is on the board we now are connected and they know who we are… …it's not what you know it's who you know….. I don't know if any new networks have emerged from Creative Oklahoma
Commerce	9(6)	One of the key reasons Creative Oklahoma has been successful for me is because of the networking…. a completely new network of people…..
Culture	11(6)	I walked into the room say 50 leaders and I would not have met the same people in the same room for any other reason…. I knew about everybody on that original board…networks are definitely important but you also have to have enough social skills to put yourself out there
Founding member	7(5)	(he) is a wonderful example of utilizing existing networks to spread influence as well as to raise money as well as to send a message….then within those (networks) they would have connections (and) so they would bring those networks together with other networks
Changing nature of networks		**The dynamic nature of networks, changing, expanding, nurturing and interconnecting**
Education	18(7)	I have never looked at myself as someone who puts all of their eggs in one basket….it is creating and developing networks and relationships…...those relationships and networks are in our sector, in our organization, they are being developed, they're being nurtured, cultivated….it has been an organic process
Commerce	11(5)	You have to participate so other people feel like you can give something back…the initial network was really among educators…..Creative Oklahoma has expanded nationally with other creative entities as well as internationally with the Districts of Creativity…the board has changed a lot
Culture	12(5)	their network is always growing and always becoming more complex… …it's a small community growing certainly quickly….I can envision this in twenty years' time being very valid as a network
Founding member	11(4)	Developing networks that will grow and expand and change and uh extend the influence of Creative Oklahoma …the creation of the new National Network

The question asked about networks, the importance of networks and emergence of new networks, and was mapped to Research Question 2, what is critical to maintain the innovation and innovation network. The following themes were identified from the stakeholder responses: a) connections with influence or leaders, b) the communication function (educating, information and support), c) the range or scope of networks to include geographical boundaries, d) the range or scope of networks as perceived as inclusive or exclusive regards individuals, groups or organizations, e) networks as resources, f) the personal value or individual level of networking and, g) the changing nature of networks.

While some of the questions in the interview protocol addressed the innovation from different perspectives, this question focused on networks. This is relevant to the theories or frameworks in this research exploring: collective and networked leadership, networks, opinion leaders and motivations to adopt in diffusion, relationships between actors in systems of innovation and the vested interest or 'stake' of individuals in the innovation process. Within the network themes there was overlap, but to get more granularity the themes were split out rather than compressed. Those themes will be discussed both separately and together.

As with most of the themes, there was greater difference within the stakeholder group themes that between stakeholder groups. In response to Research Question 5, the themes for the most part were fairly even across the stakeholder groups. The themes with the highest count were personal and individual networks, the changing nature of networks, and the communication role of networks. This was consistent with existing themes. Within the stakeholder groups there was a slight difference in the order of count of the themes. Education had personal networking, followed by and communication and dynamic networks. Commerce had personal networking and changing networks. Culture had communication, personal networks followed by changing networks. Finally, founding members had range and scope of networks, personal networks, changing networks followed by communication role of networks. The next grouping of themes were range and scope of networks to include geographical boundaries, connections with leaders or individuals with influence, networks as resources, and the perception of the networks as inclusive and or exclusive.

Themes that could be linked together were the scope and boundaries of networks. Geographically local, national and international networks were identified as raising awareness of Creative Oklahoma particularly outside of the state boundaries, with “nationally it has given us a presence, given us influence”. With that awareness came the risk of disconnecting with potential stakeholders who may not see value or importance and think “well this is just an international organization, why should I care”. A recurring theme throughout the questions was the division within the state based on geography, “the network has been largely an Oklahoma City based network”, and “we have not been able to engage the Tulsa network very well”.

Another recurring theme was the inclusive versus exclusive nature of the network. The networks were identified as being homogenous. Which to some extent follows in that the interview group were all leaders or in leadership roles and influencers within their networks (Nui, 2000), and what Mumford (2002) identifies as the elite leadership important to the diffusion process. The “elite” nature of the network, being a reason “the public at large isn’t part of this” because of a lack of “network accessibility”. To be successful the network needs to be more inclusive, whereby “everyone has got to be represented”. The exclusive nature of the network could be expected with a network that is focused on connecting with leadership and individuals with influence as part of professional and personal networking, and uses the network as a resource to access those individuals and organizations. However, in maintaining the network the organization needs to determine the purpose of the network; as one response commented, was it “forged to be inclusive”? Expanding the network would need to balance the needs or perceived needs of the current and future stakeholders.

This indicates need for not just building and leveraging networks, but also managing them (Ballinger, Cross, & Gray, 2001; Cross, Nohria, & Parker, 2002). With networks being important to stakeholders in a number of ways, leaders of the innovation need to be actively managing the current and future networks (Balkuni & Kilduff, 2006).

In the diffusion process, opinion leaders, the influence they have within their networks, and the ability to communicate information about the innovation is central to the adoption of the innovation (Rogers, 2003). The use of networks is extensive, as is reasons individuals join them. From a network perspective the themes reflected research strands as networks used for communication, information, resources, scope and range, influence, personal and organizational networking.

The following questions look at the innovation process and sector engagement.

Table 15 Cross Sector Engagement (Question 16)

Long Questions		
Q16 The sectors you are involved in, are they innovative, involved with Creative Oklahoma and who are the key people that influence innovation in those other sectors		
Theme	*Count*	*Definition and Quote*
The existence of innovation		**Innovation and creativity are, or are perceived to exist, or be emerging**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	5(3)	The whole involvement in incubators is about being innovative, so yes definitely that is the only part of business we're interested in is the innovative part….an effort to move in innovative directions
Commerce	3(2)	There are spots, there are educators that are within the sector that are innovative, but as a sector no. .. commerce I would say a third of the industries have high innovation components, a third are middling and a third are horrible
Culture	1	Creativity institutes and all of those things and entrepreneurial programs are so are all important
Cross sector engagement		**The extent to which those sectors and organizations stakeholders are engaged with are aware of, or engaged with, or have the potential to be engaged with Creative Oklahoma.**
Education	3(2)	Not in that particular way…not necessarily with Creative Oklahoma
Commerce	3(3)	Not that I know of…. not directly other than I am on the board of both
Culture	2(2)	It is indirectly ….the other program might end up having a direct relationship with Creative Oklahoma as a partner
Leading or driving innovation		**Leadership of innovation, the individuals or organizations who play a key role in leading or driving creativity and innovation, and how it emerges**

Education	4(4)	Where it is happening you can bet that there is a cooperative spirit going on between two or three important leaders…most of the time it is the people on the boards or it's the leadership of the organization
Commerce	4(3)	It is coming from the top down, the president to VPs, to chairs etc, deans or whatever, it tends to come that way…it is going to be the presidents (its twofold) its bringing in funding so there are programs and facilities available but also making that a priority for their organization because they set the leadership tone
Culture	4(4)	I couldn't tell you who the most influential person or organizations are …higher education has such a prominent role …its true university level, and that's creativity institutes and all of those things and entrepreneurial programs and so are all important
Networks as relationships		**The function or role of networks to build relationships, or coalitions**
Education	3(2)	You're building coalitions....I think that is a characteristic of Oklahoma a lot of stuff we do is based on personal relationships and developed relationships
Commerce	4(2)	To help them make connections and find synergies and find where there is an overlap…..this organization doesn't actually deliver any of the services but we provide all of that connectivity among all those organizations
Culture	2(2)	It has opened some doors, it's allowed me to help some people

The question looked at cross sector engagement. The focus was other sectors that stakeholders were involved with, the people who influenced innovation, and whether those organizations were involved with Creative Oklahoma. This question mapped to Research Question 4, and barriers and enablers to the success of the social innovation and social innovation network. The following themes were identified from the stakeholder response: a) the existence or emergence of innovation, b) cross sector engagement or boundary spanning, and c) the roles of leaders in driving innovation, including leaders driving innovation and collaboration. There was little difference in themes, or importance of themes between the stakeholder groups. The responses supported earlier themes on innovation, the role of leaders in driving innovation and the connecting function of networks. This question followed on from an earlier question, and took a deeper look at cross sector engagement, networking and innovation.

The themes identified that innovation was existing in certain areas within the sectors, "in spots", with "incubators" and "entrepreneurial programs" resources

building innovation. Networks and coalitions were identified as important, and included transfer and building of knowledge, and leaders were identified as driving innovation and in networking or making connections. In a regional innovation context, building clusters or networks of innovation (Porter, 1998) builds competitive advantage. This also builds local knowledge that is "sticky' (Asheim, & Isaksen, 2002), and because it is not easily transferable, builds local competencies and value.

Innovation was important in all three sectors, which is not surprising as all stakeholders were ultimately engaged in activities which required innovation to compete or exist. Innovation is addressed as a topic in the vested interest questions in the third section of the interview protocol. Leaders were viewed as having an important role within innovation and in how innovation emerged. This included being a resource, giving permission and seeking "opportunities" and "big new ideas". All of the stakeholders had identified themselves as being leaders in the demographic short questions. An important theme that did emerge was that networks were important in building relationships, with relationships were "a characteristic of Oklahoma". This would indicate propensity and ease of networking. However, the building of relationships had not yet led to cross sector engagement bringing expansion to the Creative Oklahoma network. This leads into the role of heterogenous and homogeneous networks in diffusion (Young, 2009). This lack of 'travel' was despite potential interest in innovation within the sectors, and the role of stakeholders as leaders having potential influence as a result of their 'bridging' or information dissemination role.

In diffusion, the role of leaders and their subsequent influence within their networks is important in factor in communicating information (Rogers, 2003). Despite

connections at the board level, and influence being at the leadership level, the cross-sector association was not identified as effective in diffusing the initiative. The subnetworks of the board members may have brought leaders into the group to be leveraged by the social innovation, but the network was not being leveraged to diffuse the information outside of the innovation network. So, individuals may be bridging networks, but not active in the role of "information broker" between networks (Burt, 1999), particularly regards to information about the innovation network.

Diffusion of innovation and systems of innovation identify the importance of actors in the innovation process (Edquist, 2006; Rogers, 1995). To expand the innovation network, the organization should try to leverage the leadership network and potential candidates in the sectors. There could be many reasons why leaders in innovative organizations and sector clusters are not yet engaged, some of which are themes that have been identified in other parts of the interview protocol. This could include, individuals have not yet been approached, the communication is not clear, or the initiative does not appear to offer a value proposition.

Table 16 Definition of Creativity (Question 21)

The next three questions explore creativity, entrepreneurship and the value of creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship leading to economic growth. While creativity and entrepreneurship were not addressed as separate topics, creativity is central to the social innovation initiative, and entrepreneurship is associated with innovation and economic growth. These are tied into the mission and vision of Creative Oklahoma as building a state (and State) of creativity

Long Questions		
Q21 How do you define creativity and what does it mean.		
Theme	*Count*	*Definition and Quote*
Creativity as a new idea		**Creativity is perceived as generating a new or unique idea**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	7(5)	Generating ideas or concepts that are new ...creativity to me is a new idea…original ideas that have value
Commerce	5(3)	Having a new idea…a new idea put into application….that messy chaos that is idea generation
Culture	3(2)	At the basic level it is only an idea…it's a good idea
Founding member	4(4)	Creativity is the spark, original ideas that have value…new ideas with value
Creativity as a new way of thinking		**Creativity as a new way of looking at something, or a new way of thinking about something, to reframe it or connect ideas in a different way to come up with a creative idea or solution**
Education	7(5)	New ways of looking at old things…new idea, new way, new something for the better....thinking not outside of the box but trying to () realize there is no box
Commerce	3(2)	New connections… trying to do something new with an old way of thinking will really not get you anywhere
Culture	4(3)	Fresh perspective to an issue or problem, or just a fresh approach ….creativity is connecting things
Founding member	3(2)	Ideas come all the time from of putting this with this and putting it together…..when someone can look at two different things and make a connection that no one else had made
Creativity as problem Solving		**Creativity as a solution to a problem or part of finding solutions to problems**
Education	4(4)	New something that solves a problem and is useful to someone in the community….you have to have creative ideas to solve problems
Commerce	3(3)	Solving public problems in terms of economic development…. it's about creating an answer to a problem
Culture	1(1)	Creativity is something that continually evolves, it doesn't hit a wall and stay there you have to figure out someway to get round the wall () that's creativity
Founding member	2(1)	They did not see it as a creative act to solve the business problems that they were solving
Creativity as a process		**Creativity as a process or part of the innovation process, or linked to innovation**
Education	7(6)	Innovation is where is becomes useful…following (ideas) into an innovative process …a process that results in a product , usually….problem solving process…most any kind of innovative or creative thing will do processes or
Commerce	5(5)	Idea though to application…the process of trying to do something new….creativity is a process (its) the whole process
Culture	2(2)	That again is creativity process….So you can have an idea, but really until it's implemented it doesn't – it could be creative, (but) so what?
Founding member	5(1)	It's a process of taking an interesting idea and not just abandoning it but actually putting it into a system that can then be developed, and used as an end product
A creative culture or climate		**Creativity as characteristics of a creative climate or culture, and supportive environment, or needing a supportive culture or climate**
Education	8(5)	Having the environmental culture that allow you to think… you've go to be free to fail….a culture of creativity (is important)….a creative environment is

		nurturing, open, transparent and vital environment….in a climate always questioning
Commerce	2(2)	If you are in a culture where fun is a part of things ...creativity has to be stimulated if we are going to stay ahead in this wide world of new products
Culture	3(3)	Creativity is having the right to think about things without being punished or denied….to some of the people it would mean cultural creativity
Founding member	0	
Creative skills or characteristics		**Creativity identified as either characteristics, skills or attributes, or as the result of a combination of skills, abilities, attitudes**
Education	10(6)	It requires (courage, an inveterate curiosity, risk taking without fear of the failure, diversity, intelligence)…attitude (willingness to refine problems, ambiguity, self-belief, risk taking).the ability to be creative…an innate characteristic of humans…well we are not really creative
Commerce	3(3)	People (that) have the capacity to be creative…intuitive.... ….it is being resourceful
Culture	5(5)	Creativity comes from within…...talking risks, catalyzing, changing approaches... stretching (people) to be more creative and take more risks… I don't think everybody has that gene
Founding member	4(3)	That you don't have anything creativity without an imagination to generate an idea in your head... I'm not creative… everybody is born with creativity…. we had to tell them they were creative
The value or relevance of creativity		**The need for creativity to have relevance or value**
Education	4(4)	It's got to be really practical and beneficial….you are judged by how creative your research is..….ideas that could be useful….understanding its value
Commerce	1	You've got to stay fresh and stay relevant, and that means you have to be constantly evolving
Culture	7(5)	Creativity is simply a way of progress….to the organization creativity could mean um continuation and survival and staying alive...being relevant….if an arts organization isn't creative (well) it's not going to be there very long
Founding member	3(2)	I have to say the word creativity and creative is a negative for Oklahoma…. it's what is creativity to you…if they couldn't sell (the idea of creativity) to their fellows, their cohorts, then they had a problem
Creativity as complex and ambiguous		**A challenge explaining what creativity is, or a problem with defining creativity because it is perceived as a complex, ambiguous idea or concept**
Education	6(5)	I'm not sure you can really define creativity…we confuse creativity and innovation…I just don't know how to define the term, I just don't….I've been using the word creativity, but like most people I don't quite know what it meant
Commerce	6(4)	Most people are automatically drawn to the arts when they think of creativity, …. everybody will have a different answer….it can manifest itself in such different ways…you know it is kind of hard to define…I think people kind of romanticize the concept of creativity too much
Culture	3(2)	Creativity is very hard to define…it is nebulous…it can be anything
Founding member	7(5)	It is a difficult concept…it was this amorphous thing... we did have lengthy discussions about the definition of creativity (we) discussed it round and round … the idea of creativity is still an uphill battle to move beyond the realm of the arts when discussing creativity

The question asked how creativity was defined and understood, and mapped to the first research question, or stakeholder motivation to engage with social innovation networks. The following themes were identified from the stakeholder responses: a) creativity as a new idea, b) creativity as a new way of thinking, or connecting to create something new, c) creativity as problem solving or solving a problem, d) creativity as a process, or part of the innovation process, e) characteristics of a creative environment or culture, f) the skills or characteristics of creative people, and finally, g) the value of creativity or the need for creativity to have value or be relevant.

There was a slight difference with the count of the themes between the stakeholder groups. Founding members identified creativity as a "difficult" idea that was hard to define. Furthermore, the board had "lengthy discussions…we discussed it round and round" and that creativity was an "idea that was new". This group did not have any count for the themes of creativity as skills or characteristics, or creativity as a climate or culture. While the responses and counts vary from question to question, and absence or low count may not necessarily indicate anything. However, it is worth noting that this was different from the other three stakeholder groups who saw creativity in much broader range of themes, and in that way aligned with creativity research (see Runco, 2007 and Kaufman, & Sternberg, 2010, for a comprehensive overview of creativity research and Mumford, 2012 for organizational creativity research). If this does indicate a communication disconnect, it could be one of the reasons behind the recurring theme in the responses around communication barriers, understanding creativity and the mission of the social innovation, and perceptions of 'stake' or potential value. Understanding how stakeholders view creativity, can provide insight

into how to formulate a message that resonates with the audience, and package offerings to support stakeholders in developing creative organizations.

Creativity is at the heart of the social innovation initiative; the mission, vision and communication strategy. Clarity around creativity and communication is important for the diffusion of the innovation, and lack of clarity has been a recurring challenge to stakeholder engagement or vested interest. The themes will be addressed in order of highest to lowest count. Education and culture identified creativity as skills, characteristics and behaviors of creative people (Guildford, 1950) slightly higher than commerce. The theme included describing creative people as having: “courage”, “curiosity”, “risk taking”, “intuitive”, “imagination”, “the ability to combine information”, and “resourceful”. Some people had more creativity than others.

The second highest theme count was around ambiguity. Creativity was seen as “nebulous”, and “hard to define”, that it “could be anything”, and despite using the term creativity, it was possible stakeholders were still unsure of “what it meant”. Additional challenges were “creativity and innovation” were seen as one and the same. This confusion or joining of the terms is not new (Richards, 1991), it follows confusion and overlap of other terms associated with creativity (Runco, 2007). There were two references to creativity being in the artistic domain and one to research. In general, it was not seen as being domain specific, although the comment about a tendency to “romanticize the concept of creativity”, is supported by Mumford, Weitzel, and Reiter-Palmon, (1997).

The challenges of defining creativity and finding value, were recurring themes in the questions. Creativity was identified as a new idea, new way of thinking about

something which is supported in research, with the need for value (see, Runco & Jaeger, 2012), as a process, and problem solving. It was also identified as a skill set, and as a climate or set of conditions needed to support creativity. Creativity and leadership was also identified. This was leadership have creative ideas, or leadership is needed to push ideas through, which together with the creativity as skills and abilities is important for those leading creative people (see Mumford, Scott, Gladdis, & Strange, 2002 for an overview). Creativity was seen a huge area or topic, and was "nebulous", "hard to define", and "it can be anything". Creativity can be seen as problem solving, and it is associated with "the arts" which was not always valued, which is not uncommon. The themes followed creativity research. Amabile (1983) identifies the variables of a creative climate, an area in which there is extensive research (see Amabile & Gryskiewicz, 1989; Ekvall, 1996; Isaksen, Lauer, & Ekvall, 1999; Isaksen & Akkermans, 2011).

The third theme with the highest count was creativity as a process, and this had the higher overall theme count for commerce. There with similarity within the stakeholder groups around taking the "idea through to application" and leading to "innovation". Education and culture had a higher count of skills and commerce of processes, could align with the culture of the sectors and would warrant further exploration. The former focusing on developing or utilizing skills and the latter on products to market or new product development (Griffin, 2010) and commercialization which is a critical to survival (Cooper, 2003).

The fourth and fifth themes were creativity as a new idea, followed by creativity as a new way of thinking about something. Some stakeholders did mention creativity as

having both ‘novelty’ and ‘value’, which are recognized as required for that aspect of creativity (See Runco, & Jaeger, 2012). Value or the need for creativity to have relevance was split out into a separate theme, and there were both positive and negative aspects. The count was higher for culture than the other groups, where value was seen as “reciprocity”, “being relevant”, “progress”, “survival” and being able to “change”. For education, creativity needed to be “practical and beneficial” it was “research” and “understanding its value”. For the founding members value was seen as culture with, “creativity and creative is a negative in Oklahoma”, and communication where failure to “sell” the value of creativity was a problem.

The last themes were creativity as problem solving or solving problems and creativity as climate. The former included specifics such as “public problems in terms of economic development” to general “solve problems”, and “fix problems”. Creativity as a climate or set of conditions needed to support creativity included being “able to think”, “be free to fail”, “fun”, “nurturing, open, transparent and vital”. Conversely creativity could be “discouraged”, driven “underground” When combined with the theme of creativity as a skill or behavior, many of the comments were variables identified in creative climate research (see Hunter, Bedell, & Mumford, 2007 for a review).

Table 17 Creativity and Economic Growth (Question 24)

Long Questions		
Q24 How can creativity lead to entrepreneurship, innovation and economic growth and how does that lead to regional competency and uniqueness		
Theme	*Count*	*Definition and Quote*
Business opportunities		**The ability to have the idea, identify the potential market value and take it to market**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	8(5)	People who are willing to jump out there(and) by putting these creative ideas about and trying to make it happen…in the oil industry (fracking) someone had

		to be imagining what it, how can I make this better….opening the doors for start-up businesses and entrepreneurship say in aviation… ideas that's either different from other peoples or a substantial improvement
Commerce	12(5)	Selecting which (ideas) can actually have an entrepreneurial or market value…. we are starting to develop some biotech (and) aerospace is another…Nano technology is going to allow us (in the next fifteen years) to come up with stuff we don't even know about now … patents out there just looking for a home
Culture	0	
Founding member	2(2)	And then if you were going to monetize that, if there were opportunities to monetize that idea or that product then you can take it into entrepreneurship…a willingness to take a chance with a new idea
Resources		**The resources that either exist or need to exist to support**
Education	10(8)	oil and gas, aerospace, defense, and security, transportation, these are all big industries, the industries that create wealth in the state…we've got to have a culture that stimulates and pops out new ideas because that is what we need to do to remain competitive….put in economic incentive programs that support and enable ….. we have this potential…access to human capital
Commerce	8(6)	What industries do we already have, are we moving towards a critical mass that we could build a new innovation culture around those industries…. we already have the regional competencies…made of risk takers ….Oklahoma is known for its entrepreneurship (its) almost in the DNA of the state
Culture	0	
Founding member	5(4)	What I think Creative Oklahoma can do, is to help provide tools as well as – maybe if we end up with enough money …the network is much more compressed ….there are two degrees of separation in Oklahoma, you can get to anybody in the state through one person, (because) everyone knows everybody
Skills and knowledge		**Human capital or knowledge that exists, and the additional skills needed**
Education	4(4)	Students in the next 20 years are going to have to be very imaginative, creative and willing to take some chances…. you've got to have the people…highly qualified and highly trained workforce that is globally prepared
Commerce	8(6)	We already have a huge talent pool of people … how do we develop the expertise, how do we develop the things that Oklahoma is really good at innovating… having the tinkerers' brain and the entrepreneurs' brain
Culture	1	You cannot tell someone to be creative
Founding member	2(2)	we can continue to stimulate creative people here in our communities to stay in our communities
Culture or infrastructure		**The importance of, and what constitutes a supporting environment, culture and infrastructure**
Education	8(6)	Welcoming so that new business can start up….builds that culture of newness is welcome here.. …having this culture that is statewide, its almost a culture of acceptance….having a culture of creativity is giving people permission
Commerce	2(1)	We are creating a situation…a hub
Culture	0	
Founding member	1	Make our environment in the state of Oklahoma an environment that fosters more creativity than what's happening now and I think we've got all the tools to do that
Reputation		**The role of reputation, image and branding in attracting capital and resources**
Education	3(3)	The better we are at creativity ideas, the better it becomes known that OK is a place where people are free to think it doesn't kill off all innovation and ideas…when people notice they want to be part of it….we are recognized in some areas
Commerce	3(1)	Once you get the reputation (of creativity) it attracts others… you bring more recognition…… it acts as a magnet (and) a seal of approval

Culture	1	People will come and seek us out
Founding member	3(2)	I know there has been a growth in creative industry sectors, which will hopefully advance Oklahoma in terms of not just being a national player in economic growth but also internationally so… can create a uniqueness and a niche for Oklahoma

The question mapped to the first research question, or stakeholder motivation to engage with social innovation networks, and asked how stakeholders thought creativity led to entrepreneurship, innovation, and economic growth, and how that in turn could lead to regional competency and uniqueness. The following themes were identified from the stakeholder responses: a) business opportunities or taking an idea to market, b) resources needed to support innovation, c) human capital or skills and knowledge or that already existed and that needed to be developed, d) the culture or infrastructure needed or existing, and e) reputation or branding building innovation

The themes identified by the stakeholder responses included infrastructure and resources to support creativity and innovation, skills and human capital development, and reputation. As might be expected the commerce theme count were slightly higher, particularly in business opportunities, resources, skills and knowledge. Culture had a very low overall count of themes, zero in most cases. This would again potentially align with the sector norms which could be further explored. The other responses included creativity as the initial idea, leading to the ability to see the potential within the market place for that idea to create value through business opportunities.

