The significance of grassroots and inclusive innovation in harnessing social entrepreneurship and urban regeneration

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this study is to examine the dimensions of inclusive and grassroots innovations operationalised by a social enterprise, and the impact of these activities on urban regeneration. To this end, the case of Homebaked in Liverpool, United Kingdom, is presented and discussed.

Design/methodology/approach – Face-to-face interviews with members of Homebaked's management, staff, and volunteers were conducted; the interviews were complemented with on-site observations and review of archival information of the social enterprise.

Findings – The data gathered revealed the organisation's involvement in both types of innovation as a means to achieve long-term urban regeneration related goals. For instance, innovative, strategic, and human dimensions, together with the human dimension emerged as key ways of innovating. The impacts of innovative practices comprised encouraging inclusiveness among residents and non-residents, with approaches including hands-on training workshops, job and volunteering opportunities being predominant.

Originality/value – First, the study advances the theoretical and applied understanding of grassroots and inclusive innovation in the context of a social enterprise. For instance, an innovative/strategic and human dimension emerged as predominant ways in which grassroots and inclusive innovation elements were manifested. These dimensions were based on technology uptake, implementation of new product/service concepts, or harnessing the skills of local and non-local individuals. Similarly, four dimensions associated with the impacts of these types of innovation were revealed. Second, the study addresses acknowledged gaps in the literature, particularly regarding the limited contributions illuminating processes and determinants of innovation among social enterprises.

Keywords: Urban regeneration, social enterprises, grassroots, inclusive innovation.

Introduction

Throughout the world, many urban communities are experiencing profound socioeconomic decline (Clark, 2013; Tighe and Ganning, 2015). Life in some of these communities is, for instance, often associated with degraded infrastructure, serious environmental hazards, unhealthy housing, or substandard services (Anguelovski, 2013). In some neighbourhoods, however, a movement of activists has emerged, and is becoming organised to counter these long-term conditions (Anguelovski, 2013), and therefore contribute to urban regeneration.

Roberts et al. (2016) define urban regeneration in terms of integrated and comprehensive action and vision, seeking to solve urban challenges. Moreover, urban regeneration is about improving the physical, environmental, and socioeconomic conditions of areas affected by change, as well as creating opportunities for improvements (Roberts et al., 2016). Consequently, urban regeneration encompasses activities embedded in practice (Tallon, 2013).

In highlighting Pearson et al.'s (2014) research, Roberts (2016) explains how urban regeneration can be perceived as interventionist; it represents activities that straddle the voluntary, private, or public sectors. Urban regeneration is also a way to mobilise collective efforts, and provides a foundation for negotiating impactful solutions (Roberts, 2016). At the same time, elements pertaining to the mobilisation of cooperative initiatives by different stakeholders are intrinsically related to social entrepreneurship. In fact, social entrepreneurship relates to entrepreneurial approaches that focus on the generation of income, and strictly occurs in non-for-profit environments (Galera and Borzaga, 2009). Moreover, social entrepreneurship consists of applying entrepreneurial principles in social domains

(Roberts and Woods, 2005). Kerlin (2006) postulates that social entrepreneurship can range from profit-oriented firms conducting socially valuable activities, to dual-purpose firms reconciling social objectives with profit goals, "to non-profit organisations engaged in mission-supporting commercial activity" (p. 248). Another definition (Wallace, 1999), which is reflected in the present study, specifies that social enterprises are for-profit businesses or subsidiaries managed by non-profit organisations; predominantly, these enterprises are concentrated in urban communities, and facilitate local development.

Academic research also emphasises the importance of innovation in supporting socially entrepreneurial initiatives. Among other definitions, innovation is the process of operationalising any problem-solving, new idea (Kanter, 1984). Innovation is a significant topic in social entrepreneurship research (Short et al., 2009). For instance, Chell, Nicolopoulou and Karataş-Özkan (2010) underscore the value of fostering innovation for social enterprises, particularly in their quest to find "business solutions to social problems" (p. 485). Perrini and Vurro (2006) identify the key role of social entrepreneurs, in promoting change, particularly by pioneering innovation within their social sector. Such attitudes can be reflected "through the entrepreneurial quality of a breaking idea" (Perrini and Vurro, 2006, p. 69), which can be extended to measuring social impacts.

The present research is concerned with the significance of two forms of innovation, grassroots and inclusive, their associations with social entrepreneurship and, consequently, with urban regeneration. These types of innovation, discussed in the following sections, have been studied from a conceptual and practitioner perspective (e.g., Codagnone, 2009; Ng et al., 2016; Swaans et al., 2014).

In considering Homebaked (2019), a social enterprise operating in Liverpool, UK, the present study will contribute both theoretically and empirically to the existing literature on grassroots and inclusive innovation, social entrepreneurship and urban regeneration. The research will also address gaps identified in academic research. For instance, Doherty et al. (2014) found a limited number of contributions illuminating processes and determinants of innovation among social enterprises, or their relative innovativeness "when compared with other organizational forms" (p