The themes were supported by systems of innovation theory, where an innovation emerges within a complex system (Edquist, 2006), and the actors as well as intuitions can support or hinder the innovation process through resources, culture, norms, policies and infrastructures. At a regional level entrepreneurs and small new

business startups can form clusters (Chatterji, Glaeser & Kerr, 2013), supporting geographical development where regional systems of innovation develop (Asheim & Gertle, 2005) to create uniqueness, reputation and competitive advantage for the state. From a Schumpeterian economic perspective, the entrepreneur is instrumental in taking the new idea and innovation to market (Schumpeter, 1934). Human capital development included having the skills and knowledge attracts, retains and develops the human capital needed to maintain competitive advantage in the state.

Table 18 Entrepreneurship and Entrepreneurs (Question 25)

Long Questions		
Q25 Entrepreneurs and Entrepreneurship – what/who is it, and where does it emerge		
Theme	*Count*	*Definition and Quote*
Business or commercially focus		**Entrepreneurs are associated primarily with business ventures or commercial enterprise**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	10(7)	Associated with business…some kind of enterprise ..figure out how to turn your art into a business…seeing where a market niche exists and how to capture it…..it's profitable...there are social entrepreneurs but there is still a business connection
Commerce	6(5)	Really it is tied to business…recognizes a profit potential and founds a business….. sees a market hole and they have an idea for a product or service that can fit…problem solvers into commercialization
Culture	5(4)	Trying to create new ventures, and I think generally those are business products or technologies or partnerships…sees a way of making money (and) maybe creating jobs… make a lot of money…I could market that….the start up thing
Founding member	5(3)	They start a business, they sell it, and they start another… …it is in the business environment…. businesses being set up by entrepreneurs….that label we have put on it have the years is that it has something to do with business…an entrepreneur is taking a new idea to market for profit or to benefit the world
Turning ideas into business opportunities		**Entrepreneurs see a need, gap or new idea and turn it into a business opportunity**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	5(5)	Ability to create something that was not there before…a person with an idea…it is an individual, a group, that develop new idea, new products and services … Seeing opportunity and seizing opportunity…create something new and then pass it one
Commerce	4(4)	Takes a dream or idea into commercialized concept….sees a market hole and have an idea for a product or service that can fit it… Connects the dots between an innovation and its ultimate usefulness
Culture	6(5)	An individual or an organization, usually small, that would have a unique concept or idea….emerges with a good idea…there is a need…they don't see problems they see opportunities for creativity

Founding member	4(3)	Someone who takes a new idea and .. have an idea...taking a notion, a product, an idea and making it better…having wonderful ideas they want to turn into something
Traits or characteristics of Entrepreneurs		**Entrepreneurs have a set of characteristics, skills, or attitudes this may set them apart from others. These personal characteristics or traits that are associated with entrepreneurs include risk**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	13(9)	People who aren't afraid of risk...not afraid of failure…they are hungry, they are ambitious, they are fighters…creative and innovative...risk taker, sees beyond the next hill, competitive, open to new ideas, competitive…have business knowledge
Commerce	8(5)	Individuals who are willing to take a risk…very resourceful people…problem solvers…not afraid to take a chance…. confidence
Culture	9(6)	Risk takers…resourceful (and) independent…ok with failure… guts…courage…willing to take the chance, risk takers….networked…..creative spirit…. won't let go……indomitable spirit
Founding member	7(4)	Dreamers (with) imagination…risk takers…tolerance for making mistakes and failures
Conditions for entrepreneurs		**Conditions, environments, places where entrepreneurs emerge or entrepreneurship happens**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	7(4)	It is more successful where capital is available...in clusters… entrepreneurship can exist in virtually any level of an organization that encourages entrepreneurship to exist.. can happen anywhere…trust….availability of capital
Commerce	6(3)	You have to have a positive growth-orientated environment…that are conducive to problem solving...environments that are business friendly and business orientated….because of a risk taking culture that exists in Oklahoma there are a lot more entrepreneurial people…..a community to encourage…financial backing
Culture	4(3)	It comes out of a need…business schools...there is a nurture element in allowing people the opportunity, (that) they're allowed…because of their network people believe in them…we have to encourage people
Founding member	5(4)	We have to create fertile ground for entrepreneurs to be successful (can't regulate (them) too much or bureaucracy stifle their energy)….we have a high tolerance for that (mistakes and failure) out here….culture for risk taking
Inclusive		**An entrepreneur can be anyone**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	15(11)	Everywhere…could be anyone….anyone can be an entrepreneur….can exist at virtually any level of the organization….the misnomer is that all creatives are entrepreneurs…entrepreneurship is the 25 cent word of the day…more often on the East and West coast… it almost can be taught
Commerce	12(9)	Anyone can be an entrepreneur …they are all over the place….at all stages of a person's life…you see a lot in the energy industry…I see it all over Oklahoma..
Culture	5(4)	They are anybody…young creative Native people… every one of us has the potential to be a entrepreneur……out of the medical research community….business schools where they have entrepreneurship programs
Founding member	5(4)	They are anyone who takes a risk…anybody is an entrepreneur……you don't see a lot of entrepreneurs coming out of government…I am sure there is entrepreneurial spirit in the nonprofit area…people in Oklahoma are entrepreneurial by nature

This question asked what stakeholders understood entrepreneurship and entrepreneurs to be, and where entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship emerged. This question mapped to the first research question, or stakeholder motivation to engage with social innovation networks. The following themes were identified from the stakeholder responses: a) entrepreneurs or entrepreneurship has a business or commercial focus, b) it is about turning ideas into business opportunities, c) the characteristics of entrepreneurs, d) conditions supporting entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship, and c) the universal nature of entrepreneurship.

The responses were uniform across the four stakeholder groups, with themes on entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship clearly connected with new ideas, innovation and business. The responses identified what entrepreneurship was, what entrepreneurs did, their characteristics, and what they needed as in the environment or culture. Broken down the responses identified entrepreneurs with being primarily associated with business, normally commercial but sometimes social, and normally for profit.

Entrepreneurs could emerge from anywhere and be anyone. Entrepreneurs were strongly connected with new ideas, sometimes as generators of those ideas, but always as being the driver of the innovation into the market place. The systems that supported entrepreneurship were identified as business friendly, open to new ideas, and with available resources. Entrepreneurship and entrepreneurs exhibited certain characteristics or skills, and were related to value creation and commercial business ventures, either as a result of generating ‘new ideas’ to fill a need or gap or from seeing potential in ideas of others.

Only a few responses diverged, two responses mentioned a social focus or solving social issues, and one mentioned entrepreneurs as being young. Other comment identified that entrepreneurship could be developed through training. The responses supported previous research in entrepreneurship and entrepreneurs. Schumpeter (1934), identified entrepreneurs as anyone who was engaged in creating business and economic development from new ideas. Gartner (2009), identified entrepreneurs as having certain traits such as risk taking, commitment, creativity, and networking skills.

The next group of questions look at the emergence of the social innovation process.

Table 19 Resources Needed for Innovation (Question 12)

Long Questions		
Q12 Innovation can be resource intensive. What were the key resources and where were they found.		
Theme	*Count*	*Definition and Quote*
Financial support		**Need for money/finances to support innovation**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	10(8)	What we have come to embrace is the fact that we're underfunded causes us to be more creative…..the reality is we don't get the funding we would like….resources come down to money, people and time and those three are the big ones…you are going to figure out how to do it without money or just die
Commerce	5(4)	O.K. so I don't have the money so how do I get where I need to without this kind of funding….we went out to our network and raised capital to start a new company…the biggest one (is) financial resources
Culture	10(7)	Everyone comes to us with these brilliant ideas and I have to figure out how to fund it….money is consistent…..we have no money
Founding member	8(8)	The financial resources…ongoing support is going to have to come from primarily the private sector…and hopefully financial support will follow…it takes money to do things…the funding….came largely from private sources
Support		**Need for support, or buy in of the idea to move it forward**
Education	3(3)	To keep that fuel, that passion, you have energy and have to have people who are pushing it and generating it.
Commerce	1	Ideas in and of themselves are good, but they don't have an emotional component….its more statewide buy in (that is needed)
Culture	1	We have to make them understand how important innovation is, sometimes you work from the top, sometimes from the grassroots
Founding member	4	People's interest, first of all they had to be interested, and second they had to be willing to invest in what we were talking about…it took their investment and their commitment… we needed to have buy in from people
Human capital		**The need for people, skilled people as a key resource**

Education	10(6)	The resources are here, but the resources here like to leave …..human capital is your most valuable and intellectual capital...you get these incredibly creative, intellectual faculty entrepreneurs and you empower them…when you are hiring people you have to hire for innovation and creativity
Commerce	5(3)	The resources of talent and the right people with the right kind of knowledge …above the money, people are more important
Culture	3(3)	And recourse intellectual resources that we have, I can name them on two hands and that should be a lot better…expertise is hard to come by……we have the people
Founding member	0	
Time		**Need for time**
Education	1	Resources come down to money, people and time and those three are the big ones
Commerce	1	It extremely important, I don't know to encourage or how we can take the time to really do it
Culture	1	Time is the big issue
Founding member	0	
Importance of leadership		**The need for leadership either as a position or as the vision to move the idea forward**
Education	2(2)	You need to have access to high quality leadership…you also have to have the decision makers, the opinion leaders
Commerce	1	Would be the resources needed in relationships, political relationships
Culture	1	Community leaders
Founding member	3(2)	People in the beginning had credibility, they had their own network that could be tapped into ..you know the public players, the leaders…the arts leadership
Importance of culture or environment		**The role played by, and characteristics of culture and environment.**
Education	3(3)	I think I have more ability to innovate because of the climate of (the organization) ….its a climate….even if you had the money you don't have the infrastructure, you don't have the support networks…we build that climate of innovation
Commerce	2(2)	Creating that situation here, where the resources that are not available to most people are available here
Culture	2(2)	The ability to be in a real network….affirming, supportive environment
Founding member	1	They had their own networks that could be tapped into

Innovation can be resource intensive. The question asked about resources needed for innovation, key resources and where those resources were located and mapped to Research Question 2 and what do stakeholders see as being critical to maintain the social innovation and social innovation network. In asking about innovation and resources in a nonspecific way, the responses could reflect the individuals' own organization or the social innovation initiative. The following themes

were identified from the stakeholder responses: a) financial support, b) need for support or buy in to move the idea or innovation forward, c) human capital or getting the right people with the right skills, d) time as a resource, e) the importance of leadership both with the vision and leadership networks, and f) the importance of culture or environment including networks. Research Question 5 focused on the differences between the stakeholder groups. There was not a huge difference between the stakeholder groups in the count of the themes, except for a much higher count with founding members on the need for financial support, and slightly higher count for support in general.

Financial support was the predominant theme, followed by human capital. The need for financial was a recurrent theme throughout the interview protocol, with founding members and culture stakeholders identifying funds and funding as a critical resource in response to this question. This was not unexpected given the not for profit nature of many community based initiatives. This sample included organizations engaged in arts based activities that identified "a limited amount of funding", as well as small business ventures without the capital of larger organizations. The availability of resources can be linked to organizational performance, (see Daniel, Lohrke, Fornaciari & Turner, 2004, for a meta-analysis). In the short demographic questions, stakeholders were asked about the size of their organizations, and how that compared to the sector norm, as larger organizations can be associated with 'slack' that can support innovation. The funding, or concern for funding, was also a predominant theme with the founding members. Creative Oklahoma operates as a not for profit organization, dependent upon

sponsorship and funding for daily operational concerns, putting on the large annual events and other support functions.

There was a slight concern with human capital, but not a big difference between the stakeholder groups. It would seem to follow, that in response to a question asking about innovation, themes of people, human capital and intellectual capital would be seen as critical elements for creativity and innovation. The role of leaders in diffusion, are change agents and opinion leaders providing education and support from their networks (Rogers, 1995). In systems of innovation, the process is recognized as emerging within complex overlapping systems, and within those systems the actors and institutions play a crucial role is supporting and blocking the innovation process (Edquist, 2006). This can include social capital and social networks that provide resources, and transfer knowledge. While leaders and opinion leaders play a critical role in innovation, organizations also realize that value and competencies reside in human capital, the tacit knowledge and creativity or creative problem-solving skills of individuals.

Table 20 The Key Actors and Institutions (Question 5)

Long Questions		
Q5 Who have been the key actors and institutions in the Creative Oklahoma initiative		
Theme	*Count*	*Definition and Quote*
Multiple leaders		**Identified multiple leaders within Creative Oklahoma and an extended leadership role of individuals and organizations**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	17(15)	Probably the most forceful and significant leader in the field….I don't think it would have happened without (his) taking the leadership…. those were the three key folks.. these groups are without doubt the state leaders in this area….leading organizations
Commerce	12(9)	(she) has been the driving force…a huge inspiration for the organization…a great leader....he was a good leader….she has the vision, the drive
Culture	11(11)	His leadership in the organization as a board member….(she) was a huge inspiration for the organization….(he) who was a great leader….state education and leaders…we have great leadership

Founding member	8(6)	By bringing in the leaders to say, now how are we going to get this going….clearly an important leader as founding chairman of the organization …most of central Oklahoma higher education have been involved at some level both public and private
Leader influence		**Influence as a leader, through position, roles, access to and position within networks, connections and visibly**
Education	21(12)	His name alone helps to very neat credibility…..almost anybody who wanted to have their picture in the paper was on board leading up to the forum….so I take a look at the folks who are on the board and you can say "my that is an impressive group" and it remains that way…(as) strong academic partners….they are essential to keeping a foothold in Oklahoma City. ..(their) knowledge and experience as it relates to education is critical to it
Commerce	11(6)	(he) is the pubic face of this, so he is always key…his name and contacts and ability to keep this going was absolutely vital….(they) got lots of people involved that were fairly good sized names….not only was he a good leader but he was good at reaching out to people that had certain skill sets and bringing them in
Culture	10(6)	Oh this is the real deal (he) is the head of it, that pulled in enough people to create the sparks and keep the interest going…..if you got their involvement and their visibility, then other people who had to be brought along in the process were influence by that……...knew all the leaders throughout the cultural communities and the other people. …His broad reach in the arts (has) helped really engage the arts sector much more
Founding member	6(3)	He spoke with a business voice and had a national platform…national and now international support for continuing the conversation….we have always had strong university leadership…so there were other connections he sort of made…the governor's office...legislators previous and present and current cabinet members previous and present
Leader resources		**Leaders as resources, or access to resources**
Education	11(7)	(her) knowledge and experience as it relates to education is critical
Commerce	8(4)	Funding came from (the) foundation, she was involved in until more recently….he was good at reaching out to people that had certain skills sets and bringing them in…the funding that we got from the foundation was very important in the beginning….you can't discount the check writers. You can't discount the groups that are in a position to put $50, 000 a year
Culture	9(6)	Really the key for funding…the corporations that funded the international program….there have been a lot of partners….the district business owners that help provide the resources but really they are disseminating information….has been the funder….funding, several organizations that have donated money…the biggest supporters for me have always been, financially, the Tribes
Founding member	5(2)	They are the major sponsors of the forum….continue to cultivate new support…is bringing in corporate support in ways that can help sustain the efforts….continuing to seek ways to partner with state government so that there is a legitimate flow of funds for particular projects and initiatives

The question asked who were the key players, or actors in the Creative Oklahoma initiative. This mapped to Research Question 2, what is critical to maintain the social innovation and social innovation network. The following themes were identified from the stakeholder responses: a) the importance of multiple leaders and

leadership, b) the influence of individuals including branding, and c) individuals as resources, or ability to access resources. There was little divergence within or between the stakeholder groups on the three main themes, and the themes in order of count were in the order above.

This question is one of a number of questions that specifically looks at leaders, leadership and networks as part of the overall innovation network. This includes the systems of innovation within which the innovation emerges and the diffusion of the innovation. Individuals that were identified were individuals in leadership positions, positions of influence or able to command attention of those with influence. Almost all of the stakeholders identified more than one leader and organization as being instrumental in, involved with or part of the social innovation. This supports research on social innovation evolving from multiple individuals (Howaldt & Schwartz 2010; Mumford, 2002) and innovation requiring collaborations and pluralistic leadership (Van de Ven, 2017).

The other two themes were the resource role of leaders, and the influence role of leaders, particularly as connectors or nodes within networks. The leadership role as a resource was primarily the ability of leaders to source finance either directly, or through social networks and connections. The themes of the leader as an influencer extended into the role of those individuals within the broader community as opinion leaders as part of the diffusion process. This included connecting with personal and professional networks, to draw influential individuals and peers as well as additional resources into the network. The networks and reservoir of social capital included being able to reach

out to a broad base of influential individuals for services beyond building the network to providing or sourcing resources.

Leaders within the network were utilized for gaining financial support or support in kind (such as television network, marketing, advertising). Sixteen individuals and seventeen organizations were regularly identified as being part of the leadership network. This aligns with the more collectivist leadership view, of a collective and expanded leadership network in action with multiple leadership roles and activities (Carter & De Church, 2012; Cullen & Yammarino, 2014). The leadership network was utilized in diffusing the innovation, providing broader resources, leveraging and connecting multiple actors in the social, economic, political, cultural systems within which the innovation emerges. This identifies multiple actual and potential roles and leadership functions supporting the management of the innovation process as well as multiple functions of the network.

Table 21 Barriers and Enablers to the Innovation Process (Question 6)

Long Questions		
Q6 What have been the barriers and enablers to the innovation process		
Theme	*Count*	*Definition and Quote*
Buy in and engagement		**The extent to which individual and organizations have bought into or engaged with Creative Oklahoma**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	6(5)	They have been very successful in reaching their target group….most people, probably the majority, have a stake in not changing things too radically, ….when people got into this I think it was fairly narrow minded self-interest
Commerce	7(5)	We can't get buy in from the government (and) it drives I think almost all of the decisions we make…. the challenge is going to be keeping the whole state engaged…..there hasn't been a lack of people that want to be supportive
Culture	4(4)	At different levels of education, not just university educators, they seen to have brought into the idea….many times I have just scratched my head, why aren't more people involved? …..the arts sector has been pretty hesitant and fearful to participate
Founding member	2(2)	There were some outsiders who got involved…..the engagement of government at all at many levels were, helped immensely
Identifying the value		**Understanding of the value of Creative Oklahoma, or the potential value at a personal, organizational or broader level**.

Education	9(7)	For success we have got to be able to make it more about how creativity increases the bottom line, that's a measure they understand, what they're focused on….you have to be able to demonstrate that this is an idea that becomes a concept, that becomes a reality… the challenge is how are we going to keep Creative Oklahoma relevant
Commerce	4(4)	The companies not getting it, not understanding the value
Culture	7(4)	People don't understand that the opportunities are there…..a lot of people want quick results and this, by its nature, the creativity movement is long term….from what's going on currently with our state government they don't care about arts communities and don't find it valuable
Founding member	0	
Communication		**Barriers and enablers around communication, including the message, the value, and the organization**
Education	7(5)	That's the key word, to discuss creativity or innovation is intangible to so many… they have been able to market their vision for their target group….understanding what creativity is, is one barrier
Commerce	8(6)	Our goals are so broad that no one can really buy in…business not really understanding….either we don't have a better grasp on what we are trying to accomplish or maybe it hasn't been well communicated to us what we're trying to do… it's hard to (go to people to) raise money when you can't give, concise, really clear, here's where we are, here's where we are going, and here's how you can be part of it
Culture	8(5)	Hurdles is in business just not really understanding… the arts group, been a little offended, that we think creativity is in everyone and not just them. …the barrier of communicating this broad mission of creativity exists everywhere….it's too amorphous….the name Creative Oklahoma hurts them, it captures what they are doing but when you don't put the word innovation with creativity people think it's for artists
Founding member	6(2)	How do you get people to understand the concept? …we don't have a 30 second elevator speech
Culture and norms		**The institutions (norms, culture, rules of the game) that support or block the innovation process**
Education	12(11)	Oklahomans like to stick to a very solid foundation of norms, it's really hard to get away from those…from a cultural standpoint, Oklahomans tend not to have much confidence in themselves….this region has been very resistant to change and diversity… its perceived as very backward, very conservative, not friendly to innovation or creativity
Commerce	9(5)	Old world thinking, institutional thinking…..the arts group has been a little offended that we think creativity is in everyone and not just them….the state has really had to overcome a negative image that Oklahoma people had of themselves…..the background in culture and norms that are mostly associated with foundations, fit very nicely with the arts community and education. There is a huge disconnect between the norms and culture of those agencies and business and commerce. … you still see some of that entrepreneurial spirit and the entrepreneurial zeal in the culture here
Culture	7(5)	There is an anti-intellectualism in Oklahoma…as a state we are just very conservative, we didn't used to be, we're founded on wildcatters……it's hard to do some of those more creative things because we just don't get it
Founding member	9(4)	People in Oklahoma are very creative, thinking outside the box, the entrepreneurial spirit in this state is remarkable….anybody who came to this state came here and took a risk, it's a positive trait to be willing to take a risk
Resources		**The types of resources and where the resources come from**
Education	10(8)	The players that are involved in Creative Oklahoma have big pockets, they want to be philanthropic…the biggest problem in the beginning was trying to

		garner financial support….there is always going to be resource issues in terms of how do we promote and how do we publicize and market….the political players are in place…economic barriers there was no money
Commerce	7(5)	(she/he) has a huge reservoir of social capital…why is it always about raising money
Culture	6(4)	She/he) always had really strong relationships with education, more so the arts….the obvious barrier there is one of funding….cutting back 3% of their funding, their donations, absolutely a barrier
Founding member	8(5)	The financial barrier…barriers frankly have been the money…donors are not excited about giving to an organization, they want to give to a cause…(he/she) has formed so many groups, and so many partnership and so many introductions
Leadership		**The role of or level engagement by leaders in the Creative Oklahoma initiative that support or hinder the innovation process**
Education	10(8)	People in key political positions have stepped forward…..occasionally our political leaders will use the work creativity or innovation but they don't know what they are talking about….(she/he is) a strong leader, … if you had attended one of the first meetings of the Oklahoma board you would have found a lot of people with important titles, that were there because the other people that had important titles were there and that was very important….. …
Commerce	6(4)	A leadership issue….get a board of people who are moneyed and have means/connection so that we can move this organization forward…..strong leadership is something that is at least helping this thing survive and grow…they are very powerful people that want this to happen
Culture	7(5)	New initiatives can be brought to political leaders pretty quickly…. a fear of people, academics or educated people are leading initiatives, it's sometimes suspect, in the broader community and that is a pretty big barrier…(their) personal charisma and leadership abilities keep a lot of us saying "I will continue supporting"
Founding member	9(6)	Along with (their) vision….(their) position in the community to reach people at high levels, opportunities for other very influential community member to have a piece of what this might look like going forward….who is also very well positioned politically and socially…..having support not only at the executive level of government, at all, at many levels were, helped immensely…we struggled to find the right leadership for the group
Inclusive vs exclusive		**The perception of what creates an in-group and outgroup, or what might differentiate between stakeholders being engaged or not engaged**
Education	5(4)	Oklahoma has a tendency to be divided economically by metro and rural and political…it has been people who are considered moneyed people and therefore it's a group outside of the reach of the norm of the general population
Commerce	5(2)	The challenge is going to be keeping the whole state engaged and not let it become an urban-rural situation…..as social dynamic, just people like to get together, social aspect to it 'cuase you want to be in a club, and the purpose of the club is to have a club
Culture	3(3)	The challenge is going to be trying to keep the whole state engaged and not let it become a rural-urban situation
Founding member	1	There is a huge difference between Oklahoma City and Tulsa, the further West you go, the more you are going to get this entrepreneurial spirit, if I can figure out a way of doing it I'll go out and do it you know

The question asked what were the barriers and enablers to the Creative Oklahoma initiative. This mapped to Research Question 4 and what limits or enhances

the success of the innovation and innovation network. The following themes were identified from the stakeholder responses: a) buy in and engagement of individuals and organizations, b) understanding the value, or potential value, of Creative Oklahoma at an individual, organizational or broader level, c) communication and understanding the purpose of Creative Oklahoma, and creativity, d) the culture and norms of Oklahoma, the climate (political, economic), e) resources, f) the role of leaders in the Creative Oklahoma initiative, and g) inclusive vs exclusive elements.

With a few exceptions, the themes were fairly evenly spread across the stakeholder groups and were recurring dominant themes throughout the questions. Within the stakeholder groups the count of the themes of the barriers and enablers to the social innovation initiative were as follows. Education identified impact of culture, resources and leadership. Commerce identified communication, impact of culture, resources and leadership. Culture identified communication, impact of culture, leadership and resources, and founding members identified leadership, resources and the impact of culture. Some themes did overlap, especially buy in, engagement and communication, where problems with perceiving value in the initiative was a recurring theme. The theme of culture (institutions) and the theme of perceptions of inclusive or exclusive nature of the social innovation and network could have been compressed into one theme, but were also split out for granularity.

Based on the count, the themes were in two main groups. In the first group, the predominant themes in order of the number of times the themes occurred were: the impact of the culture (norms, climate, political economic) on the innovation, the impact of resources, and the role of leadership and leadership engagement in the initiative. The

second group included: communication, and the barriers to the effectiveness of communicating the message, challenges with perception of the value of the initiative, buy in, and creativity, role of leadership and barriers to an inclusive innovation. The last theme in particular illustrated some of the deep divides that faced the region, and challenges facing the innovation in achieving a statewide innovation strategy. Despite having a low count, this theme could be an important barrier to the innovation. Themes where there is either a low count, no count, or even very high count of themes within the unit of analysis may or may not be representative of the stakeholder group. An example would be there were no responses from the founding members on understanding the value of the innovation as either a barrier or enabler to the innovation process. However, that has actually been a recurring theme throughout other questions, within communication, engagement and buy in, networks, leadership and events. Further research would be needed to clarify the importance attached to under or over representation of a theme.

The impact of culture (institutions) on the innovation process was both a barrier and an enabler. In systems of innovation, institutions (the norms, values, beliefs, climate, culture, polices, and procedures) within the social, political, economic and cultural contexts with which the innovation emerges, are critical variables that affect the relationships of the actors within the systems and block or support innovation (Edquist, 2006). Barriers included a general culture that was conservative, anti-intellectual, lacking diversity, highly independent and resistant to change. Interestingly there was also a longstanding lack of confidence and problem with overcoming a negative self-perception within the state as a whole. Conversely, the culture was seen as very creative

and entrepreneurial. Economic and political climate were identified as both barriers and enablers, as were actors or leaders, and the themes were tied to resources. Institutions working against creativity and innovation may have long term implications for the diffusion of an innovation focused on creativity. One of these that may be hard to change is the perception of creativity belonging to the artistic community.

The interview protocol included a specific question on resources needed for the innovation, and this was a recurring theme. Lack of financial resources was the main barrier, and social capital and networking connections were key enablers of the innovation. Leadership engagement and support from influential individuals across sectors and industries, as well as leadership networks were identified as enablers, “a lot of people with important titles were there, because the other people that had important titles were there”. This supports research on the role and value of elite support in innovation (Mumford & Moertl, 2003), the diffusion process (Rogers, 2003), and influence within networks (Nui, 2002). It also indicates some of the reasons individuals attach themselves to leadership networks. The regional culture was also identified as structured to allowed easy access to individuals and communication or dissemination of ideas, which is an enabler in the innovation process and the value of ties and networks (Borgatti & Halgin, 2011). Leaders and engagement overlapped with resources and buy in, but was identified as a separate theme.

The main barriers to the initiative being inclusive were the cultural and communication challengers of implementing a state-wide initiative where there was a rural-metro and East-West divide within the region. This also reflected the cultural norms of entrepreneurship and embracing change vs a conservative and unwilling to

change mind set in some subcultures. Another subtheme focused on actors rather than institutions. Stakeholders who were involved were seen as a group of "moneyed people" functioning as a social "club", which made the network unavailable to most of the "general population". This is a challenge facing the organization in developing the leadership network in the early stages of the innovation process. Targeting opinion leaders and those with a sphere of influence as part of building the depth and breadth of communication networks is critical to the diffusion process, but may leave other stakeholder groups being excluded. This may be contrary to many social innovations that are grass roots initiatives with a focus on inclusive social action (Moulaert, MacCallum & Hillier, 2013).

Communication barriers focused on problems of both explaining and understanding (encoding and decoding) the initiative. A recurring challenge was seen as "it's hard to explain" what creativity was, how it provided value and what the organization did. The problem of understanding the value of Creative Oklahoma and education about the initiative and/or targeting, is also a subtheme of communication. At the heart of the communication and lack of buy in and support was the fact that the creativity was not seen as having value, and part of that was the ambiguity of the concept. Furthermore, the message was not being communicated in a way that a culture that was naturally predisposed to being innovative but apathetic to creativity, would buy into the broader concept as a value proposition. This may be indicative of failure to gain and retain support, which Hazel and Onaga, (2003) found could cause initiatives to die away in the early stages of the innovation.

Barriers with the themes of engagement or buy in and understanding the value of the innovation were separated out as themes. Both themes overlapped with communication barriers, and included perceptions of general confusion and lack of clarity of the mission and understanding the value of creativity. Value, or perception of value, included not understanding the return on investment or potential benefit, as well as a general lack of value associated with the arts, especially by the government. This thread continued into buy in and engagement, with perception of 'creativity being a barrier' and "the name Creative Oklahoma hurts them, if you don't put the word innovation with creativity, people think it's for artists". Enablers included success in reaching the target audience, particularly in the education sector, through leveraging social capital and leadership networks. The challenge, having reached that influential audience, was the follow through. Leaders of the initiative need to have an understanding why or what individuals perceived as valuable and important (vested interest), and how to communicate effectively to those individuals.

From a diffusion perspective communication is critical, or as Rogers (2003) proposes, it is at the heart of the innovation process. Unless leaders can communicate the message, and educate others in their network on the value or potential value of the innovation, then it is hard for the innovation to gain traction. This maybe a challenge within a social, cultural political and economic context that does not see value in creativity, and where specific actors and norms may be a barrier to the innovation process. It is critical that opinion leaders within their own networks and in bridging networks can communicate the value, return on investment, the advantage of the innovation, and try to overcome the inherently conservative culture and strong

resistance to change. In an attempt to expand the network, the organization may also try to identify and connect with those entrepreneurs and potential champions who maybe outside of the homogeneous network, and focus on bringing them into the network to help grow the base.

Table 22 Creative Oklahoma in Other Sectors (Question 20)

Long Questions		
Q20 How did Creative Oklahoma emerge in different sectors, and what have been the barriers and enablers		
Theme	*Count*	*Definition and Quote*
Buy in or value		**Attitudes of different sectors, or actors within sectors to Creative Oklahoma to getting buy in, or seeing the value proposition**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	1	On the entrepreneurial side we had already gotten through most of the easy stuff, it wasn't like we need a new program
Commerce	3(2)	Art thinks it (creativity) is their domain; art thinks they own it anyway; it was also a funding challenge… business (is) why do I care, creativity, so what, innovation okay…..educators are more primed to understand the necessity of innovation
Culture	0	
Founding member	3(3)	They don't really see it, they don't see what is in it for them to be involved with the organization… there is a feeling of being threatened like "that's our space"….culture (are) so hungry for a way to get their message out, (and) they want to be (involved) because they get it
Leadership engagement		**The role of or level engagement by leaders in engaging with or understanding the importance of creativity**
Education	2(2)	the college and university presidents that have participated have made it a conscious effort to engage
Commerce	1	Its definitely emerged within education because of the leadership; these are deans of the colleges at several of our universities
Culture	1	They have been able to tap into a couple of university presidents which has come from the top
Founding member	1	In the beginning, it was college presidents
Communication or understanding		**Do people and organizations understand what creativity is, what Creative Oklahoma is**
Education	1	Creative Oklahoma is still not yet known well enough in the state to as to what it is, outside of the key people who are part of it…
Commerce	3(2)	Innovation that is where I can start to get it… the way it was communicated (to culture) cause that kind of blow back…;they don't need an organization to tell them how to be creative
Culture	0	
Founding member	1(2)	Commerce is less interested because they don't get it, they haven't gotten it yet…..we don't have to deal with that squirrely bird 'creativity' people get unhappy about it
Connections and networks		**Connections, networks and relationships, to include personal or professional**

Education	3(2)	Pretty much confined to that geographic area….they have been able to tap into a couple of university presidents….they've reciprocally said we'll give you our support
Commerce	1	Little bit of a silo
Culture	1	There were certain people who out of respect for what she did previously became involved with creative Oklahoma
Founding member	1	the commerce piece will take a lot of nurturing to keep it involved
Influence of organizations and people		**The extent to which organizations and individuals (actors) within sectors influence engagement**
Education	1	it has to come from the top
Commerce	1	Just the influence of A+ Schools and ACM had great influence on people …
Culture	1	They have been able to tap into a couple of university presidents
Founding member	2(2)	He had a following (of people)…in many ways it is still a Good Old Boys system within business, so until the CEOs or presidents recognize that value of that you will never get to their people

The question asked how Creative Oklahoma emerged in the different sectors and the barriers and enablers to the initiative. This mapped to Research Question 4, the barriers and enablers to the social innovation and social innovation network. The following themes were identified from the stakeholder responses: a) getting buy in and support for Creative Oklahoma, b) leadership engagement, c) the connection of innovation in commerce, d) personal and professional connections, and e) the extent to which organizations within sectors influenced engagement. There was very little difference in themes between the stakeholders. The low count of the themes indicated stakeholders had limited insight into what was happening in other sectors regards the diffusion of the innovation. This builds upon the themes of networks and the bridging role of leaders within the Creative Oklahoma social innovation network.

The main themes were role of leadership engagement, connections, and buy in. The cultural sector was seen as resisting the Creative Oklahoma initiative due to a sense of owning 'creativity' and fear of competition for funding. This was a recurring perception of the cultural sector across the stakeholder groups. As with other questions

and other stakeholder responses, innovation rather than creativity was the driver for commerce. Personal or professional connections were instrumental in gaining support and engagement, in particular the importance of connecting with leaders and influencers who can spread the message or take action in their domain. Also understanding, and tapping into the vested interest of the groups, and understanding the fears and reasons for resistance. The themes are valuable not so much by what they show but what they don't show. The lack of differentiation and information would indicate a gap to be explored. This is an area where leaders/opinion leaders in the innovation network need to go out and do some research to find out what the motivators are that would get other leaders vested in Creative Oklahoma.

Table 23 Support and Barriers for Creative Oklahoma (Question 22)

Long Questions		
Q22 What have been the main barriers and or enablers to the Oklahoma Creativity initiative in your sector and how were they overcome or capitalized on		
Theme	*Count*	*Definition and Quote*
Understanding the value of the innovation		**Individuals and organizations being able to understand or make a value connection between creativity, Creative Oklahoma and the benefit of involvement**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	9(7)	The enablers are, are, are people who become believers and who feel empowered to try to make something happen…. … some leaders just don't get it…. that has the title creativity uh and instructing people how to be creative, they would look at it a little cynically
Commerce	11(5)	Understanding how it all fits together and why creativity matters……. enablers are individuals, decision makers who get it who understand that value….. What benefit does it give my company? …….its always about what's my ROI, it always comes back to what can I get out of it
Culture	6(4)	The cultural organizations (for the most part) do not understand what this new organization is. They don't get it. They get the conference. They don't get the organization…… is the organization really creating some kind of deliverable? What is our deliverable that we can deliver, can we deliver it better than anybody else, or at least better than anybody else around here
Communication		**Being able to communicate the mission or message of Creative Oklahoma and explain creativity**
Education	2(2)	Creativity is not something you tell someone to go do once and they are going to do it. So I think you know so the barrier is communication and messaging

Commerce	8(6)	A lot of this has just been communication….. I think if we can come up with some concept that really gets the imagination of corporate types. That's a challenge to keep people engaged and interested… Well again, it is probably back to the being able to articulate in a mission statement
Culture	7(4)	Then I think because of the ambiguity of the language, and because it's an initiative that's broad and not certainly super tangible in the short term, I think people dismiss it pretty quickly....I think it is vastly confusing to a lot of people. I may be wrong, but that's the response I get
Perceptions of what creativity is		**Perceptions and understanding of what creativity is and who is creative, and what the value is**
Education	3(2)	Barriers have been people who are just having the conventional thinking who think creativity is for artists and nobody else….. what is its purpose why is there a need for this organization when we have other either arts organizations
Commerce	3(2)	People don't have any trouble understanding (the value of creativity in education)…everybody wants to be seen as an innovative creative organization, even if they don't believe that there's some direct benefit to their organization, a lot of them want to be associated with creativity….its in their incentives to be know as an innovative company (stocks and branding)
Culture	3(3)	I do think that affiliation with commerce is a challenge when in intersection with purist, fine artists. I mean that that language of art as instrumentation for economic development or creativity as an instrument for economic develop is a real hindrance for a lot of people in the arts…….. what do you mean it's Creative Oklahoma, they're calling themselves that but we are the ones in the creative field, who are they
Resources		**The resources such as financial or personnel to be able to get support, or believing that Creative Oklahoma should be a resource**
Education	5(5)	They discuss money in this sector in this region this area, as the excuse for not being able to develop or grow or to expand and just trying to introduce….. the biggest trouble with us interfacing with anyone, is understanding who's the first person you call if you want to engage with the university at any level….the enablers are people who become believers….I see individuals as enablers
Commerce	3(3)	The biggest barrier is lack of funds and the fact that Creative Oklahoma was emerging when the recession hit… .they have got to get funding somehow…a lot of musical types believe that an organization like Creative Oklahoma should be paying them for something
Culture	3(2)	I think the barriers begin with the recession that we experienced at the time we were becoming involved with Creative Oklahoma and the lack of resources – it was more really the perceived lack of resources…because they put a lot of resources into it (Creative Oklahoma)…there is suspicion, dollars are too hard to come by
Audience		**Who has been the target audience, who needs to be an audience including engagement of involvement of leadership and the impact of the audience**
Education	5(4)	I think there are some personality players… they need to get more of those universities engaged, because the reality is those universities are the places through which will come the future leaders of Oklahoma, the leaders of commerce, of education, of culture in a sense…. They're being adopted more by certain universities that you now see in the leadership roles within it
Commerce	5(3)	Creative Oklahoma has a real issue with creatives …the barrier is finding out who the stakeholder are and who really cares about creativity and innovation...figure out a way for young people to embrace ….the majority of people involved in the board are educators or tied to education
Culture	1	I mean Tulsa was very resistant to it from the beginning because it came out of Oklahoma City

Norms, values, culture		**Institutions - cultural norms, values, beliefs that are seen as barriers or enablers to the innovation process**
Education	8(5)	The traditions and the bigotry…some others within this community perhaps are not, perhaps they've still got this 'well I don't need to be told how to be creative, I am creative, yeah, what do I need that for?'….sometimes our creativity is channeled in ways that don't make us an attractive place for businesses to move to…..this is a very religious state
Commerce	6(3)	The political philosophy of our current leadership which is fiscal conservatism and austerity…... lack of political savvy…… inertia, trying to overcome the way we have always done things… people who just are stubborn and not willing to change or try anything different…the recession….people having conventional thinking that creativity is for artists and nobody else
Culture	4(3)	It's foreign to them because, that was the weirdo Uncle Al that used to try to something… it's a fear of not understanding, because they weren't brought up to experience and know and have it …we are not all white Anglo Saxon Protestants….the artistic community had a certain perception
Networks and Connections		**The importance of networks, relationships and connections in the innovation**
Education	5(2)	Those who believe politically it is in their best interest to get connected with them or not…people are going to ask well whose involved….some people are driven by personal growth personal gain (and) they can be (part of) the spread of the network, which is absolutely crucial to Creative Oklahoma
Commerce	2(2)	They don't know what the other ones should be doing in the relationship …reservoir of social capital
Culture	2(1)	The barriers have been the long distance because they're in Oklahoma City…I do feel a little disconnected at times

The question asked what were the barriers and enablers to the Creative Oklahoma initiative in the stakeholders' own sector. This mapped to Research Question 1 and what motivated individuals to become involved with the social innovation and the social innovation network. The following themes were identified from the stakeholder responses: a) understanding the value of creativity and Creative Oklahoma, b) being able to communicate the message or mission, c) perceptions of what creativity is, d) resources such as financial or personnel, e) the audience that have been targeted and who needs to be targeted, f) the culture, norms, values and beliefs (institutions) and, g) the networks and connections. This question was one of three questions that focused on exploring perceptions on the barriers and enablers to the social innovation diffusion.

The themes confirmed consistent threads running through the interview protocol responses.

The predominant focus of the themes was around communication (value, perception, audience, networks, and institutions), and resources, specifically financial. The three main barriers and enablers were seen as the value of the social initiative, communication and culture (institutions). The first two overlapped slightly, and in both of those themes there was a slight increase in the number of responses from the commerce stakeholders. Barriers arising from perception of creativity also overlapped with value and communication, and provided detail on institutional barriers, conventional mindset, associations and understanding value.

The themes tied to diffusion of innovation (Rogers, 2003), vested interest (Crano, 1995a) and systems of innovation (Edquist, 2006). Where communication is central to diffusion, the organization relies upon leveraging networks to engage opinion leaders in educating individuals or organizations about creativity, the value of creativity and Creative Oklahoma within their own sectors and networks. In managing the innovation process, those individuals and organizations need to understand the value or benefit of both creativity and the social innovation. Unless the message is understood and resonates, then it is difficult for leaders who are not yet engaged in the innovation network to see the value or benefit of the innovation or innovation network.

From a systems of innovation perspective, the barriers and enablers – the culture, the individuals, the relationships, social capital, resources, norms will be specific to Oklahoma and the context with in which Creative Oklahoma operates. If creativity is understood to mean a certain thing within a social context then it becomes

more complex to form a message in a way that changes the cultural mindset and perceptions of what creativity is, and what value it may have within the context and to individual actors.

The following questions focus on the environments including opportunities for innovation.

Table 24 Sector and Organization Characteristics (Question 7)

Long Questions		
Q7 Thinking about the environment that you operate in. How would you describe your industry or business sector, how would you describe your organization and how would you describe your individual characteristics		
Theme	*Count*	*Definition and Quote*
Changing industry		**The industry and environment is changing**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	20(9)	Going through transitioning and transformation ….there are too many who cannot move beyond that overarching concept of change….education absolutely must reform, it must change,….vast change….it is an organization adapting to the changes ……we are struggling to figure out how we keep going…. very unstable
Commerce	11(4)	There is a paradigm shift going on ..shifting playing field all the time…environment is changing all the time…. dynamic….the bleeding edge…fast moving..…it has changed radically
Culture	9(6)	It is dynamic and constantly changing…it's rapidly moving and innovating and changing...anything can happen here… …the broad environment has changed, fortunately we had a head start
Highly competitive		**The industry and or organization are highly competitive**
Education	4(4)	Trying to keep up with what the rest of the world is doing…..it's pretty hungry…. its recognizing that is order to survive we have to be more aggressive
Commerce	8(4)	As an industry we need to figure how to take advantage of what is going on…..ultra competitive…..if we are standing still we are going to be run over……definitely high risk….hyper competitive
Culture	10(5)	You have to build your support…we all cross promote….I feel like they (arts community) work together a lot more…there are only so many governmental commissions in public art so it's very competitive in that sense…. …how can I differentiate….there was a real competition for dollars but for some reason in our community you saw a desire to collaborate…
Innovation and creativity		**The importance of innovation, creativity, and new ideas in the industry**
Education	14(8)	In order to survive we've go to be more aggressive and do different things …….the creativity started at the leadership level the capacity to try new things……the vision was to make our university a destination through creativity and innovation. … I am trying to create a climate of innovation.
Commerce	8(4)	Where innovation and creativity become much more essential …constantly searching for better ways….tends to be a fairly creative group because you need to find creative ways to sell our communities ….bleeding edge….entrepreneur…… we really kind of pioneered this is our own industry

Culture	8(5)	It's exciting, innovative and creative…it has left us very nimble to be able to change the way we work, or who we work with……we are very cutting edge….I feel our artists are doing some interesting things
Leadership		**The role or roles of leaders and leadership**
Education	3(3)	Creativity started at the leadership level….(he/she) allowed people to be creative … the president is acutely aware of the need for change….leadership is not command and control it is climate control
Commerce	2(2)	Our CEO and executives saying that if we are standing still we are going to be run over….I am an entrepreneur, a leader
Culture	3(3)	Leadership is pretty fluid…the governor at that time wanted…strong vision of where they want to go

The question asked about the environment within which the different sectors operated, to describe the industry, organization and sector characteristics. This mapped to Research Question 1, and stakeholder motivations to engage with the social innovation and social innovation network. The following themes were identified from the stakeholder responses: a) the changing nature of the industry and environment, b) highly competitive nature of industry and organization, c) the importance of innovation and creativity, and c) the role or roles of leaders.

The themes were the same across the three stakeholder groups and the three dominant and connecting themes were, dynamic environments, competitive environments, and importance of innovation. There was a difference in emphasis with culture stakeholders which has emerged in other themes, and that is collaboration. In talking about the environment, the cultural stakeholders identified collaboration and partnership more than competition. This is despite comments on the highly competitive nature of sourcing funding with limited public and private sector grants and sponsorships. This view could be due to the specific perceptions of individuals in that sample, or the sector in general.

Changing industry and environment was the predominant theme for all three stakeholder groups. The language was slightly different in the commerce stakeholder

group, with “bleeding edge” and “paradigm shift” versus “unstable” and “reform" used in commerce and education respectively. The use of words leading to the themes could be sector specific. All three stakeholder groups identified the systems within which they were operating as being “dynamic” and “changing”. The contexts were highly competitive whether in terms of business or funding, and all sectors identified the need for innovation and creativity to survive and prosper. The themes in this section connected to the vested interest questions in the protocol, exploring ‘stake’, or degree to which individuals have a vested interest in innovation and potential interest in a social innovation network. Understanding the environmental context, provides the change agents and innovation leaders with insight into challenges facing leaders who are currently in the network, as well as those who may be future targets.

Leaders identified themselves as being resourceful, energetic, and creative, which would support actively seeking network engagement that would provide value in furthering social capital and broader organizational needs. The demographic questions identified the interviewees as identifying themselves and being identified by others as leaders, experts in their arena, having influence, which from a diffusion of innovation lens is critical to the communication network function (Larsen, 2011).

Table 25 The Importance of Innovation (Question 8)

Long Questions		
Q8 How important is innovation in your sector, where does it manifest		
Theme	*Count*	*Definition and Quote*
Changing environments		**Change as part of the environment, including innovation being driven by, or driving change**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	6(6)	Innovation is really the seed of any positive economic outlook or change…. the pace of change is so fast….in the midst of a really profound transformation….. so it required moving in an innovation direction
Commerce	6 (5)	It comes from a need, a need to change…..the digital world is changing everything, we have to embrace it….we have to adapt and change ….innovation is

		in the keystone to the economy because everything changes….an unwillingness to accept the status quo or decline
Culture	6(6)	We have had to adapt in ways that are very innovative….if they continue to grow and reinvent themselves….what can I do to change that if I feel it needs to change….to push past stasis…..to be relevant (it) has to be innovative
Roots of innovation		**What are the drivers of innovation or**
Education	5 (5)	Where we see the most innovation is figuring out you have a raw product (and) how to get it to the market place…technology (innovation) comes from the labs…..it is our mission…..(innovation) comes from the community colleges that are more resourceful and creative than research universities because they struggle to survive
Commerce	10(5)	Comes from curiosity…..on the art side it comes from people just driven to it …it comes from a problem….innovation must occur because something new has to be created….we are not afraid to try things and we pioneered….times were tough a few years ago
Culture	4(4)	It comes from curiosity….good conversations with diverse types of people…. interacting with people….they feel like compelled from deep within to explore
Competition and business survival		**The competitive nature of the environment within which the organizations operate and the need to innovate to survive and grow**
Education	8(5)	We've got to innovate to survive…innovation is not an option it is a requirements….if we do not compete in innovation we have no service or product to offer to maintain the economic position….we are hungrier than they are…..
Commerce	7(5)	It's a very competitive space… innovation must occur because something new has to be created…. it is important for survival at the basic level we have to adapt and change
Culture	2(2)	If they continue to grow and reinvent themselves it will succeed, if they don't you know it will go away….we can't be creating art in the same way we did in the last 50 years (because)everything else is moving
Culture or environment		**The characteristics of the culture, climate and environment that support or block innovation**
Education	4(4)	People are encouraged to try new things even if they don't work…..an environment where there is openness, where there is not fear of failure….you develop a culture of creativity that allows innovation
Commerce	4(4)	We are not afraid to try new things….figure out new ways to do things .. not very innovative or creative...being in a culture of (organization) wanting ideas and expecting ideas
Culture	4(4)	We need to always look at the new…it is not static (the environment)…we've had to adapt in ways that are very innovative if we want to maintain traditional values….all artists have a need to communicate
Innovation arising out of a need		**Innovation driving or being driven by an internal or external need, challenge or problem**
Education	3(3)	Innovation is really the seed of any kind of positive economic development; every job we have exists because of it….workforce demand is looking for…I was tired of glass ceilings
Commerce	5(4)	(innovation) manifest itself when times were tough; It comes out of a need a need for change; it comes from a need …something new has to be created that is better than what existed previously
Culture	2(2)	We always need to look at the new…(the new) is what gets people excited, that is what gets their attention

The question asked about the importance of innovation and mapped to Research Question 1 and stakeholder motivations to engage with the social innovation and the

social innovation network. The following themes were identified from the stakeholder responses: a) changing environments with innovation driving or being driven by change, b) the roots or drivers of innovation, c) competition and business survival and the need for innovation, d) the effect of the climate or environment supporting innovation, and e) innovation arising out of a need. The themes were very close and could have been compressed, but instead were split out to try to get more granularity.

With respects to Research Question 5 there not a great deal of divergence between the stakeholder groups in count of themes, or the actual theme count themselves. Education had a slightly lower frequency of themes overall. Culture had a lower response on the theme of competition, which has been consistent in other questions, and on innovation arising out of a need. That could be based on sector specific language and terminology. This could reflect differences between the private sector, public sector and nonprofit cultures, and how different sectors regard competition and business survival, what it looks like, and how it is articulated. The word 'need' in the cultural community may have a different emphasis. An artist who is driven "from deep within to explore" may not consider that as a 'need' but a passion. Likewise, a social innovation mission may have community needs at the heart of the organizational vision, but express that with different terminology.

The overall turbulent and dynamic contexts were reflective of what Schumpeter (1934) and Christensen (2011) call 'disruptive innovation'. This also reflects the complex, chaotic and uncertain innovation management journey identified by Van de Ven (2017) and Van de Ven, Pooley, Garud and Venkataraman, (2008). The main innovation themes were changing environments, competition and survival, the roots of

innovation, and the culture or environment. Innovation was driven by the changing environment, and need to remain competitive and survive in a business context. Change and the need to change encompassed organizations, sectors, the broader environment and systems, and included being “in the midst of profound transformation”, “we have to adapt and change”, “or “change is the only constant”. This overlapped into innovation and survival, and was identified as “it’s a very competitive space” and “we’ve got to innovate to survive”. There was some slight difference in the theme responses, but with closer inspection (and additional research) the differences could be interpreted as similarities. Education identified research, technology and commercialization, smaller more flexible education establishments, and the purpose of the organization as the roots or drivers of innovation. Commerce and culture saw drivers of innovation as being curiosity, as well as challenges, and entrepreneurship. The themes are very similar, but the articulation and choice of words is different, for instance, research can come from curiosity and a desire to know.

The themes in this question also connect to vested interest or importance and value (Lehman & Crano, 2001), as well as diffusion, with motivational drivers including ‘fit’ of the innovation (Rogers, 2003). From a systems of innovation perspective, the stakeholders or ‘actors’ identified culture and climate as some of the institutional elements affecting the innovation process within their industries. The other ‘institutional’ variables included the impact of economic, social, political and cultural systems within which innovation emerges. While the social innovation network is focused on creativity, the systems within which the stakeholders are operating may have

deeper ties to technology, and regional systems where technology and research may be driving innovation (Lundvall, 2010; Nelson, 1993)

The questions were designed to build clusters of questions that could examine a topic from slightly different perspectives. This was to triangulate and to see if themes emerged across the questions, and if there was constancy with the themes (Yin, 2014). This question and the themes built onto and explored themes that came out of asking stakeholders about their environment, and link to the next question about the actors who drive innovation and how to they influence innovation. Stakeholder vested interest in innovation is addressed separately in the third section of the interview protocol.

Table 26 Key Organizations and People Driving Innovation (Question 9)

Long Questions		
Q9 What or who are the key organizations or people in your sector who influence innovation drive or change and how do they influence.		
Theme	*Count*	*Definition and Quote*
Leadership		**Individuals within an organization or within an industry, what they do and how they influence**
	Count	*Quote*
Education	22(10)	They (university presidents).. they're able to raise greater money because people have the confidence that they're going to do the right things with it…any of the leadership areas are key, any of them can frustrate and kill off.. ….it's got to come from the top….. strong president that has a very clear vision
Commerce	5(5)	He is certainly a leader…he's got the business background and credibility…able to stir an emotion, show relevance;…it's from a leadership strata….it's strata that is high enough to be able to make decisions
Culture	8(5)	Key people are all leadership people….it really takes a very sophisticated artistic vision and concept and ability to lead people to make them excited about their vision
Technology		**The role of technology in driving change or innovation, or supporting innovation**
Education	1	In our sector it is through (research and) what we call the technology transfer, which means taking research into the commercial sector
Commerce	2(2)	The catalyst is technology…most of the technologies that actually end up succeeding are starting out with scientific environments in university laboratories
Culture	0	
Research		**Innovation from research including individuals and organizations**
Education	5(3)	The research organizations drive innovation through their research….university research is the vehicle for economic advancement and so on
Commerce	3(3)	It is usually defined by research, whether psychological research, data driven market kind of research… university laboratories

Culture	0	
Competition		**The role of competition driving innovation**
Education	2(1)	A lot of the initiatives that are going on in higher education as it related to creativity and innovation connection comes through competitive nature of the universities….we drive innovation through partnering with people who have challenges or problems
Commerce	2(2)	Competition itself influences innovation and change….if we aren't continually looking for better ways and more innovative ways of doing what we do then our competitors are probably going to figure it out first
Culture	1	One way is forming unique partnerships
Individuals		**Individual people, individual organizations, coming from a single source**
Education	3(3)	Some of it has to do with the mission of the university….
Commerce	7(5)	It always starts with the artist…it is individuals…people on the margins, they trying things that are a little risky
Culture	7(5)	I think Tribes who are doing new things open up a good deal….its the universities…..higher education certainly has that role…...(the) "why can't we people"…..going back to the key artists, they all think outside the box
Culture and climate		**The importance of culture, norms, policies and climate (institutions)**
Education	9(4)	You cannot be innovative through legislation because all you are doing is creating compliance issues
Commerce	2(3)	The economy drives change, regulators force change
Culture	1	The arts community itself, what is cutting edge this year is going to be so different in three months
Collaboration		**The role or importance of partnerships and collaboration in innovation**
Education	6(4)	A coalition of people….we drive innovation by partnering with people…tapping into that network that is already there and helloing that expand
Commerce	4(2)	He has an unbelievable ability to connect with people (and) open doors to both opportunities but also to their organizations….it's a mix of people
Culture	6(5)	Some of it is cross sector…there are some key cultural institutions that are really good at documenting their work and distributing it…connected the government with the community and the grass roots with the bureaucracy

The question asked about the key organizations or individuals in the sectors who influence innovation and drive change and mapped to Research Question 4, the limits and enablers of the innovation and the innovation network. The following themes were identified from the stakeholder responses: a) leadership influence on innovation, b) technology and innovation, c) the role of research, d) competition affecting innovation, e) collaboration and partnerships affecting innovation, f) individuals and organizations influencing innovation, and g) the culture, climate and environment affecting innovation. With respects to Research Question 5 there was not a great deal of difference between the stakeholder responses. The low theme counts were low across

the units of analysis, and the higher counts were fairly uniform across the groups. Education had a higher count for the leadership theme than individuals theme, while commerce and culture were about the same for both themes. This was the highest count for all the stakeholder groups.

The main themes were leadership and individuals as drivers of innovation and change. These two themes could have been compressed. However, they were split out as there was a slightly different focus in responses overall, as well as between the stakeholders as to how and what influenced the organization or sector. The education stakeholders saw leaders and those in a leadership as the primary driver of change, while commerce and culture saw individuals (who could be leaders, but not specifically named as so) and organizations as driving change. Supporting this theme was the collaboration, or partnership between entities as a driver of innovation. The focus on leadership and leaders could be because of the number of universities in the state as well as in the sampling frame and differences of how leaders are perceived. In particular, the position of influence or prestige held by university presidents within the education network, versus the structures and networks within the cultural or commercial sector where a leader such as a CEO may move across industries and networks and have a different attachment and name.

Within the three stakeholder groups the themes around leadership, individuals and collaboration, were similar. The role of leaders and individuals was identified as being able to articulate a vision for change, being able to influence others and give permission for new ideas, and was the same across all three stakeholder groups. Education and commerce noted research (knowledge and new ideas) as a driver of

change, with research coming from universities and also from conducting market research. While not expressly mentioned, the impetus for change and innovation in culture might occur at the product or service level driven by the individual artist. It might also occur as social innovation through the mission of the cultural organization. Education as important in driving change was mentioned by all the stakeholder groups.

Building on the previous questions, the theme of individuals and organizations driving innovation highlights the role of actors within the sectors who are perceived as having influence. This overlaps with the theories of diffusion, leadership networks and the complex role of leaders, and systems of innovation. From a diffusion perspective is it how innovation spreads through opinion leaders with influence within networks (Rogers, 2003; Young, 2011). From a social network and collaborative leadership perspective, the role of the actors within the networks, forming partnerships and collaborations as well as utilizing networks for resources such as funding to build the network and social capital of the network. From a systems of innovation perspective (Edquist, 2006), the actors and institutions and relationships between them were identified as critical factors in driving innovation.

The actors were identified as individuals, and either leaders in general or with specific roles such as university presidents, who regardless of position had influence on innovation. This influence ranged from acting as a barrier to "frustrate and kill off" innovation, to enabling innovation through support, including having "a very clear vision", and acting as resources to raise money. The institutions ranged from "economy driving change", to technology, competition, change and policy challenges where "you

cannot be innovative through legislation, because all you are doing is creating compliance issues".

The key summary of the findings from the main protocol questions are below.

Table 27 Main Questions Combined Themes

Research Question 1	Research Question 2	Research Question 3	Research Question 4
Motivation to join social innovation and network	*Motivation to stay in social innovation and network*	*Perceived success and gaps of social innovation/network*	*Enablers and barriers to the social innovation/network*
Q1 networking, personal, business, organizational, creative people,(economic dev. human capital, altruistic),	Q2 communication: lack of clarity, targeted, scope (range limitations), leadership focus, personal contact, events, resources, mass communication	Q3 branding, change agent, awareness, educating, resources, event management, connection with leaders	Q6 support, perception of value communication effectiveness, culture resources, leadership buy in, inclusive vs exclusive.
Q7 changing environment, innovation, competition/competitive, leadership	Q5 actors, leadership, leadership resources, individual resources	Q4 awareness, resource, events, networking, connections with creatives, influence/advocate	Q20 lack of crossover, support/buy in, leadership engagement, perception of value, communication & understanding, connections & networking, influence,
Q8 changing industry environment, highly competitive/competition, culture/environment, innovation need	Q12 resources, financial, support/buy in, human capital, leadership, culture, time	Q15 connections with leaders, cross sector networking.	Q22 perception/understanding of value (creativity and organization) , communication, understanding , resources, audience, culture, networks
Q17 networking, personal, business, creative people, altruistic	Q14 new knowledge/ideas (bus survival, bus sector, competition, networking, environment, awareness)	Q19 networking and potential connections, awareness and branding	Q9 leadership, research, technology, competition, collaboration, individuals, culture/climate
Q21 creativity defined (new ideas, problem solving, process, new way of thinking, climate, skills, value, ambiguous)	Q18 networking, personal, business, creative people, new knowledge/ideas, resources, reputation/image, altruistic		Q13 culture, resources, leadership, regulations, environment
Q24 creativity human capital, econ.dev. branding, business opportunity)	Q23 networks, leadership networks, network function/role, scope, value, resources, dynamic nature		Q16 Innovation location, cross sector engagement role of leaders driving innovation, network and innovation
Q25 entrepreneur as business, need, gap, trait, inclusive, environment)			

There were a number of questions in the protocol that looked at innovation and the drivers of innovation, as well as the benefit and value of the social innovation and social innovation network. The short question vested interest questions triangulate with the second part of the interview protocol long form questions in the previous section.

Vested Interest

The final five questions focused specifically on 'vested interest'. Understanding 'stake', and the perceived importance and value of innovation to the stakeholders, helps

to predict the attitude-behavior-consistency (A-B-C) (Crano, 1995a; Crano, 1995b). This third section of the interview protocol triangulated with questions on motivation and benefit of the social innovation. It also related to stakeholder environment, communication, barriers and enablers, the success of the innovation and cross sector engagement. This section is also mapped to the five research questions: motivations to engage with social innovation networks, what was perceived as critical to maintain that social innovation network, where the social innovation is perceived to be successful or unsuccessful, the limitations and the potential and finally, the differences and similarities of concerns and perceptions across the four stakeholder groups.

The questions looked at the stake or importance of innovation, to the individual, their organization and association with Creative Oklahoma. Each block of questions addressed one element of vested interest. The five sections addressed the following: awareness or salience of innovation, immediacy of innovation, probability of innovation occurring, ability to affect innovation and finally vulnerability or risk of not innovating. The individuals were asked to provide a brief sentence or few words to explain their perspective. The responses across the four stakeholder groups were very similar, including different responses within the stakeholder groups. The responses also provided triangulation the groups of questions in the demographic and long response questions underpinning the importance of vested interest in understanding the attitude-behavior-consistency (A-B-C) as part of diffusion of social innovation.

Table 28 Vested Interest and Salience (Question 29)

Vested Interest
Q 29 Awareness of innovation: (salience) Scale is 1 = low - 7 = very high
Personal, organizational and sector
A How often is innovation on the agenda /how often is it discussed in your organization(sector)

	Education	Commerce	Culture	Founding member
Quote	We thrive on the culture of innovation here	It's discussed always	Constant discussion	All the time
B How concerned are you about the need for innovation				
Quote	I'm very, very bullish on innovation	Extremely concerned. It is like breathing	Extremely	Extremely. There is no progress if we don't innovate
Creative Oklahoma				
C How topical is the Creative Oklahoma initiative (as part of innovation)?				
Quote	Not that often	Frankly not very	Very little. There's not necessarily a connection	Pretty low
D How much are policy makers talking about/aware of the Creative Oklahoma initiative				
Quote	Not much. Its, its, it's got the ear of very important people but	Very little, most policymakers are just very confused by it	In certain circles	I do not think the policy makers are particularly focused on this concept
E How much are people in the community talking about/aware of the Creative Oklahoma initiative				
Quote	I think there are some subsets of the people in the community who talk about it a lot	It's not catching fire, it's not inspiring people	Not enough people know	Does the average Oklahoman know anything about it? The answer is probably no
F How much are people in education, commerce and culture sectors/organizations talking about (how aware)				
In the education sector				
Quote	Hot topic in education	Education would be definitely the best about it There are hotspots	Mostly in education (Creative Oklahoma) has developed very strong ties in that community	Education would be high. The education committee and how their networks are keyed into that
In the commerce sector				
Quote	Talking about innovation not necessarily thinking about Creative Oklahoma	The business sector is probably aware of it. Starting to see more and more commerce	That's probably lower 'cause it's so broad. commerce less	It's pretty low
In the culture sector				
Quote	I think it's more applied to particular things rather than a creativity movement. Culture, and the Chickasaw Nation is big in it	In the culture sectors they're always talking about creativity, but I don't know that they're talking about Creative Oklahoma	Culture has noticed it for sure. the Native American community	There are different groups and it's harder to define that audience

This group of questions focused on perceptions of awareness or salience of innovation and awareness of the regional social innovation initiative. In response to

Research Question 5 the themes were consistent across all four stakeholder groups. The questions asked about individual and organizational awareness about innovation and level of community awareness about the social innovation. There was a distinct difference between awareness and importance of innovation at personal and organizational level, versus awareness and importance of the Creative Oklahoma social innovation creativity initiative in general. This was a common theme throughout the vested interest questions, and could indicate a lack of travel of the social innovation from a diffusion perspective. The other disconnects were how innovation and creativity are seen to have value, the range of influence of the leadership network, and communication about the innovation. These themes mapped to Research Question 1 which focused on motivations to engage with social innovation networks and Research Question 2 and what was perceived as critical to maintain that social innovation network.

Awareness of innovation (salience) at the individual and organizational level was very high, as in "it is discussed all the time" and individuals are "extremely" concerned about innovation. Conversely, the perception of potential stake and awareness of the social innovation initiative within the organization and broader community was perceived as low; "it's not catching fire, it's not inspiring people", which indicated the innovation was not travelling. There was a sense of awareness about Creative Oklahoma being "in certain circles', with the education sector as being more aware with "hot spots". This confirmed the themes such as awareness in the main interview protocol, where a role or function of the social innovation network was raising awareness, but that the awareness was limited.

Social innovation is slow to diffuse throughout the social context as noted by Rogers, (1995) and Mumford, (2002). The connection was not being made on a grand scale between the initiative and potential stakeholders, with people outside of the leadership group having little awareness of the innovation. The early roots in education and engagement of the education sector, had resulted in more awareness in that sector than elsewhere. When combined with an intangible concept like creativity that is hard to define and explain, the process could take longer. The salience of innovation at the individual and organizational level indicated that Creative Oklahoma had targeted individuals who were motivated by, or had vested interest in innovation. Therefore innovation, rather than creativity, has a high value and importance. Individuals join and remain in networks for a number of reasons, and it is possible that stake in the social innovation might the reside in a range of variables of which innovation is one.

Table 29 Vested Interest and Immediacy (Question 30)

Vested Interest				
Q 30 How often innovation occurs: Scale is 1 = low - 7 = very high				
Personal, organizational and sector				
A How often does innovation occur (do products and processes change)				
	Education	Commerce	Culture	Founding member
Quote	We are seeing that all the time	All the time	We are constantly looking for new ways	Appears all the time
B How long do you think it will be before new innovations/innovative ideas emerge in your organization or sector Scale is 7 =within 3 months 1 = after two years				
Quote	Happening all the time in various places and various universities Monthly to yearly and spotty	Tt's a constant; and it's a daily thing	They're constantly thinking about things, coming up with new ideas	In my sector, they are on the table all the time
C Do you anticipate results will be in the near future or in the distant Scale is 7 =within 3 months 1 = after two years				
Quote	Right now and in the future	There is an immediate impact	There's long term and short term	Both

	Some innovative ideas that we can implement in three months and some might take five years	We move quickly, it sometimes takes a year or two for an idea to implement	Almost immediately. it's going to take us awhile to adapt	It takes time to find out if that's working or not
Creative Oklahoma				
D How long do you think it will be before new innovations/innovative ideas emerge from affiliation with Creative Oklahoma Scale is 7 =within 3 months 1 = after two years				
Quote	New ideas are coming all the time Long term. It's a slow process	Results soon Very long term There are some that happened quick but I would say the most important ones probably take a little time	Future	It comes in fits and starts there is no lack of new ideas there is a percolation period that needs that time
E Thinking about the association with Creative Oklahoma are you anticipating results will come soon (short term) or will come in the future (long term) Scale is 7 =within 3 months 1 = after two years				
Quote	Long term	The results are going to take longer It's still going to be both	Short and long	Both, because there are immediate results. Deeper more systemic results will come in the long term

The block of questions focused on the immediacy of innovation or how often innovation occurs within the sector or organization and from association with Creative Oklahoma. The responses were uniform across the stakeholder groups. Innovation and new ideas occurred all the time, and results were identified as being both short and long term. This would seem to be logical, when thinking about different types of innovation, the process, and resources required. Some innovations are easier and quicker than others to bring to fruition. The association with the social innovation network was identified as beneficial with stakeholders optimistic that results would happen in the long term. Innovation takes a long time from incubation through to diffusion (Rogers, 2004), and social innovation can take longer because of the larger number of actors involved (Mumford & Moertl, 2003).

This group of questions, and the leaders clearly invested in innovation and confident that innovation will occur, mapped to three of the research questions. Research Question 1, and the motivation to become engaged with the innovation network which would be high vested interest in innovation and confidence of innovation occurring at some point through association with Creative Oklahoma. Research Question 2, the motivation to remain engaged is based upon confidence that there will be results from the social innovation and payoff from a long-term investment in the network. Finally, Research Question 3, the perceptions of success of the social innovation network based upon the confidence that the social innovation network will bring benefit, even if it is long term. The motivation to engage and remain engaged with the innovation and innovation network could be based on a number of reasons besides innovation. There are many reasons why individuals join networks, some of the reasons that have emerged include prior connection, potential new connections, new partnerships, ideas or innovation and now the opportunity for a payoff even if it is a long-term option.

Table 30 Vested Interest and Probability (Question 31)

Vested Interest				
Q 31 Probability of innovation occurring: Scale is 1 = low - 7 = very high				
Personal, organizational and sector				
A How likely is it that innovation leads to competitive advantage in your sector				
	Education	Commerce	Culture	Founding member
Quote	Highly likely. if you don't innovate you're obsolete	Extremely likely If you don't innovate, then you disappear	Highly likely Need to differentiate	Totally
B How likely is innovation to occur in your sector				
Quote	High likely	It's innovate or die, so highly likely	We have to Highly likely	Highly likely
C How certain are you that innovation is a factor positive outcome or success				
Quote	It's a huge factor in success.	A primary factor highly certain	Highly certain.	Highly certain

	Organism has to grow or die, and you're not going to grow without innovation	I don't understand how you can be successful without innovation	Innovation is necessary You learn something	Nothing positive happens without innovation.
D How certain are you that lack of innovation is a factor in negative outcomes				
Quote	Highly likely If you don't continue to innovate, you will die I have departments who refuse to change, and they're going down the tube	Highly certain If you do the same thing you've always done you're gonna die	Highly certain A lack of innovation keeps you stagnant	Highly certain Stagnation
Creative Oklahoma				
E In terms of new knowledge, new ideas, new relationships, innovation, how confident are you that involvement with Creative Oklahoma could bring benefits				
Quote	Extremely confident, they have a lot of potential Surrounding yourself with people who are very positive about the power of creativity and innovation (does) rub off on you	Pretty highly confident There's definitely benefits they're just hard to quantify	I'm highly confident Any type of creative process or introduction (they're providing) could only be beneficial	Highly confident I've seen the evidence
F What is the probability of new innovations/innovative ideas emerging from affiliation with Creative Oklahoma				
In the education sector				
Quote	High probability It depends on where they choose to go Great things can happen when people get together	There's high expectations It depends Sometimes it takes time	I am pretty confident It's an opportunity for networking.	high probability
G What is the probability of no new innovations/innovative ideas emerging from affiliation with Creative Oklahoma				
Quote	Why should it exist if it isn't going to have some kind of new benefit Some probability that there will be ideas		The mere existence of initiative is going to produce something It's very possible that nothing might for a while	Very unlikely If it's not, it's not going to exist

This group of questions explored the probability of innovation occurring within stakeholder sectors or organizations, and as part of the Creative Oklahoma network. The responses were consistent across the four stakeholder groups. Innovation was identified as important with regards to competitive advantage, business success and survival, regardless of sector. There were high levels of certainty that failure to innovate had a high negative impact that was seen as leading to stagnation and death for the organization. In other words, innovation was critical to survival. This reflected and reinforced themes in the long protocol questions.

There was high level of confidence that involvement with Creative Oklahoma was seen as being beneficial, even if those benefits were not always clear. This triangulated with themes in the long protocol questions that focused on why individuals were associated with Creative Oklahoma, the motivation and benefits including the connection with networks, creative people, relationships and the competitive environments within which the stakeholders operated. The expectations of potential outcomes included indirect as well as direct payoff, whereby the innovation network rather than direct organizational facilitation, provided outcomes.

This group of questions mapped o three of the research questions. Research Question 1, where innovation could be seen as a motivation to become engaged in the innovation network. Research Question 2, where the innovation, and possibility of new knowledge, ideas and partnerships emerging from the social innovation network were seen as potential outcomes, even if that was a long-term proposition and pay off. Finally, Research Question 3 and the success of the social innovation network is the expectation that the social innovation network will bring benefit at some point. This

indicates that value and importance can be connected to more than one variable, and can include both immediate as well as potential and long-term payoff, perhaps even the risk that there is no pay off. This has importance for maintaining and growing the innovation process and networks.

Table 31 Vested Interest and Self Efficacy (Question 32)

Vested Interest				
Q32 (4) Ability to effect innovation Scale is 1 = low - 7 = very high				
Personal, organizational and sector				
A To what extent are you instrumental (how effective are you) in driving innovation (policies, procedures, vision)				
	Education	Commerce	Culture	Founding member
Quote	Highly effective. The person in my job should be	Very highly It's my thing	I'm highly effective. I get to do that! All the time I don't do it, it isn't going to get done	Highly effective. Well I do it every day I'm that idea, risk taker (person)
B In terms of new ideas, relationships, new ways of doing business, to what extent has your involvement with Creative Oklahoma affected the generation of innovation				
Quote	It legitimized things I was starting to think about Made me more aware In ways that may not have been that measurable	Gives me a forum to talk. It's been a stimulating factor	Raised an awareness for me Probably some effect, it's hard to pin down and say what	Highly effective
Creative Oklahoma				
C How effective are you at using Creative Oklahoma to generating innovation				
Quote	Not that often	Highly I can probably be more so	I don't utilize it as much as I should	Moderately effective I think I could have used it more

This group of questions explored self-efficacy and innovation within the stakeholder organizations and within the innovation network. The responses were consistent across the stakeholder groups. The ability of stakeholders to affect innovation was high, which aligned with the responses in the longer questions where leaders were seen as instrumental in driving innovation. However, individuals identified that they did not utilize the social innovation network to generate innovation as much as they could,

providing an opportunity for both the stakeholders and the organization to take further action. The self-efficacy and response efficacy triangulated with the initial short questions where individuals identified themselves and were identified by others as leaders. This supported the lens of collective leadership or leadership as a network within social innovation. In diffusion of innovation Rogers, (1995) identifies the opinion leaders as influencers, within this sample, those leaders also identify as having a vested interest in innovation.

The lower utilization of Creative Oklahoma by stakeholders to generate innovation could potentially identify awareness or lack of awareness as identified in the questions relating to networks and boundary spanning. This connects back to themes in the main questions where, despite involvement with other sectors and organizations, individuals were not aware of innovation, indicating lack of involvement with Creative Oklahoma despite the existence of heterogeneous linkages that could diffuse the social innovation and develop a 'state of creativity'. It could also relate to the function of the network with new ideas, new partnership, and new collaborations, which was also a theme in earlier questions. This links to networks, the role of networks with connection, cohesion and communication (Kreinfler & Young, 2013). This mapped to Research Question 1, and motivations to become engaged with the innovation network, where the stakeholders saw themselves as drivers of innovation. This would not only be a motivation to become engaged in the innovation network, but would be a motivator for the innovation leaders to identify and approach those individuals as candidates to become involved. This group also mapped to Research Question 2, and what motivated

the individuals to remain in the innovation network, where the individuals saw themselves and their involvement with the social innovation as driving innovation.

Table 32 Vested Interest and Risk (Question 31)

Vested Interest				
Q33 (5) Risk of not innovating Scale is 1 = low - 7 = very high				
Personal, organizational and sector				
A How vulnerable is the sector to innovation from competitors				
	Education	Commerce	Culture	Founding member
Quote	We thrive on the culture of innovation here	Always a risk, extremely vulnerable you are innovating or you die	Oh very susceptible Uniqueness There is a lot of competition	All the time
B What is the risk of not innovating				
Quote	There's a huge risk there eventually, you could disappear	Very risky Its key You're going to become irrelevant The status quo, is never the best results we can get	High risk We have to continually think outside the box there's a risk of not being unique	Very high risk in our business It's death because you never stay still you're either go backwards or forwards so it's you're declining
Creative Oklahoma				
C What is the risk of not being involved with the Creative Oklahoma initiative for you				
Quote	I don't think there is a lot of risk	No risk	No risk	Pretty low
C What is the risk of not being involved with the Creative Oklahoma initiative for the State of Oklahoma				
Quote	Not that often	Frankly not very I think a high risk because if it's an opportunity that's not being seized then that's risky to forgo any opportunity	Very little. There's not necessarily a connection	Pretty low

The final question looked the vulnerability or risk of not innovating. The four groups of vested interest questions combine to look at stake and risk. However, the researcher added this group of questions to address this separately. The responses were consistent across the four stakeholder groups. The risk of not innovating within the sectors and organizations was perceived as being very high across all four stakeholder

groups, and was related to competition, survival and failure to succeed in competitive environments. These were recurring themes in the main interview protocol. Conversely, the risk of not being involved with Creative Oklahoma and the innovation network was seen as being low at both the individual and broader state level. Individual risk in the main questions could be tied back to the motivational factors such as opportunities for networking, and the state level tied back to human capital and economic development, and broader and longer reaching ramifications. Comments in the main protocol questions indicated that while networking was the primary driver for joining the innovation network, if individuals were not already connected in the network access to individuals through networks was not difficult. In other words the connections either would have, or could have been made without Creative Oklahoma. This could be one of the reasons for low individual risk.

Risk is one of the elements in diffusion (Rogers, 1995), where communication about the innovation helped educate individuals and mitigate the risk of the 'new' innovation. With the risk of not being engaged with the social innovation network being perceived as low, this might be an additional motivator to be engaged. The loss versus gain calculation may be seen as a low entry and exit costs. Risk is something that leaders are used to calculating as they scan the environment, analyze, identify opportunities, and make innovation decisions (Sternberg, Kaufman, & Pretz, (2003).

This last set of questions mapped to two research questions. With Research Question 1, and motivations to become engaged in the innovation network, responses would indicate that the importance of innovation (risk of not innovating and risk from competition) would be reasons to become engaged in the innovation network. Research

Question 2, the motivations to remain in the network, the responses would indicate that stakeholders perceive there to be a low risk attached to being involved with the social innovation network, which could be a reason to remain in the network, and maintain the network. The potential risk and possible perception of loss is low. This indicates that there may be many factors at play in deciding to become invested in a social innovation network.

The key summary of the findings from the vested interest protocol questions are below.

Table 33 Vested Interest Combined Themes

Research Question 1	Research Question 2	Research Question 3	Research Question 4
Motivation to join social innovation and network	**Motivation to stay in social innovation and network**	**Perception of success and gaps of social innovation, social innovation network**	**Enablers and barriers to the social innovation and network**
Vested Interest - innovation	**Vested Interest - innovation**	**Vested Interest - innovation**	**Vested Interest - innovation**
Q29 High awareness of innovation in organization and personal concern	Q29 High awareness of innovation in organization and personal concern	Q29 Limited awareness across sectors and outside group	Q29 Limited awareness across sectors and outside group
Q30 Innovation is constant	Q30 Innovation is constant	Q30 Long term/future results	Q30 Long term/future results
Q31 Innovation leads to competitive advantage, associated with success	Q31 Innovation leads to competitive advantage, associated with success	Q31 Confident/high probability with innovation network	Q31 Confident/high probability with innovation network
Q32 highly effective at driving innovation	Q32 highly effective at driving innovation	Q32 low usage of social innovation	Q32 High able to affect, low usage of social innovation
Q33 High personal/organizational risk and low risk of association with social innovation	Q33 High personal/organizational risk but low risk regards association with social innovation	Q33 low risk regards association with social innovation	Q33 low risk regards association with social innovation (initiative and state)
Leadership networks, diffusion, systems of innovation	Leadership networks, diffusion, systems of innovation	Leadership networks, diffusion, systems of innovation	Leadership networks, diffusion, systems of innovation

Demographic Short Answer Responses

The interviews began with nine demographic style short answer questions, which were designed to identify stakeholder association with other sectors, the length of time in sector/organization, the size of organization and the level of education and

perceived social standing of individuals. The average years in sector were 26, and the average years in the organization were 15. The organizational sizes were evenly spread, with 13 large (31%), 11 medium (26%), 16 small (38%) and 1 falling into no category. When measured against the sector norm, the organizations were again evenly split being identified as 33 % or 14 large for the sector norm, 11 medium (26%), 14 small (33%) and 3 (7%) who did not identify with a category or there was no sector norm due to the uniqueness of the organization. An example of the latter being a think tank organization. In the sample 86% of the interviewees identified that they were involved with other sectors besides their own, which would suggest the possibility of finding some evidence of heterogeneous or bridging networks to spread information about the innovation (Rogers, 2004).

The sampling frame included individuals who had been involved with the organization from the beginning, or in the early stages of development of the innovation. Rogers (1995), identified change agents, innovators and opinion leaders as playing an important role in the diffusion process, and the communication function due to the position they hold within the community and their networks. Two questions focused on how the interviewees saw themselves and how they felt others perceived them with regard to leadership. In identifying how they perceived themselves and how others perceived 81% of the sample described themselves as being leaders or having unique or expert skills, and 88% said others would describe them as being leaders or having unique or expert skills.

Opinion leaders have been associated with a number of characteristics or traits, one of which is education (Rogers, 1995). In the sample 71% had obtained graduate

level or above education, 21% undergraduate, 2% with professional qualifications and only 4% with the highest level of education being high school graduation. The sample conformed to existing research in diffusion, and diffusion of innovation through communication where the characteristics of opinion leaders included educated and perceived by their peers as having influence within their community and network, (Rogers, 1995). The individuals in the sample were identified as leaders or experts in their field,

Innovation is more likely to occur in larger rather than smaller organizations due to slack or availability of resources to support innovation, Mumford and Moertl, (2003) identify that the resources needed for social innovation, particularly capital and human resources, are often beyond the scope of smaller organizations. The size of the organizational and size of the organization relative to perceived organizational norm links to the question on resources.

Table 34 Short Introductory Questions Demographics

Short Introductory Questions
Q2 Years in this sector
Mean 26 years, Median 28 Years, Mode 40 years, Range 5-40
Q3 Years in job
Average years 15
Q4a Size of organization
Large 13, Medium 11, Small 16, No Category 1
Q4b Size of sector norm
Large 14 Medium 11 Small 14 No Category 3
Q5 Cross sector involvement
36 Yes (86%) 6 No (24%)
Commerce crossover into culture, education, and Culture cross over into education, and Education cross over into commerce and culture
Q6 Education
Post Graduate 19, Graduate 11, Undergraduate 8, Associates 1, High School 2, Professional 1
71% have a graduate or above education (21% undergraduate (1 associates) 2% professional and 4% high school education only)
Q7 Role or skill level perceived by self
Leader 21, Unique 10, Expert 3, High Skill 6, Average 2
81% see themselves as a leader or with unique or expert skills
Q8 Role or skill level perceived by others

Leader 24, Unique 9, Expert 4, High Skill 4, Don't know 1
88% identify as being seen as by others as a leader or with unique or expert skills

Chapter 6: Discussion and Limitations

Prior to discussing the implication of the study, it is important to identify some of the limitations of the research. While there are a number, the three primary limitations are this research is it is a qualitative study using a single case study with an interview protocol designed by the researcher not a proven interview or survey tool. The data gathered, and the interpretations of the data are limited first by the scope and actual questions of the interview protocol, and secondly through the investigators' identification of the themes using thematic analysis and subsequent interpretation of those themes.

Limitations

One of the main limitations was the decision to focus on a single case study rather than multiple case studies. This was a resource based decision with time, financial and language limitations. The single case study limits the analytic generalization (Yin, 2012), which potentially limits the findings of this study to the specific social innovation initiative examined by the researcher. In addition, the case study examined the social innovation at a specific point of time in the innovation development. The system specific variables of the context, timeframe, social, political, economic and cultural factors that may have had an influence on the development and diffusion of the innovation, may not apply to other case studies, and may not apply to the same case study at a different time, or time in the innovation process. The actors, institutions, and relationships between them that were relevant to the study, may be specific to that innovation, time and context.

The decision to focus on a specific social innovation and social innovation network, highlights other limitations of the case study. Interviewing individuals who had been closely involved in the emergence and development of the social innovation in the case study, limited the perception to those individuals who were close to the innovation process as the social innovation emerged, and the timeframe within which that occurred. These were individuals who were in a leadership position within the network, which resulted in a homogeneous rather than heterogeneous perspective of the initiative. Even within the same case study, a different interview group may have resulted in a different perspective with different data.

Rather than using a proven interview or survey instrument, the interview protocol was developed by the researcher. In choosing to go this route, the scope and questions of the interview protocol limited the data. Those interviewed could only respond to questions that were asked. If the question was not asked, the interviewees could not respond, and data could not be gathered. In addition, questions may have had different significance depending upon the stakeholder group and individuals within the group, who responded from their frame of reference within the stakeholder group and their interpretation of the question. Within the interview protocol, a question that may have seemed significant to one stakeholder group, may have had little significance to another, and in responding, what may have been taken as a given with one group and not commented upon, may have been new and exciting to another group. For example, artists within the culture group may consider creativity or connection with creative people as normal and not providing exceptional value. For the other stakeholder groups

connecting with creative people might not be an everyday occurrence and therefore of potential value.

All respondents were given the opportunity at the end of the interview to provide additional information, and were asked if there was anything that they felt had not been addressed, or any questions that they expected to be asked but had not. By taking an exploratory approach, the sweep of questions may have been too broad. The interview was scheduled for two hours with individuals who were very busy, and there may not have been time to expand the conversation further. The sample and sampling frame was focused on a potentially homogeneous group and network, which limited the perspective. In exploring leaders and leader networks within the social innovation process, the sample focused on individuals who viewed themselves and were perceived by others, as leaders. The perceptions were from a group of leaders, the innovators, or early adopters in diffusion. A more diverse group of individuals may have provided a different perspective of the diffusion process, and the extent who which the innovation leadership and change agents were successful.

Finally, a limitation of qualitative research methods is that in exploring the complex phenomenon of a social innovation initiative, narratives rather than numbers are being interpreted. The data is subjective and risks bias. While the use of thematic analysis as a qualitative analysis method allows the researcher to pull or discover the themes within the data, the interpretation of that data and the themes is subjective. The interpretation was done by the researcher, and there was no use of an independent team of trained researchers, or a second researcher to identify themes and interpret the data.

Discussion and Theoretical Findings

The research contributes to the innovation and social innovation body of knowledge with regards to the role of leader networks, leaders, communication, vested interest and systems of innovation. Before addressing these areas, it is important to revisit the research questions and focus of the research. The purpose of the study was to explore stakeholder perceptions of the diffusion of a regional social innovation initiative in the first five years of the innovation. This is a timeframe in the innovation process and initial stages of the diffusion process, where relationships and networks, especially with formal and informal leaders, may be critical to build support and buy in for the innovation initiative. The research questions focused on what engaged the stakeholders, exploring why individuals might become involved in the social innovation and social innovation network. Once engaged it would be important to understand what would be critical to maintain that network and for stakeholders to remain engaged, what would improve and grow the network, and finally what are the barriers or enablers to the innovation network being successful. In exploring those four questions, the final question focused on the differences, if any, between the stakeholder groups.

While diffusion emphasizes the importance of communication and the opinion leader, understanding what is important and has value to a range of individuals and organizations is also critical. Understanding the potential ‘stake’, especially with a diverse audience, maybe critical to the communication of diffusion, and the ongoing management and maintenance of the innovation process. This can be especially important where the focus of the innovation is cross sector, multi-agency, and is seeking to engage effectively with different sectors and stakeholder groups. As well as being a

social change catalyst, social innovation (as is any innovation) is influenced by the context, economic and political environment, culture, and actors who support or hinder the innovation process. Understanding stakeholder motivations to engage or become involved with a statewide social innovation project, what motivates them to remain in the network, and what are the barriers and enablers to maintaining and growing the social innovation and network is critical for organizations operating in and navigating through community engagement initiatives through extended networks. There were a number of dominant themes that came from the data that contribute to research. This included, networks, leaders, communication, vested interest and the actors and institutions in the innovation process.

The predominant theme, and the first one to be discussed, is networks. Extant research on collectivist leadership identified the complex roles of leaders as one of more collective social behavior with dynamic leadership networks (Friedrich, Vessey, Schuelke, Ruark, & Mumford, 2009; Yammarino, Salas, Serban, Shirreffs & Shuffler 2012). This view of leadership as a network and involving multiple actors (Carter & De Church, 2012) is relevant to the case study. The results indicated that the innovation network was comprised of multiple leaders and organizations. Individuals joined and remain in networks for a number of reasons, and that the leveraging and building of a network of extended relationships is an active process. The motivations may be different for both those leading the innovation and those engaged in the leadership network.

Networks were of importance for the change agents leading the organization as well as leaders in the innovation network. Leaders of the innovation used the network to

engage opinion leaders, increase awareness, and as a conduit for information, support, finding resources and expertise. Stakeholders identified networks and networking as being the primary reason for engagement in the innovation. The stakeholders considered networks to be critical to personal and business development, with individuals actively engaged in seeking to expand and build contacts and networks. As the social innovation organization seeks to build networks, particularly leadership networks, those leaders in the network are seeking to expand their own networks, social capital and spheres of influence. This can be for themselves as well as for the organizations they lead or represent. The innovation network was identified as being fluid, changing and dynamic, with the scope expanding to encompass local, national and global networks. This dynamic nature indicates ongoing potential and opportunities for individual leaders to expand their networks as actors move in and out of the network.

Formal and informal leaders may play a critical role in building social capital within their own networks. They are also acting as a 'bridge' to connect to other networks and stakeholders that the innovation network may not have access to, or influence within. While all the stakeholders were engaged with multiple networks and in potential bridging positions, the innovation was not spreading across networks. In the expansion of the network and diffusion of information Young, (2009) identified the importance of heterogeneous networks and Morris, (2000) noted the need for cohesion in networks. The vested interest questions that focused on innovation salience, confirmed that there was a very low level of awareness outside of the leadership network, indicating a lack of what Kreinfler and Young, 2013 and Young, (2011) call connection, cohesion and communication or 'noise'.

The stakeholders also identified the network as being exclusive rather than inclusive, indicating that it was confined to a homogeneous leadership network. The research confirmed that the innovation network was comprised of leaders, forming an elite network. While there is tremendous value with collaborative leadership and leadership networks, there may also be risks associated with the leadership network in the development, maintenance and management of the innovation process. Forming an in-group or elite may have the advantage of speeding up the diffusion within a leadership network and accessing valuable resources. However, this may be limiting for the long-term diffusion process and gaining the critical mass that the social innovation may be looking for. The value of the connection over into other networks will not be successful, and the innovation will not travel if the individuals who are bridges are not active in passing on the information and influencing new membership of the network. In seeking to expand the innovation leader network and access leaders as sources of influence, resources and connections, the assumption maybe made by innovation leaders, that those in the network will continually act as advocates and champions and actively work to bring others into the network.

The network function involves not only the relationships between the actors but includes the activity that is conducted in those networks (Borgatti & Halgin, 2011). As discussed, individuals join and remain vested in networks for a number of reasons. Not all of the reasons for engagement may align with the articulated vision and mission of the social innovation. The organization used the networks to access leaders, influence, resources, support, knowledge and for communication. From a stakeholder perspective motivation to join and remain in the network were equally varied. Existing relationships

of respect and friendship, opportunities to access and build personal and business connections, knowledge, social capital, political support, business opportunities, resources, and influence were a few of the existing and expected ties and activities identified by the stakeholders. The willingness to be used as a resource and to contribute, was offset by an expectation from stakeholders that there would be returns from the network at some point, even if that was a long-term future proposition. The organization should be aware that networks are dynamic and interlinking. The networks maybe utilized for different purposes, and stakeholders will be assessing long and short-term gain, and low and high risk and expecting reciprocity in the network.

Self-interest and exploitation of the networks as identified by Burt (1995) as a reason for belonging to networks. However, Portes, (2000) noted the trust based relationships can build an altruistic spirit within the networks. While the primary network focus of the stakeholders was building personal and business networks, there was an altruistic theme, albeit a less dominant theme especially amongst some groups. The count of the themes indicated that there may be differences in stakeholders within the network as to where the locus of motivation resides. This misconception can emerge between those who have founded the organization and those they seek to engage in the network. Those forming a social innovation organization may believe, that appealing to common humanity is a strong motivator to engage with the network. However, altruistic spirit may not be a primary reason why individuals become invested in the innovation.

The case study shed light on how leaders are used or can be leveraged to develop a social innovation through the use of networks and relationships. Exploring leadership from a networked perspective, and within a social innovation network,

contributes to the understanding of the extended role that formal and informal leaders play in the innovation process. Leaders and leadership was the second most dominant theme. It was linked to networks, but was also identified as a separate theme running through the responses. Leaders within the network were identified as having a number of roles and functions. Chrobot-Mason, Gerbasi and Cullen-Lester, (2016), identify a new leadership lens that is a "network of influence relationships in which multiple people participate" (p. 29). This involves leaders engaging at multiple levels and taking on changing roles and responsibilities (Cullen & Yammarino, 2014).

As a leader, the role was implicitly as an influencer and opinion leader within networks. This included influencing individuals, but also as a function of being leaders of organizations being able to influence inside the organization, and leading an organization that was influential within the region or sector. This supports research of the value of the individual to the diffusion process, and the innovation process as actors with a sphere of influence within the systems. Rogers, (1995) and Niu, (2002) emphasized the importance of individuals with influence in networks and within the diffusion process, and Mumford and Moertl (2003) identified these individuals as providing elite support. The explicit leadership themes also included the importance of leaders driving and influencing change and innovation. This placed their role in innovation and as influencers as having value within the social innovation network, with regards to giving permission within their own organizations, within their peer networks, and as part of reputation building. The organization also used the network as part of the strategic planning through the function of the board. This activity took the place of the some of the operational function that normally exists within the

organization and places greater responsibility on the leadership network. This expanded the role of leaders in the innovation network, but also aligned with leaders' motivations as being actively engaged with pursuing board positions as part of personal and business networking.

Leaders were also identified as resources within the network, often targeted to support the innovation. Mumford and Moertl (2003) identify financial capital, human resources and the need for elite support as being some of the primary requirements for social innovation, with Niu (2002) emphasizing the importance of individuals with influence in networks. The extensive nature of resources, as well as identifying, accessing and gaining those resources, may be beyond the capability of many small organizations. Therefore, attracting individuals to the network who can provide support in a range of criteria may be critical to developing and sustaining the organization. The need for financial support, and using the network to access individuals with influence who could provide financial support, was a dominant and recurring theme supporting other findings on the importance of resources. Other uses by the organization included leveraging the network to access elite support, communication, information, new partnerships, ideas, support, and pro bono services. The leadership network used the network for similar reasons, but understood that the payout or return especially with ideas and partnerships was likely to be long term rather than immediate.

Stenmark, Shipman and Mumford (2011) identified social and political networking skills as being important especially in the latter stages of the innovation process. This was evident as ongoing leadership skills in both the leaders of the organization and the stakeholders within the leadership network. Individuals with social

capital, strong networking skills were identified in the key actors' who were instrumental in the social innovation process. Stakeholders themselves identified constant networking activities as associated with leadership positions, as well as their own activities. This included actively seeking multiple board positions, as well as personal and organizational networking as part of business functions. Leaders of the innovation organization were identified as having extensive networking skills, and social capital that were leveraged to grow the network and access resources. This provided information on how the organization leverages leaders as resources and assets, and conversely how the leaders in the network view the short and long-term value of the social innovation network, and leverage the network in turn. Understanding the 'needs' of the leadership network as a whole as well as needs of the individuals within the network, can help not only in the management the network, but also help change the innovation and grow the innovation network.

The third dominant theme was motivation to engage with the innovation network and the perceived benefits of the network. Vested interest was also explored with a separate short form questionnaire, because this was felt to be a key component in the diffusion of a social innovation and the formation and maintenance of the innovation network. The findings indicated that 'stake' may be far more complex, involving perceptions of both low and high risk, and operate at a number of levels. Networks, especially building and leveraging networks was a primary motivation for individuals to join the social innovation. Within the network came the possibility of new partnerships, ideas, knowledge, resources, branding opportunities, and connecting with creative or interesting people. The organization had a vested interest in attracting and

retaining leadership or elite support to the network, and leveraging the network primarily for connections, resources, communication, and awareness. Therefore, within innovation, vested interest or stake operates both from the organizational perspective as well as the individuals attracted to the network. There may also be more than one reason for individuals to engage.

Understanding why individuals are potentially invested in the network, as well as identifying any gaps, can allow those managing the innovation to be more effective and efficient. Challenges with buy in and perception of value of the innovation was a key theme throughout the interview protocol, particularly with regards to communication, leader engagement and sector engagement. As well as recurring as a theme, vested interest was explored in a separate survey tool. The questions focused on salience of innovation, certainty, probability, self-efficacy (Crano, 1983; Miller, Adame & Moore, 2013) and risk. Sternberg, Kaufman and Pretz, (2003) comment that innovation decisions are more likely to be driven by a leaders' analysis of the risk and opportunities than any other motivating factor. The results highlighted the role of 'stake' in the diffusion process, and provided insight into how individuals may perceive stake. It confirmed that stakeholders may be engaged with the innovation for multiple reasons, with different levels of risk. Some of the reasons for engagement, for example self-interest and altruistic, may seem to conflict. A key motivator was innovation and the importance of innovation, which was seen by stakeholders as critical to survival in complex, competitive and changing environments. This means leaders may strategize from a personal as well as an organizational perspective. Variables include perceived stake (value and importance), where low and high risk exists, as well as a range of

network benefits. Furthermore, leaders are prepared to wait for potential payoff, which may be a long time in the future.

Communication was the fourth main theme in the stakeholder responses, and was identified as complex and varied role in the innovation. As well as being critical to the diffusion process through networks and leadership, other activities included branding or image, awareness, access, information, education, support, and building relationships. In addition to activities, the range or scope of communication in terms of geographic and sector boundaries and the audience or communication targets were also identified as important to the success or failure of the innovation. The expanding and changing nature of the leadership network, meant that the communication network was also dynamic (Larsen, 2011) which would be expected in the diffusion process seeking to gain more adopters.

Elite support is critical to the diffusion process, and communication plays an important role in building relationships with individuals. Personal communication was used to connect directly with leaders and those with influence, to connect with individuals who could act as an intermediary with other leaders, and to communicate, educate, and build support. The role of communication in the early stages of the innovation development relied upon face to face meetings with opinion leaders and those with influence to explain the information and gain support. The data confirmed not just the value, but the necessity of one on one meetings. At one level this was critical in explaining complex ideas in the diffusion process. However, it was also important in building relationships and connecting with elite leadership as part of

impression management, gaining commitment and support for the innovation and accessing resources.

In diffusion, the role of communication is central to the diffusion process (Rogers, 2003). In informing and educating about the information, it provides input that potential adopters use to help make decision about the value and fit of the innovation. One of the primary roles of the organization was seen as communication, in terms of building awareness, educating, and sharing information. However, a major challenge was around the clarity of the message and understanding the value. This raises two important elements. The first is the importance of crafting clear messages that are understood. The second is crafting clear messages that resonate with the stakeholders and meet stakeholder needs. To achieve this, the organization needs to gain insight into the audience, the environment and 'stake'. Understanding what stakeholders value and expect, allows the communication and communication strategy to be crafted to resonate more effectively with the potential vested interest of the stakeholder.

Innovations emerge within systems, and the actors and institutions within these systems affect the innovation process. The role and importance of the actors and institutions, and the relationships between them that acted to support or hinder the innovation, emerged as clear themes. The variables have relevance outside of the case study. The dynamic nature of systems means there are many moving pieces at play that may have a first and second order effect on the innovation. Understanding the barriers and enablers can assist leaders managing the innovation, in what Van de Ven, (2017), identifies as being somewhat turbulent. There was a clear cadre of elite actors,

identified as both individuals and organizations, who were identified as affecting the social innovation in a number of ways.

Enablers were identified as influence and willingness to lend their reputation, name, support, endorsement, resources, as well as ability to connect and communicate with other leaders due to network position. As well as influence, actors provided resources, or access to resources. There were primarily financial but also services in lieu, such as marketing, branding, personnel, expertise, knowledge, facilities, and leadership skills to support the innovation. Finally, actors supported the innovation through their active role on the organizational board, formulating strategy, and guiding the innovation. Barriers were seen as individuals and organizations not understanding the value, which can be a challenge in communication strategies. Also, long standing relationships, history of actors not collaborating with each other, mindset, and failure to follow through on promised support affected the innovation process.

The dominant theme within institutions was that of culture and norms in organizations, sectors, and communities. However, economic, political, climate, and sector characteristics were also identified as supporting or blocking the innovation. Enablers were identified as entrepreneurial, risk taking, innovative, can do mindset. Actors formed into highly networked relationships supporting the innovation process, and the ability to connect easily and quickly with leaders and resources was a clear advantage to the network, and seemed to be a locally developed institution. Barriers to innovation included highly conservative culture and norms, which included fiscal conservatism. Combined with fear and not wanting to change this can be a major hurdle to overcome. Other challenges included a highly independent ‘can do it alone’ mindset,

which can work against collaboration, this could be a barrier as collaboration would seem to be important for creativity and innovation. Another polarization was the value of education on one hand, and an anti-education feeling on the other. The general environments within which the stakeholders operated were characterized by constant change and competition, which resulted in innovation being seen as important to survival at the organizational and individual level. A culture and environment that supported creativity and innovation was seen as important, both within organizations and broader contexts.

Culture and norms exist at different levels, and leaders may struggle with organizational subcultures that can form pockets of resistance to change. An area of interest was the sub culture of sectors. These differences may be barriers, enablers or neutral but can provide insight into how individuals and sectors operate and may engage in an innovation network. The artistic community self-identified as being more collaborative, commerce and education perceived themselves as operating in more competitive environments. Other institutional elements were an economic context as sensitive and somewhat energy dependent, causing a feast or famine economic climate which affected funding support and other resources. Regional systems that are dependent upon a single or dominant industry may face different challenges to those with a more diversity. The changing dynamics of the political context was also mentioned, as both a barrier and enabler. Policy was not identified as either an enabler or a barrier to the innovation process and the innovation network. Given that innovation, social innovation, entrepreneurship, knowledge and knowledge management, human capital development, creativity and workforce development are all

areas of policy interest, the lack of themes around policy was interesting. This could indicate a lack of awareness within the social innovation network, or a lack of policy, or that the sectors use different terminology to describe this.

Social innovation is complex, and the contexts within which the innovation process emerges are complex. To explore this complexity from a single theory or variable could miss the richness and run the risk of simplifying a dynamic process that has multiple moving parts. This study contributes to the body of research to expand a combination of theories to explore the social innovation process. Innovation does not happen without diffusion and the communication of information through networks of opinion leaders. Especially in the early stages. The innovation emerges within complex social, economic, political and cultural systems, where the norms, climate, subcultures, infrastructures and individuals interact to affect the success the innovation process. To explore a social innovation network and social innovation initiative without acknowledging the complexity, and including the diffusion, systems, and perceptions of 'stake', would miss some of the interlinking dynamics at play in a social innovation network and simplify the process. Leaders and leadership roles in networks, diffusion, and systems of innovation provide a richer picture of the complexity of the leadership role within social innovation. Vested interest and the role of institutions (norms, culture, policy) in systems of innovation show the importance of changing contexts and systems to building and sustaining networks. It illustrates the dynamic nature of networks, including individuals and the functions of networks.

The research used a single case study of a statewide social innovation on creativity to explore social innovation from the perspective of four primary stakeholder

groups: founding members, education, commerce and culture. The results indicated that the leveraging and building a network of extended relationships is an active process, considered critical to personal and business development. As the social innovation organization seeks to build networks, particularly leadership networks, so are leaders seeking to expand their own networks and spheres of influence. Individuals join and remain vested in networks for a number of reasons, not all of them may align with the vision and mission of the social innovation. Therefore, the organization should be aware that networks are dynamic and interlinking, and may be utilized for different purposes. Furthermore, stakeholders are cognizant that their expectations of potential outcomes include indirect as well as direct payoff, whereby the innovation network rather than direct organizational facilitation, provided outcomes.

Future Research

The research focused upon a single case study. It would be interesting to collaborate with other creativity innovations loosely connected to the national and international network. While systems of innovation identify the uniqueness of each innovation context, future research could examine the International Districts of Creativity (DCN), and the National Districts of Creativity Network to explore common elements in the different initiatives. This could shed light on the social innovation process. The members of the National Creativity Network in North America and Canada have been heavily influenced by the Creative Oklahoma model and leadership. There may be some similarities in how the leadership in each area started the process.

Communication and the networks used to communicate, and influence decision making are an important part of the diffusion process. The perception of the

interviewees in this study confirmed that networks, networking and social capital were critical in connecting with the right people, communicating effectively (for example face to face), and for doing business. Data was not captured on the strength or direction of connections, the range or potential of the networks or the nodes. Future research including social network analysis, could provide more detailed information on networks and the role of collectivist leadership networks in the innovation process.

Robinson (2015) has called for the need a both top down and bottom up grass roots approach to change. While the early stages of the innovation process seek to leverage elite support, a question for those leading the organization is "how does the structure move outside of that leadership network"? In seeking broader stakeholder engagement, it would be important to examine leaders throughout the community. To include, not just those with formal authority who may be the first elite group, but those informal leaders or emergent leaders who may have influence in other sectors of the community. In organizations, where change tends to be pushed from the top down, resistance to change is in part due to employees being disengaged from the decision-making process. In a broader community context, engaging the 'voice' of individuals at all levels to become engaged in the innovation process may be difficult. However, finding a way to get a more diverse stakeholder base, to identify issues and solutions, and provide the input might make the process more inclusive.

While the focus of this research was not organizational innovation, it is important to acknowledge that organizational innovation may be where stakeholder vested interest may ultimately lie. It would be valuable to explore what innovation and social innovation mean to organizations and how that can be leveraged as part of the

strategic alignment to gain competitive advantage. As well as innovation and competitive advantage of Porter (2000) and the leverage of clusters (see Katz & Muro, 2010; Porter, 1998), the strategic management of knowledge and the innovation process is being seen as critical in building organization and regional competencies. The shift from innovation management as the innovation of products as a market strategy, to include strategic alignment of innovation process and knowledge management (McDonough, Zaxk, Lin & Berdrow, 2008) is indicative of the increase in business interest. This includes aligning the innovation process, and knowledge management aligning with strategy rather than depending upon innovation and market position to deliver competitive advantage alone. Strategic innovation and organizational innovation management (see Van de Ven, Angle, & Poole, 2000), innovation management (Hubner, 1986; Sundbo, 2001; Sundbo, Gallina, Serin & Davis 2006), and organizational knowledge management (Choo & Bontis, 2002) are becoming critical to organizational success. There has also been a marked shift in organizations towards corporate social responsibility moving to social innovation (Osburg & Schmidper, 2013). Exploring how organizations can work in collaboration, leverage social innovation and cross sector partnerships to provide value, is area within the organization to examine. This would extend innovation outside of the organizational structure, policy frameworks and could include what Asheim, (2007) identifies as innovation and regional competency building which could support economic development strategies.

References

Adams. D., & Hess, M. (2010). Social innovation and why it has policy significance. *The Economic and Labor Relations Review*. 21(2), 139-155.

Amabile, T. (1983). *The social psychology of creativity*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Amabile, T. (1988). A model of creativity and innovation in organizations. In B. S. Cummings (Ed.). *Research in organizational behavior* (pp. 123-167). Greenwhich, CT: JAI Press.

Amabile, T., & Gryskiewicz. S. (1989). The creative environment scales: The work environment inventory. *Creativity Research Journal*, 2, 231-254.

Asheim, B. (2007). Constructing knowledge-based regional advantage; implications for regional innovation policy. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management*, 7(2-5), 140-155.

Asheim, B., & Isaksen, A. (2002). Regional innovation systems: The integration of local 'sticky' and global 'ubiquitous' knowledge. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 27(1), 77-86.

Asheim, B., & Gertler, M.S. (2006). The geography of innovation: Regional innovation systems. In Fagerberg, J., Mowery, D.C. and Nelson, R.R. (Eds.). *The Oxford handbook of innovation* (pp. 291-317). NY: Oxford University Press Inc.

Ballinger, G., Craig, E., Cross, R., & Gray, P. (2011). A stitch in time saves nine: Leveraging networks to reduce the costs of turnover. *California Management Review*, 53(4), 111-133.

Balkundi, P., & Kilduff. M. (2006). The ties that lead: A social network approach to leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(4), 419–439.

Barroso, J. M. (2009a) *The business solution to the problem of climate change.* May 2009. Downloaded from http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-09-258_en.htm

Barroso, J. M. (2009b) *Thriving on an ocean of opportunities*. May 2009. Downloaded from http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-09-265_en.htm

Barrutia, J.M., Echebarria, C., & Lopez, A.G. (2010). Social capital and innovation: An empirical analysis in the context of European regions. 50th Congress of the

European Regional Science Association: "Sustainable Regional Growth and Development in the Creative Knowledge Economy", 19-23 August 2010, Jönköping, Sweden. European Regional Science Association

Bertrand, J. (2004). Diffusion of innovations and HIV/AIDS. *Journal of Health Communication,* 9, 113–121,

Borgatti, S., & Halgin, D. (2011). On network theory. *Organization Science,* 22(5), 1168-1181.

Borras, S., & Edquist, C. (2013). Competence building: A systemic approach to innovation policy. IDEAS Working Paper Series from RePEc. St.Louis. Downloaded from https://ideas.repec.org/p/hhs/lucirc/2013_028.html

Bouchard, M. (2012). Social innovation, an analytical grid for understanding the social economy: The example of the Quebec housing sector. *Service Business,* 2, 47-59.

Bouchard, M. (2013). *Innovation and the social economy: The Quebec experience.* University of Toronto Press, Scholarly Publishing Division

Boyatzis, R. (1998). *Transforming qualitative data: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Burt, R. S. (1999). The social capital of opinion leaders. *American Academy of Political and Social Science,* 566(1), 37-54.

Burt, R.S. (2000). The network structure of social capital. *Research in Organizational Behavior,* 22, 345-432.

Byrne, C., Mumford, M., Barrett, J., & Vessey. W. (2009). Examining the leaders of creative efforts: What do they do, and what do they think about. *Creativity and Innovation Management,* 18(4), 256-268.

Carter, D., & Dechurch, L. (2012). Networks: The way forward for collectivistic leadership research. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology,* 5(4), 412-415.

Chatterji, A., Glaeser, E., & Kerr, W. (2013). Clusters of entrepreneurship and innovation. *Innovation Policy and the Economy Forum.* April 2013. Downloaded from http://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Publication%20Files/130424-CGK-IPE_45be2057-0f20-4dc2-98d4-e422198bd55c.pdf

Chesbrough, H. (2006). *Open business models*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Chesbrough, H. (2006). Open innovation: A new paradigm for understanding industrial innovation. In Chesborough, H., Vanhaverbeke, W., & West, J. (Eds.). *Open innovation, researching a new paradigm* (pp. 1-12). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Chesbrough, H. (2012). Open innovation: where we've been and where we're going. *Research Technology Management,* 55(4),20-27.

Choo, W.C., & Bontis, N. (2002). (Eds.). *The strategic management of intellectual capital and organizational knowledge*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Chorbot-Mason, D., Gerbasi, A., & Cullen-Lester, K. (2016). Predicting leadership relationships: The importance of collective identity. *The Leadership Quarterly,* 27(1), 298-311.

Christensen, C.M. (2011). *The innovator's dilemma*. New York: Harper Business.

Civita M. D., & Dasgupta K. (2007). Using diffusion of innovations theory to guide diabetes management program development: An illustrative example. *Journal of Public Health,* 29, 262-268.

Conger, D, S. (1984). Social, scientific and technical inventions in a developing world. In Heden, C.G., & King, A. (1984). (Eds,). *Social innovations for development,* (pp. 33-52). NY: Pergamon Press.

Contractor, N., DeChurch, L., Carson, J., Carter, D., & Keegan. B. (2012). The topology of collective leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23 (6), 994-1011.

Cooper, R.G. (2003). Profitable product innovation: The critical success factors. In Shavinina, L.V. (Ed.). *The international handbook on innovation (pp. 139-157).* Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science Ltd.

Crano, W. D. (1983). Assumed consensus of attitudes: the effect of vested interest. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology,* 9, 597-608.

Crano, W. D. (1995a). Attitude strength and vested interest. In R. E. Petty & J. A. Krosnick (Eds.). *Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences* (pp.131–158). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum

Crano, W. D. (1995b). Components of vested interest and attitude-behavior consistency. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 17, 1-21.

Crano, W. D. (1997). Vested interest, symbolic politics, and attitude-behavior consistency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 72(3), 485-491.

Crano, W. & Prislin, R. (1995). Components of vested interest and attitude-behavior consistency. *Basic and Applied Social Research*, 17(1 & 2),1-21.

Creative Oklahoma Mission and Vision website downloaded from http://stateofcreativity.com/about/

Cross, R., Nohria, N., & Parker, A. (2002). Six myths about informal networks – and how to overcome them. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 43(3), 67-75.

Cullen, K., Palus, C., Chrobot-Mason, D., & Appaneal, C. (2012). Getting to "we": Collectivistic leadership research. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology,* 5(4), 428-432.

Cullen-Lester, K., Maupin, C., & Carter, D. (2017). Incorporating social networks into leadership development: A conceptual model and evaluation of research and practice. *The Leadership Quarterly,* 28 (1), 130-152.

Cullen-Lester, K., & Yammarino, F. (2014). Special issue on collective and network approaches to leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly,* 25, 180-181.

Cullen-Lester, K., & Yammarino, F. (2016). Collective and network approaches to leadership: Special issue introduction. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(2), 173-180.

Dacin, P., Dacin, M., & Matear. M. (2010). Social entrepreneurship: Why we don't need a new theory and how we move forward from here. *Academy of Management, 24(3),* 37-57.

Damanpour, F. (1991). Organizational innovation: A meta-analysis of effects of determinants and moderators. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(3), 555-590.

Daniel, F., Lohrke, F., Fornaciari, C., & Turner, J. (2004). Slack resources and firm performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 57(6), 565-574.

De Dominicis, S., Crano, W.D., Cancellieri, U., Mosco, B., Bonnes, M., Hohman, Z., & Bonaiuto, M. (2014). Vested interest and environmental risk communication:

Improving willingness to cope with impending disasters. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 44, 364-374.

DiPietro, W. (2003). Capital formation, innovation and economic growth. *Indian Development Review*, 1(2), 139-150.

Directorate-General for Research and Innovation. Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities. (2013*). Social Innovation Research in the European Union: Approaches Findings and Future Directions Policy Review*. Luxembourg: Publication Office of the European Union.

Districts of Creativity downloaded from http://www.districtsofcreativity.org/Donaldson, C., Siegel, J., & Crano, W. (2016). Nonmedical use of prescription stimulants in college students: Attitudes, intentions and vested interest. *Addictive Behaviors*, 52, 101-107.

Drath, W., McCauley, C., Palus, C., Van Velsor, E., O'Connor, P., & McGuire, J. (2008). Direction, alignment, commitment: Toward a more integrative ontology of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19, 635-653***.**

Edquist, C. (2006). Systems of innovation: Perspective and challenges. In Fagerberg, J., Mowery, D.C., & Nelson, R.R. (Eds.). *The Oxford handbook of innovation.* (pp. 181-208). NY: Oxford University Press Inc.

Edsand, H-E. (2017). Identifying barriers to wind energy diffusion in Colombia: A function analysis of the technology innovation systems and wider context. *Technology in Science,* 49, 1-15.

Ekvall, G. *(*1996*).* The organizational climate for creativity and innovation*. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology,* 5, 105–123.

Ekvall, G. *(*1997*).* Organizational conditions and levels of creativity. *Creativity and Innovation Management,* 6, 195–205.

Engel, S. (2015). *The hungry mind: The origins of curiosity in childhood*. Harvard University Press.

Fagerberg, J. (2006). Innovation: A guide to the literature. In Fagerberg, J., Mowery, D., & Nelson, R. (Eds.). *The Oxford handbook of innovation.* (pp. 1-26).

NY: Oxford University Press Inc.

Friedrich, T., Vessey. W.B., Scheu Friedrich, T., Vessey, W. B., Schuelke, M., Ruark, G., & Mumford, M. (2009). A framework for understanding collective leadership: The selective utilization of leader and team expertise within networks. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(6), 933-958.

Fredrich, T., Griffith, J., & Mumford, M. (2016). Collective leadership behaviors: Evaluating the leader, team network, and problem situation characteristics that influence their use. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(2), 312–333.

Gartner, W. (2000). What are we talking about when we talk about entrepreneurship? In Westhead, P., & Wright, M. (Eds.). *Advances in entrepreneurship*: *Volume 1* (pp. 15-22). MA: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

Green, D., & Gerken, A. (1989). Self-interest and public opinion toward smoking restrictions and cigarette taxes. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 53, 1-16.

Guildford, J.P. (1950). Creativity. *American Psychologist*, 5, 444-454.

Hall B. H, (2005). Innovation and diffusion. In Fagerberg, J., Mowery, D.C. & Nelson, R.R. (Eds.). *The Oxford handbook of innovation* (pp. 459-484). NY: Oxford University Press Inc.

Harriger., D., Lu, W., McKayer, J., Pruitt. B., & Goodson, P. (2014). Assessment of school wellness policies implementation by benchmarking against diffusion of innovation framework. *Journal of School Health*, (4), 257-283.

Harris, A. (2016). *Creativity and Education (Creativity, Education and the Arts*). Palgrave Macmillan.

Haxeltine, A., Avelino, F., Wittmayer, J., Kemp, R., Weaver, P., Backhaus, J., & O'Riordan, T. (2013). Transformative social innovation: a sustainability transitions perspective on social innovation. In *NESTA Conference Social Frontiers: The Next Edge of Social Science Research*. November. Downloaded from http://kemp.unu-merit.nl/pdf/Haxeltine%20et%20al.%202013%20TSI%20Transition%20Perspective.pdf

Hazel, K.L., & Onaga, E. (2003). Experimental social innovation and dissemination: The promise and its delivery. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 32(3-4), 285-294.

Harper, David J. (2011). Choosing a qualitative research method. n Harper, David J. & Thompson, A.R. (Eds.). *Qualitative research methods in mental health and psychotherapy.* Wiley-Blackwell.

Howaldt, J., & Schwartz, J. (2010). Social innovation: Concepts, research fields and international trends. Retrieved 10th April 2012 from http://www.internationalmonitoring.de/fileadmin/Downloads/Trendstudien/Trends_V2/IMO-MAG%20Howaldt_final_mit_cover.pdf

Howaldt, J., & Schwartz, J. (2011). Social innovation: Social challenges and future research fields. In Jeschke, S., Isenhardt, I., Hees, F., & Sven Trantow, S. (Eds.). *Enabling innovation: Innovative capability - German and international* (pp. 203-223). Springer NY: Springer.

Hubner, H. (1986). *The art and science of innovation management: an international perspective: proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Product Innovation Management*, Innsbruck/Igls, Austria, August 26-28, 1985 Amsterdam; New York : Elsevier

Hunter, S., Bedell, K. & Mumford, M D. (2007). Climate for creativity: A quantitative review. *Creativity Research Journal*, 19(1), 69 – 90.

Isaksen, S.G., & Akkermans, H.J. (2011). Creative climate: A leadership lever for innovation. The Journal of Creative Behavior. 45(3), 161-187.

Isaksen, S. G., Lauer, K., & Ekvall, G. (1999). Situational outlook questionnaire: A measure of the climate for creativity and change. *Psychological Reports*, 85(2), 665-674.

Isaksen, S., & Ekvall, G. (2010). Managing for innovation: The two faces of tension in creative climates. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 19(2), 73-88.

Katz, B., & Muro, M. (2010). The new "cluster movement": How regional clusters can foster the next economy. Downloaded from http://www.hrp.org/Site/docs/ResourceLibrary/Brookings_09-21-10_clusters_muro_katz.pdf

Kaufman, J., & Sternberg, R. (2010). (Eds.). *The Cambridge handbook of creativity*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Kets de Vries, M. & Instead, K. (1999). Transforming the mind-set of the organization: A clinical perspective. *Administration Society*, 30(6), 640-675.

Kets de Vries, M. (2001). Creating authentizotic organizations: Well-functioning individuals in vibrant companies**.** *Human Relations*, 54(1), 101-121.

King, A. (1984). The need for social and institutional innovation. In Heden, C.G., & King, A. (Eds.). *Social innovations for development* (pp. 1-20). NY:Pergamon Press.

King, A. (1984). Concluding statement. In Heden, C.G., & King, A. (Eds.). *Social innovations for development* (pp. 159-162). NY:Pergamon Press.

Kim, L., & Nelson, R. (2000). (Eds.). *Technology, learning and innovation: experiences of newly industrialized economies*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Kirkpatrick, D. L., & Kirkpatrick, J. D. (2006). *Evaluating training programs* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Klein, J-L. (2013). Introduction: Social innovation at the crossroads between science, economy and society. In Moulaert, F., MacCallullum, D., Mehmood, A, & Hamdouch, A. (Eds.). *The international handbook of social innovation* (pp. 9-12). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Kreindler, G., & Young, H.P. (2013). Rapid innovation diffusion in social networks. Downloaded from http://www.econ2.jhu.edu/people/young/Rapid_Innovation.pdf

Larsen, G. (2011). Understanding the early state of the innovation diffusion process: awareness, influence and communication networks. *Construction Management and Economics*, 29(11), 987-1002.

Lehman, B., & Crano, W.D. (2002). The pervasive effects of vested interest on attitude-criterion consistency in political judgement. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 38, 101-112.

Li, M. (2013). Social network and social capital in leadership and management research: A review of causal methods. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(5), 638-665.

Lundvall, B-A. (2010). (Ed.). *National systems of innovation: Towards a theory of innovation and interactive learning.* New York, New York; Anthem Press.

Majumdar, S., Guha, S., & Marakkath, N. (2016). Technology and innovation for change: An introduction. In Majumdar, S., Guha, S., & Marakkath, N. (2016). (Eds.). *Technology and innovation for social change*. (pp.1-3). New York:Springer.

Marinova, D. & Peillimore, J. (2003). Models of innovation. In Shavinina, V. (2003). (Ed.). *The international handbook on innovation* (pp. 44-53). Oxford, UK: Pergamon.

Matei, A., Savilescu, C,. &, Antonovici, G.C. (2015). Social innovation in the local public sector: A cross-regional approach for Romania. *Theoretical and Applied Economics*, Volume XXII. No. 4(605), Winter, pp. 5-20.

Meadow, A., & Parnes, S. (1959). Evaluation of training in creative problem solving. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 43(3), 189-194.

Meadows, D. H. (1972). The limits to growth: A report for the Club of Rome's project on the predicament of mankind. Club of Rome. *Universe, New York*.

Meadows, D.H. (2008). *Thinking in systems: A primer*. Chelsea Green Publishing.

Meadows, D.H., Randers, J., & Meadows, D.L. (2004). *Limits to growth: The 30-year update*. Chelsea Green Publishing.

Mehra, A., Smith, B., Dixon, A., & Robertson, B. (2006). Distributed leadership in teams: The network of leadership perceptions and team performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 232-245.

Miller, C., Adame, B. & Moore, S. (2013). Vested interest theory and disaster preparedness. *Disasters*, 37(1).1-27.

Moulaert, F, Martinelli, F., Swyngedouw, E., & Gonzalez, S. (2005). Towards alternative model(s) of local innovation. *Urban Studies*, 42(11), 1969-1990.

Moulaert, F, MacCallum, D., & Hillier, J. (2013). Social innovation: intuition, precept, concept, theory and practice. In Moulaert, F, MacCallum, D., Mehmood, A., & Hamdouch, A. (Eds.). *The international handbook on social innovation: Collective action, social learning and transdisciplinary research (pp.13-24)*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Moulaert, F, MacCallum, D., Mehmood, A., & Hamdouch, A. (2013*). The international handbook on social innovation: Collective action, social learning and transdisciplinary research*. Cheltenham, UK; Edward Elgar.

Mowery, D.C., & Sampat, B. (2005). The Bayh-Dole Act of 1980 and university-industry technology transfer: A model for other OECD Governments? *Journal of Technology Transfer,* 30(1-2), 115-127.

Mulgan, G. (2012). Social innovation theories: Can theory catch up with practice. In Franz, H-W., Hochgerner, J., & Howaldt, J. (Eds). *Challenge Social Innovation: Potentials for business, social entrepreneurship, welfare and civil society*. (pp.19-42). Berlin: Springer.

Mulgan G., Ali, R., Halkett, R., & Sanders, B. (2007). In and out of synch: The challenge of growing social innovation. *NESTA Research Report* September 2007. Retrieved 10 June 2012

http://www.youngfoundation.org/files/images/In_and_Out_of_Sync_Final.pdf

Mumford, M. (2002). Social innovation: Ten cases from Benjamin Franklin. *Creativity Research Journal,* 14(2), 253-266.

Mumford, M. (2012). (Ed.). *Handbook of organizational creativity*. London, UK:

Mumford, M., Scott, G., Gladdis, B., & Strange, J.M. (2002). Leading creative people: Orchestrating expertise and relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly,* 13(6), 705-750.

Mumford, M., & Moertl, P. (2003). Cases of social innovation: Lessons from two innovations in the 20th century. *Creativity Research Journal,* 15(2&3), 261-266.

Mumford, M., & Licunana, B. (2004). Leading for innovation: Conclusions, issues and directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(1), 163-171.

Muro, M., & Katz, D. (2010). The new 'clusters movement: How regional innovation clusters can foster the next economy. *Metropolitan Policy Program at Brookings*. Downloaded from

http://wpri.com/2015/08/12/will-the-1-3m-brookings-study-of-ris-economy-do-any-good/

Nelson, R, R. (Ed.). (1993) *National systems of innovation: A comparative analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nelson, R. R., & Rosenberg, N. (1993). Technical innovation and national systems. In Nelson, R, R. (Ed.). *National systems of innovation: A comparative analysis* (pp. 3-28). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nicholls, A., & Murdock, A. (2012). (Eds.). *Social innovation: Blurring boundaries to reconfigure markets*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Niu, S-C. (2002). A scholastic formulation of the Bass model of new-product diffusion. *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, 8(3), 49-263

Northhouse, P. (2004). *Leadership theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks. CA. Sage Publications Inc.

OECD. (1997). *National innovation systems.* OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD. (2001). *The wellbeing of nations: The role of human and social capital* . OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD. (2008). *Environmental policy, technological innovation and patents. OECD Studies on Environmental Innovation*. OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD. (2010a). *The OECD innovation strategy: Getting a head start on tomorrow*. OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD. (2010b). *Measuring innovation: A new perspective.* OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD. (2011). *Fostering innovation to address social challenges.* OECD Publishing, Paris.

Osburg, T., & Schmidpeter, R. (2013) (Eds.). *Social innovation: Solutions for a Sustainable Future.* Springer.

Porter, M. (1998). *Competitive strategy: The techniques for analyzing industries and competitors*. New York, New York: The Free Press.

Porter, M. (1998). Clusters and the new economics of competition. *Harvard Business Review*, 76(6), 77-90.

Porter, M. (2000). Location, competition, and economic development: Local clusters in a global economy. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 14(1), 15-34.

Portes, (2000). The two meanings of social capital. *Sociological Forum*. 15(1), 1-12.

Pring, R. (2012). *Life and Death of Secondary Education for All*. Routledge.

Richards, T. (1991). Creativity and innovation: woods, trees, and pathways. *R & D Management*, 21(2), 97-108.

Robinson, K. (1993). *The Arts in Schools; Principles, Practice and Provision*. Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.

Robbins, K. (2011). *Out of our minds: Learning to be creative*. (2nd ed.). Capstone, A Wiley Company.

Robinson, K., & Aronica, L. (2016a). *Creative schools: The grassroots revolution that's transforming education*. NY: Viking Penguin.

Robinson, K., & Aronica, L. (2016b). *Creative schools: Revolutionizing education from the ground up.* NY: Viking Penguin.

Rogers, E.M. (1962). *Diffusion of innovations*. New York: Free Press.

Rogers, E.M. (1995). *Diffusion of innovations*. (4th ed.). New York: Free Press.

Rogers, E.M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations*. (5th ed.). New York: Free Press.

Rogers, E. M. (2004). A prospective and retrospective look at the diffusion model. *Journal of Heath Communication*, 9(1), 13-19.

Rogers, E.M., & Adhikarya. (1979). Diffusion of innovations: An up-to-date- review and commentary. In Dan Nimmo (Ed.). *Communication Yearbook 3*. (pp. 67-81). New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books.

Rogers, E.M., & Scott, K. (1997). The diffusion of innovations model and outreach from the national network of libraries of medicine to the Native American communities. White Paper prepared for the *National Network of Libraries of Medicine*. Downloaded from http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/documents/diffusion/rogers.htm

Runco. M. (2007). *Creativity: Theories and themes: Research, development and practice*. New York, NY: Elsevier Academic Press.

Runco, M., & Jaeger, G.J. (2012). The standard definition of creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, 24(1), 92-96.

Rushton, M. (2013). Introduction. In M. Rushton (Ed.), *Creative communities: Art works in economic development.* (pp. 1–11).

Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Ryan, B., & Gross, N. (1943). The diffusion of hybrid seed corn in two Iowa communities. *Rural Sociology,* 8(1), 15-24.

Scott, J., & Carrington, P. (2011). *The SAGE handbook of social network analysis*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE

Schumpeter, J. (1936). *The theory of economic development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Schumpeter, J. (1942). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*. NY: Harper Perennial Modern Thought, Harper Collins Publishers.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.

Singhal, A., & Rogers, E. (2003). *Combating AIDS: Communication strategies in action*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Sivacek, J., & Crano, W. D. (1982). Vested interest as a moderator of attitude behavior consistency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43, 210-221.

Stenmark, C., Shipman, A., & Mumford, M. (2011). Managing the innovation process: The dynamic role of leaders. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 5(1), 1931-3897.

Sternberg, R.J. (2002). (Ed.). *Handbook of creativity*. NY: Cambridge University Press.

Sternberg, R.J. (2012). The assessment of creativity: An investment approach. Creativity Research Journal. 24(1), 3-12.

Sternberg, R., Prestz, J., & Kaufman, J. (2003). Types of innovations. In Shavinina, V. (2003) (Ed.). *The international handbook on innovation* (pp. 158-169). Oxford, UK: Pergamon.

Strang, D. & Soule, S. (1998). Diffusion in organizations and social movements: From hybrid corn to poison pills. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 265-290.

Stroh, D. (2015). *Systems thinking for social change: A practical guide to solving complex problems, avoiding unintended consequences, and achieving lasting results.* VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.

Tan, J., Zhang, H., & Wang, L. (2015). Network closure or structural hole? The conditioning effects of network-level social capital on innovation performance. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 39(5), 1189-1212.

United Nations (1968). Polices & means of promoting technical progress. Papers presented to the fifth meeting of senior economic advisors to ECE Governments. NewYork. United Nations Publications

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

Van de Ven, A.H., Polley, D., Garud. R., & Venkataraman, S. (2008). *The innovation journey*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Van de Ven, A.H., Angle, H.L., & Poole, M.S. (2000.) (Eds.). *Research on the management of innovation: The Minnesota studies.* New York, New York: Oxford University Press.

Van de Ven, A.H. (2017). The innovation journey: you can't control it, but you can learn to maneuver it. *Innovation: Organization and Management*, 19(1), 39-42.

Wohlfieler, D. (1998). Community organizing and community building for health: Community organizing and community building among gay and bisexual men: The STOP AIDS Project. In Minkler, M. (Ed.). *Community organizing and community building for health (*pp. 230-240). New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Yammarino, F., Salas, E., Serban, A., Shirreffs, K., & Shuffler, M. (2012). Collectivistic leadership approaches: Putting the "we" in leadership science and practice. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 5(4), 328-402.

Yin, R.K. (1981). The case study crisis: Some answers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26(1), 58-65.

Yin, R.K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods.* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks. CA. Sage Publications, Inc.

Yin, R.K. (2016). *Qualitative research from start to finish*. (2nd Ed.). London: The Guilford Press.

Yin, R.K., Hacket, E., & Chubin, D. (2008). Discovering "what's innovative": The challenge of evaluating education research and development efforts. *Peabody Journal of Education,* 83(4), 674-690.

Yin, R.K., & Kaftrarian, S. (1997). Introduction: Challenges of community-based program outcomes evaluations. *Evolution and Program Planning*, 20(3), 293-297.

Young, H. P. (2009). Innovation diffusion in heterogeneous populations: Contagion, social influence and social learning. *American Economic Review*. Vol 99(5), 1899-1924.

Young, H. P. (2011). The dynamics of social innovation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, PNAS* 108(4), 21285-21292.

Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations*. (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NT: Prentice Hall.

Appendix A: Recommendations for Supporting Organization

New ventures, especially those starting from zero, have a limited time to get their message out into the market place and succeed. Failure among new business startups is high. Entrepreneurs, new business start-ups, and businesses seek to get an elevator pitch that allows then to quickly explain their idea, the value of that idea; in other words, fashion a hook that grabs and retains the attention of their audience. Not only do complex ideas need to be distilled to the essence and value, but they need to resonate with the audience whether that is one or many. Social innovation initiatives seeking to gain traction in the broader community face the same challenges as businesses. How to market the organization to the market place, how to gain support from opinion leaders who can influence community sectors, how to provide value or perception of value, and how to maintain and grow a customer base.

The general themes that came from the stakeholders are helpful in providing insight for the organization. A key group of themes were around communication. Specifically, confusion around the concept of creativity and the problem communicating the benefit of the organization and communication in general. That could be explained in part, by the importance that is placed on of innovation rather than creativity. It could also be related to the intangible nature of creativity, and the need for tangible offerings or a portfolio of tangible products and services that helps individuals and organizations understand the value and benefit of creativity.

Expanding and growing the Creative Oklahoma community is critical to achieve the vision and mission of the organization. There are limitations to the existing network, and a lack of connection and engagement across networks, which limits the ability of

the organization to bring in new membership. This is despite extensive cross sector engagement and evidence of heterogeneous networks that should facilitate connections and expansion. Networking, building social capital and partnership building are critical not just to grow the organization, but to access additional resources, stimulate new ideas and gain new knowledge through new or existing connections

The following ten recommendations have come to light through this case study research process, and may have practical application to the supporting organization and other social innovation initiatives.

1 – Creativity vs innovation

Creativity is a complex concept, and it was clear that there was a great deal of ambiguity not just surrounding the meaning of the word but also how it could provide broad based value. Board members who had been part of the social innovation process, helping to build the organization, and clarify the purpose, struggled not only to understand the concepts themselves but how to explain the concepts to others. The term creativity was largely misunderstood within the broader community. Some of the barriers were located in community norms and culture because the term was either seen as ambiguous or tied to a specific concept such as art. Conversely, innovation was a concept that was not only clearly understood, but was identified as being critical across all stakeholder groups. It had a more common frame of reference in the community, with broad application in economic development and social initiatives. Innovation was seen as critical to business survival. All the stakeholders were extremely highly vested in innovation, but they struggled to identify where creativity fit in the workplace or

practical application. The exception was the culture community, who saw it as an integral part of work.

Changing the name of the organization would require a major rebranding effort. However, rewriting copy and focusing communication to include innovation, would tie the organization to innovation and link creativity to innovation. Adding a call in for marketing purposes that clearly focuses on innovation, for example stimulating innovation in Oklahoma, would provide a route to engage individuals and organizations across the three sectors. Innovation can then be tied back to creativity, and a home can be found for creativity.

2 - Focus the energy of the initiative where it has been successful, while building strategies to be more inclusive.

The problem for an organization seeking to be statewide (and even global), is how to extend the footprint. A major area of success was an increased awareness on the national and international stage. However, within the region, the locus and footprint of the organization was clearly within Oklahoma City, with limited exposure outside of a defined geographical area. There was limited 'travel' within sectors, across demographic and geographic boundaries. Some of the barriers were longstanding political and cultural tensions, and it is important to work out how this can be refocused into an enabler for the innovation.

Building up, and capitalizing upon existing strengths is a solid growth strategy that can allow optimization of resources and strengthen a powerbase. Focusing on the where the organization has been successful and has some high-profile support would allow the initiative to building on existing strengths, including networks, network

connections and ‘wins’. This could also be a less risky approach to building success and branding, allowing resources to be focused, with the organization choosing where, when and what initiatives to partner with or initiate. The organization could develop a portfolio of tangible offerings that could help explain how creativity can be of value, and the diversity of interpretation and implementation.

Innovation, and social innovation in particular, takes a long time to diffuse into the socio-economic context. While consolidating support and tangible outputs, the organization should work out a long-term strategy for diffusion into Tulsa. At the same time develop a longer-term strategy for how to diffuse into rural Oklahoma, starting with communities that have the closest ‘fit’ and for whom the message and mission may resonate most closely. In a state where business heavily utilize relationships and connections, the ability to access leaders and opinion leaders quickly through networks is valuable in supporting the innovation expansion. Identifying who to connect with, and building and nurturing those relationships with a long-term partnership in view, would be critical to expanding the organizational reach.

3 - *Increase network coverage and diffusion by utilization of opinion leaders engaged in current network*.

A theme that was clear across the stakeholder groups was the need to expand the social innovation network. Stakeholders had themselves been actively recruited into the network. This was often through personal connections, and as part of standing up and developing the organization in the initial stages. To grow, the organization needed, and still needs, to bring in new members and spread the message of the organization.

It was clear that stakeholders are actively engaged in cross sector activities, with access to heterogeneous networks. Some of those networks and organizations were clearly identified as innovative and creative, which would be a good 'fit' the social innovation network. However, the connection is not being made or leveraged with effect. The board of directors are highly networked individuals, with extensive social capital. These individuals would be a primary resource, able to play an active role in recruiting a certain number of new organizations and individuals each year. A starting point would be to leverage existing individuals and their networks. This would require current stakeholders to bring in new members, as potential ambassadors and board members. The aim would be long term sustainable partnerships, focusing networks where individuals were nodes linking to new and different networks. The initial focus would be on Oklahoma City, moving towards building relationships as part of the strategic planning to expand the network footprint to other main cities and rural communities. The starting point would be those who would be most aligned, and where the existing network assets can be leveraged.

4 – *Communication*

Communication is central to the diffusion process, and is a critical role played by opinion leaders in educating others in their networks about the innovation. A social innovation that is focused on a creativity, especially a broad-based community based initiative, may struggle to explain the meaning of creativity and the different value propositions.

Communication was predominant theme that also converged with a number of sub themes. Communication is critical to diffusing the innovation, and that includes the

mediums used to diffuse the message, modifying the message and targeting the audience. Marketing and branding utilize the same elements, and communication is also used to maintain and manage existing networks. The organization needs to have a strong, clear and regular communication pathway and to target current audience. An integrated communication plan is critical to maintaining consistency of message and brand. The organization also communicates through the tangible services and products, and the forum, workshops, training, showcasing creative individuals and organizations all help to make an intangible concept more tangible.

There was a problem with understanding what creativity was and how it could create value. This generated a challenge of how to communicate with different stakeholder groups, as well as individuals within those groups. Conversely, innovation was perceived as important. If the communication can include innovation or clearly link creativity to innovation, it will allow individuals to see a connection and benefit. There was a potential disconnect between what the founding members saw as the perceived value of creativity to the community and what the community stakeholder groups saw as value. Innovation had greater direct value. There was also a difference in understanding of what creativity was defined as, and how well it was understood.

5 –*Leveraging existing assets, and building an asset map*

While this was not an explicit theme, identifying and leveraging current assets is part of the need to manage and build sustainable networks within the community. Assets can include resources, information, knowledge, access, skills and contacts. Building an asset map, or adapting the asset map concept, may provide a valuable tool to manage and strategize the innovation process. This will also require the organization

to be deliberate in gaining insight and understanding of the individuals and organizations.

Innovation emerges within a ‘system’ or series of interlinking systems, where the actors and institutions and the relationships between them can support or hinder the innovation. Therefore, it is important to understand the complex tapestry of the context and timeframe affecting individuals, organizations, and communities. Building an asset map can also build an extended awareness of the historical and current nuances of the political, cultural, social and economic background within which the innovation emerges or wishes to emerge. This includes managing networks and relationships, and using connections to navigate tensions, build relationship and access resources.

6 – *Networking and building professional connections*.

Professional and social connections were leveraged to bring influencers into the organization. A primary motivation for engaging with the social innovation was through personal and organizational networking, motivated by potential business and partnership opportunities. Leaders, as identified by stakeholder responses, are actively engaged in networking and building social capital, and organizations encourage individuals to network. The networks have multiple functions from recruiting, accessing individuals who had influence, knowledge, skills, connections, and access to resources.

To continue to attract and to retain individuals, the social innovation needs to focus on creating opportunities for deliberate networking and partnerships. This will build connections and provide value to stakeholder, while building social capital for the organization. The initiative needs to focus on making professional connections and enhancing innovation within the business community. This would also support

expectations of stakeholders that association with the organization would generate, new partnerships and new knowledge.

7 – *Build Portfolio of Tangible Offerings*

A challenge for the organization was defining what creativity was and how it provided value. One of the key problems was ambiguity of the concept, especially where creativity was seen as something that was intangible. Conversely, the organization was seen as very successful with tangible offerings such as the forums, showcasing creative individuals, and engaging subject matter experts and speakers. The forums were identified as the most successful offering from the organization, providing visible examples of creativity as well as networking opportunities.

As a creative and innovative organization, building a portfolio of tangible creative offerings is a way to demonstrate creativity. Individuals may not understand the value unless they see the outcome and potential benefit. In diffusion this is part of the trialability and risk of an innovation. Individuals gather information and decide if it has value, and if they want to become invested in the innovation. It may attract more people to the organization.

8 – *Inclusive vs Exclusive*

The stakeholders clearly identified a need to be, or perceived to be, less exclusive and more inclusive. The network was defined as being Oklahoma City centric. Rural communities in particular were identified as missing. Other missing groups were identified by demographics such as age, or characteristics such as creativity. To expand the organization and become more inclusive, the organization needs to identify the communities, and the formal and informal leaders within the

communities. To embark on a plan of intentional engagement of opinion leaders in a broader community context, the organization will need to identify what may be of benefit to those communities. Understanding the potential 'stake', and what leaders and communities feel has value and importance, may increase the chances of them becoming vested in Creative Oklahoma.

9 – *Reciprocity*

While change agents and organizers focus on recruiting to expand the network, it is important to maintain and manage the relationships and network. Individuals and organizations were being recruited primarily because of influence, connections and ability to fulfill resource needs. The traffic seemed to be predominantly one way, with those in the network giving to the organization with little or no reciprocity. Networks have multiple functions, sharing information, providing support, building social capital, and it is important to be engaged and active within the network. In that sense, the network depends upon those within the network reciprocating and being both a 'recipient' and 'disseminator'; to share and build the network. The feedback loop of the diffusion process focuses primarily on feedback from adopters that modify the innovation. Another feedback loop is that of the managers of the social innovation, back to the members of the network to make them feel valued, and provide value. As well as utilizing social network for resources provide resources, the social innovation needs to reciprocate and build 'fans' at the same time as building social capital.

10 – *Move from talking about and educating about to engagement and practical implementation*

There is a need to build a portfolio of offerings that can help support the perceived and unmet needs of the community and network. A primary function of the network is communication, providing information about the organization and educating individuals. This is important in helping individuals understand the mission, vision and values as part of selling the organization, and getting individuals invested in the organization. However, there is a time when the talking needs to move into producing something. With an organization that is focused on an intangible like creativity, it is important to build tangible outcomes. To provide products and services that identify the organization as creative, not merely talking about being creative. This could also be way to build reputation and expand the organizational brand outside of Oklahoma City.

Taking elements of creativity and breaking them down into deliverables that can support stakeholders in realizing the 'state of creativity', and build individual, organizational and community creativity. Creativity was primarily identified by the founding members as being an idea that was new and had value. Creativity, or stimulating creativity in organizations is complex. It can involve developing a creative climate to support individuals and teams, developing leadership and management skills to support creative climate, creative problem solving and creative workforce, understanding the creative capacity of the organization and the individuals, and the creative problem solving and creativity tools. The social innovation could provide training and development in creative tools, working with communities and facilitating creative problem-solving tools to work with challenges, engage stakeholders and find

solutions. This would also provide income back to the organization, solving one of the primary barriers to the innovation process which was lack of financial resources.

Appendix B: Interview Documents and Protocol

Letter for Interview Protocol Introduction

Good morning, good /afternoon, I am Strawberry Olive, a PhD candidate at the University of Oklahoma. I am requesting your participation in a PhD research study called “Social Innovation in a Regional Context: A Case Study of Creative Oklahoma and the Implementation of a Statewide Creativity Initiative”. The purpose of the study is to examine the social innovation process from inception to emergence and diffusion, in a community context at regional level and within the three sectors of education, commerce and culture. This interview will investigate and understand Creative Oklahoma as the facilitator of a social innovation initiative (innovation process), and secondly to examine the diffusion and post diffusion phase as the original ‘adopters’ transform the social innovation into their own context as part of the changing dynamics of the innovation process.

You have been selected as a research interview candidate based upon your current engagement with the Creative Oklahoma organization, and your expert knowledge in your sector.

Questions for education, commerce and culture stakeholder groups

Creative Oklahoma

Thinking about Creative Oklahoma:

Q1 How and why did you become involved with Creative Oklahoma, and what has your level of involvement been?

Q2 How did Creative Oklahoma communicate, how was the mission communicated, has it changed

Q3 What do you see as the function or role of Creative Oklahoma and how has that been successfully managed.

Q4 What has been most successful, or beneficial for you regards Creative Oklahoma and what is the delta or gap with where Creative Oklahoma is now and where you think it should be.

Q5 Who have been the key people (actors) in the Creative Oklahoma initiative

Q6 What have been the barriers and enablers to the Creative Oklahoma initiative

Sector and Organization Characteristics

Q7 Thinking about the environment that you operate in. How would you describe your industry or business sector, how would you describe your organization and how would you describe your individual characteristics?

Q8 How important is innovation in your sector, where does it manifest (come from)

Q9 What or who are the key organizations or people in your sector who influence innovation drive or change and how do they influence.

Q10 What opportunities do you see for innovation in your sector

Q11 What opportunities for innovation do you see in Oklahoma

Q12 Innovation can be resource intensive, what were/are the key resources

Q13 What are the main influences to innovation in your sector, the barriers and enablers to innovation.

Q14 How important is it to generate new knowledge and ideas in your sector, where does it come from and has anything emerged as a result of association with Creative Oklahoma

Q15 Are you involved with any other sectors and if so in what way.

Q16 The sectors that you are involved in, are they innovative, involved with Creative Oklahoma and who are the key people that influence innovation in those other sectors.
Q17 What motivated you and your organization to join with Creative Oklahoma
Q18 What benefits or value do you get from association with Creative Oklahoma
Q19 In the other sectors you are involved in, have any new partnerships or ideas (innovation) emerged as a result of Creative Oklahoma
Q20 How did Creative Oklahoma emerge in different sectors – what have been the barriers and enablers
Q21 How do you define creativity and what does it mean
Q22 What have been the main barriers and or enablers to the Oklahoma Creativity initiative in your sector and how were they overcome or capitalized on
Q23 How important are networks, what have been the key networks, and what networks have emerged as a result of Creative Oklahoma
Q24 How can creativity lead to entrepreneurship, innovation and economic growth and how does that lead to regional competency and uniqueness
Q25 Thinking about entrepreneur, what is an entrepreneur/entrepreneurship and where does it emerge

Founding Members Questions

Q1 As a founding member can you tell me about Creative Oklahoma, why it was started, how it was started and who was involved?
Q2 Thinking about the Creative Oklahoma initiative, what did you see as being the aims and objectives of starting Creative Oklahoma? Has it changed over time and why do you think it changed?
Q3 Thinking about the resources that Creative Oklahoma needed/needs. What do you think were the main resources needed at the start, as it progressed, in the future and where were/are they sourced?
Q4 What do you see as the role of Creative Oklahoma and where has it been successful?
Q5 Thinking about where Creative Oklahoma is now, where do you see it going in the future (the delta)? How do you think that matches with the three stake holder groups?
Q6 What do you think have been the major milestones of the initiative, and where has it been most successful?
Q7 Thinking about the Creative Oklahoma initiative what do you think have been the main enablers to the initiative and what were the main barriers and how were they overcome?
Q8 Thinking about the external environment rather than the internal environment to Creative Oklahoma as an organization, what do you think have been the main external influences?
Q9 Thinking about the targets of the creativity initiative, who was targeted and what was the criteria to get people involved?
Q10 Thinking about communicating about Creative Oklahoma, how is the information being communicated and what has been the most effective strategy to target audiences? Has it changed? Is it different with who you targeted first and who you targeted later?
Q11 Thinking now the Creative Oklahoma initiative, how has it emerged in the different sectors?
Q12 Thinking about the different stake holder groups and innovation, are there any differences in innovation or attitude towards innovation?

Q13 What innovations, new ideas have you seen emerge as Creative Oklahoma has developed? Within Creative Oklahoma as an organization, within the different stake holder groups and maybe combined with and between the stake holder groups?
Q14 Who have been the key players, who have been instrumental in the Creativity Initiative process and how has that evolved?
Q15 Thinking about the individuals and the organizations who were quick to join or align with Creative Oklahoma, why do you think they did, what was different about them from those who signed up later?
Q16 What's the motivation the drive or the reason why individuals or organizations align themselves to Creative Oklahoma?
Q17 Think about Creative Oklahoma, how can it give value, what is the value, or how do you think or in what way does can Creative Oklahoma give value?
Q18 Thinking about new knowledge and ideas and Creative Oklahoma, what knew knowledge has emerged and where did it merge from and what did it bring?
Q19 Thinking about networks, how important are networks? What have been the main networks? And what role have they played and have you seen any new networks emerge and if so what has been the value or the benefit or any new knowledge that's come out of it?
Q20 Creative Oklahoma has a mission that identifies creativity at its core. How was the concept framed or explained?
Q21 Thinking about entrepreneurship, innovation and economic growth, how or in what ways do you think creativity can lead to those goals? How can that develop competency, skills, and advantages at the regional level?
Q22 Thinking about innovation, what opportunities do you see for Oklahoma or your sector?
Q23 What do you see as being an entrepreneur or and an entrepreneurship?

Short Demographic Questions for all stakeholders

Q1 What sector are you in

- Education
- Commerce
- Community
- Other:

Q2 How many years in the sector

Q3 How many years in the organization/current job

Q4 For the sector norm is the organization considered

- Small
- Medium
- Large

Q5 Are there any other sections that you are involved in if so in what capacity.

- Education
- Commerce
- Community
- Other

Q6 What level of education have you achieved

- High school
- Graduate
- Post graduate
- Professional
- Other qualifications

Q7 Within your sector what is your level of experience/knowledge/how would you describe your self

- Leader in the field
- Expert knowledge/expert skill
- Highly knowledgeable/highly skilled
- Knowledgeable/skilled
- Average

- Have a skill that is unique or different and desirable

Q8 Within your sector what is your level of experience/knowledge/how would others describe you

- Leader in the field
- Expert knowledge/expert skill
- Highly knowledgeable/highly skilled
- Knowledgeable/skilled
- Average

Have a skill that is unique or different and desirable

Appendix C: Vested Interest Questions

Vested Interest
Q 29 Awareness of innovation (salience) Scale is 1 = low - 7 = very high
Personal, organizational and sector
A How often is innovation on the agenda /how often is it discussed in your organization(sector)
B How concerned are you about the need for innovation
C How topical is the Creative Oklahoma initiative (as part of innovation)?
D How much are policy makers talking about/aware of the Creative Oklahoma initiative
E How much are people in the community talking about/aware of the Creative Oklahoma initiative
F How much are people in education, commerce and culture sectors/organizations talking about (how aware)
Q 30 (2) How often innovation occurs (immediacy) Scale is 1 = low - 7 = very high
Personal, organizational and sector
A How often does innovation occur (do products and processes change) Scale is 1 = low - 7 = very high
B How long do you think it will be before new innovations/innovative ideas emerge in your organization (sector)
C Do you anticipate results will be in the near future or in the distant
D How long do you think it will be before new innovations/innovative ideas emerge from affiliation with Creative Oklahoma
E Thinking about the association with Creative Oklahoma are you anticipating results will come soon (short term) or will come in the future (long term)
Q 31 (3) Probability of innovation occurring (certainty): Scale is 1 = low - 7 = very high
Personal, organizational and sector
A How likely is it that innovation leads to competitive advantage in your sector
B How likely is innovation to occur in your sector
C How certain are you that innovation is a factor positive outcome or success
D How certain are you that lack of innovation is a factor in negative outcomes
Creative Oklahoma
E In terms of, innovation, how confident are you that involvement with Creative Oklahoma could bring benefits (new knowledge, new ideas, new relationships)
F What is the probability of new innovations/innovative ideas emerging from affiliation with Creative Oklahoma
G What is the probability of no new innovations/innovative ideas emerging from affiliation with Creative Oklahoma
Q32 (4) Ability to affect innovation (Self-Efficacy) Scale is 1 = low - 7 = very high
Personal, organizational and sector
A To what extent are you instrumental (how effective are you) in driving innovation (policies, procedures, vision)
B To what extent has your involvement with Creative Oklahoma affected the generation of innovation (new ideas, relationships, new ways of doing business)
Creative Oklahoma
C How effective are you at using Creative Oklahoma to generate innovation
Q33 (5) Risk of not innovating (Stake risk) Scale is 1 = low - 7 = very high
Personal, organizational and sector
A How vulnerable is the sector to innovation from competitors
B What is the risk of not innovating
Creative Oklahoma
C What is the risk of not being involved with the Creative Oklahoma initiative for you
D What is the risk of not being involved with the Creative Oklahoma initiative for the State of Oklahoma

Appendix D Letter of Introduction and Supporting Documentation

May 21, 2012

information removed

information removed

information removed

information removed

Dear information removed,

I would like to take this opportunity to bring to your attention an OU Ph.D. student, Strawberry Olive, who is in the dissertation phase of her program and would like to incorporate the Creative Oklahoma initiative into the research. Her dissertation focus is innovation in creativity and she has been meeting with information removed. I feel that her research would be better received if she were to have the senior level organizational support in her effort.

As background, OU has run a program training Ph.D. students in Organizational Leadership for over a decade. This program is administered through the Graduate College and the College of Continuing Education (Advanced Programs), and is funded through contracts with the U.S. Department of Defense. We have trained students through five Germany cohorts and one Tulsa cohort, and there have been well over 100 students who have enrolled in these five cohorts with a sixth entering their second and last summer of residency this year.

Respectfully,

information removed

University of Oklahoma

information removed

Appendix E: Interview Candidate Email

I am Strawberry Olive, a PhD candidate at the University of Oklahoma. I am the principal investigator for a research study on social innovation and am doing a case study on the state wide Creative Oklahoma creativity initiative. The purpose of the study is to examine the social innovation process, from conception to how it develops, emerges and diffuses within a community context at regional level and in different domains. The Creative Oklahoma statewide 'creativity' social innovation initiative is the case study subject, within the three sectors of education, commerce and culture.

There are two elements to the research study. First to understand Creative Oklahoma as the facilitator of a social innovation initiative (innovation process), and secondly to examine the diffusion and post diffusion phase as the original 'adopters' transform the social innovation into their own context as part of the changing dynamics of the innovation process.

Creative Oklahoma has recommended you as an interview candidate, based upon your current engagement with the organization, and your expert knowledge in your field. If you are willing I would like to schedule an appointment to conduct the interview.

The interview will take approximately two hours and ten minutes. The first part of the interview will be short demographic questions and the main interview will ask questions based on Creative Oklahoma and the sector/s that you are involved in.

Please find attached the informed consent form, it will be produced at the interview as well. Should you wish to contact me for any further information on the study, I can be reached at the contact details in the signature block. Thank you in advance for you cooperation and time.

Sincerely

Strawberry Olive

E-mail: Strawberry@ou.ed

Appendix F Institutional Review Board Description of Study Protocol

Submission of a copy of a grant application does not replace completion of this form. Please respond to each item. Incomplete submission forms will be returned to you.

1) Click below to describe the research design of the study.

This research design explores social innovation in a regional context and sub sectors. This will identify main stakeholders/actors and institutions influencing the process.

The research will involve 45 structured interviews conducted with key personnel from a variety of organizations, who will be selected on the basis of their involvement with the Creative Oklahoma social innovation initiative and . The stratified sample will come from Creative Oklahoma foundation and the three stake- holder groups that are the focus of the Oklahoma initiative. The structured interviews will be 2 hours in length, and will focus on the originators of the social innovation initiative, and a group of individuals who have been identified as highly involved with the initiative. The interviews will use probe questions aimed at expert knowledge of and experience with the social innovation initiative and business sector specific expertise. A short supplemental questionnaire will focus on demographic related topics. Any additional data will be from relevant historical records.

2) In the input area below, describe the recruitment procedures. Attach a copy of any material used to recruit subjects (e.g., informed consent forms, advertisement, flyers, telephone scripts, verbal recruitment scripts, cover letters, etc.) Explain who will approach potential participants to request participation in the research study and what will be done to protect the individual's privacy in this process.

The Dean of the University of Oklahoma Graduate College will send a letter of introduction to the director of Creative Oklahoma, to introduce the Principal Investigator (PI).

The interviewee selection, which will be done in conjunction with Creative Oklahoma leadership, will be based upon level of engagement and knowledge of the community wide social innovation initiative.

Creative Oklahoma will request support from organizational members and affiliates internally.

The Principle Investigator (PI) will contact the interviewee candidate via email (recruitment script #1) and request participation in the research study and schedule an interview appointment. A reminder e-mail will be re sent a week prior to the interview date.

The interviews will be audio recorded – with permission of the interview candidate.

The Informed Consent form will be provided via e-mail to all prospective interviewee candidates to read prior to the interview. The form will be produced at the interview, and read by the interviewee, identifying consent and level of confidentiality. This will include: consent to (or not) being directly quoted and consent to (or not) being reported by name with any quoted material. The interviews will be audio recorded and the interviewee can refuse permission for the taping of the interview. Prior to the interview, the PI will explain the purpose of the study and interviewees will be given time to ask any questions before the interview starts and at the end. The PI will not/has not offered either compensation or any inducement to partake in this study.

Creative Oklahoma leadership will be engaged in finding substitute candidates (based on experience and sector) should a candidate from the original sampling frame have to drop out for any reason.

3) Below, list and describe the tasks that participants will be asked to perform, including a step-by-step description for each procedure you plan to use with

your subjects. Provide the approximate duration of subject participation for each procedure.

Read study recruitment letter (e-mail), read consent form, ask any question before or after the interview (10 minutes).

The participants will be asked to complete a short demographic survey, which includes background questions about themselves, the state of Oklahoma and industry sector experience they have expert knowledge in. This is both a lead in to the main interview but also provides additional background information. (10 minutes).

The structured interview will last two hours. The interview questions are contained in the interview protocol. (Two hours). The interview will be taped.

The protocol questions ask the interviewee to provide facts, information and opinions based on experience with the Creative Oklahoma initiative.

4) Describe your data collection procedures. If data collection instruments will be used, indicate the time necessary to complete them, the frequency of administration, and the setting in which they will be administered, such as telephone, mail, or face-to-face interview. (You must submit a copy of each study instrument, including all questionnaires, surveys, protocols for interviews, etc.)

Data collection will be qualitative and conducted through face to face interviews which will last two hours including a pre questionnaire that will take 5 minutes

5) Click below and provide background information for the study including the objective of the proposed research, purpose, research question, hypothesis and

other information deemed relevant. Include up to 5 references from the literature.

The purpose of the proposed research is to gain insight and better understanding of social innovation in a regional and sector context and produce a practical framework.

This study will explore the following hypotheses:

Ha1: Regional and sector specific factors would affect the social innovation process

Ha2: Innovation would differ between first generation and second generation iteration.

Ha3: Social innovation and creativity initiatives can affect regional competencies

Ha4: The combined framework of social innovation, systems of innovation, entrepreneurship and diffusion would provide a macro and micro perspective of the social innovation process.

The emergence of social innovation in a regional context will be explored using Creative Oklahoma Creativity initiative as a case study. This study will be explored in a temporal context, from the inception of Creative Oklahoma to the current time. The theoretical framework (Ha3) will be used to explore an appropriate and effective construct with practical application in the development of a social innovation initiative. The research will examine blocks/enablers to

the innovation process and the potential opportunities /benefits that could accrue from a social innovation initiative at regional level.

References:

Boyatzis, R. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development.* London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Edquist, C. (2006). Systems of innovation: Perspective and challenges. In Fagerber, J., Mowery, D.C., and Nelson, R.R. (Eds). *The Oxford handbook of innovation*. (pp 181-208). NY: Oxford University Press Inc.

Gartner, W. (2000). What are we talking about when we talk about entrepreneurship? In Westhead, P., and Wright, M. (Eds.). *Advances in Entrepreneurship: Volume 1* (pp. 15-22). MA: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

Hall, B. H. (2005). Innovation and diffusion. In Fagerberg, J., Mowery, D.C., and Nelson, R.R. (Eds). *The Oxford handbook of innovation*. (pp, 459-484). NY:Oxford University Press Inc.

Mumford, M.D. (2002). Social innovation: Ten cases from Benjamin Franklin. *Creativity Research Journal.* 14(2), 253-266.

Appendix G: Informed Consent Form

Social Innovation

Introduction and purpose:

I am Strawberry Olive, a PhD candidate at the University of Oklahoma. I am requesting your participation in a PhD research study looking at social innovation in a regional context.

The purpose of the study is to examine the social innovation process from inception to emergence and diffusion, in a community context at regional level and within different sectors. The Creative Oklahoma statewide 'creativity' social innovation initiative is the case study subject, within the three sectors of education, commerce and culture. There are two elements to the research study. First to understand Creative Oklahoma as the facilitator of a social innovation initiative (innovation process), and secondly to examine the diffusion and post diffusion phase as the original 'adopters' transform the social innovation into their own context as part of the changing dynamics of the innovation process.

You have been selected as a research interview candidate based upon your current engagement with the Creative Oklahoma organization, and your expert knowledge in your sector.

Procedures: If you agree to be in this study, you will continue with the interview as scheduled. You are free to stop at any time in the process. The first part of the interview will be short demographic questions and the main interview will ask questions based on

Creative Oklahoma and the sector/s that you are involved in.

Length of Participation: the interview will take approximately 2 hours.

Risks and Benefits of Being in the Study: The principal researcher is required to identify and inform study participants of any risks associated with participating in this study. There are benefits associated with this study, other than adding to the body of knowledge on social innovation. The only risk is disclosure of interview subject responses. This is addressed in confidentiality.

Confidentiality: Your responses are anonymous and your privacy is ensured. All data records will be coded, and will not contain any names or organizational details. The research records will be stored securely. Only approved researchers will have access to the records. In published reports, there will be no information included that will make it possible to identify you as a research participant. Only approved researchers and the OU-NC IRB will have access to the records, this includes access as part of quality assurance procedures.

Compensation: There is no compensation for your time or participation in this study.

Voluntary Nature of the Study: Although you have been recommended, participation is voluntary. Your decision to participate in the study or not, will not result in either penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you agree to participate in this study, you are free not to answer any question or discontinue participation at any time without penalty or a loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Informed consent: By proceeding with the interview you are agreeing to participate in this research study as outlined above. In continuing you are acknowledging that you

understand what has been outlined above, and you are providing the principal investigator with your participation consent. You are free to stop at anytime in the process, and may refuse to answer any questions.

Contacts and Questions:

Should you have any issues, concerns or complaints about this research study, or any research-related injury please contact me via email or phone information removed , phone: information removed . If you have any questions, concerns, complaints about the research or about your rights as a research participant, and would like to talk to someone besides the individuals on the research team, or if you are not able to contact the research team, you may contact the University of Oklahoma – Norman Campus Institutional Review Board (OU-NC IRB) at (405) 325-8110 or irb@ou.edu. Please print and retain a copy of this page for your records.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation and time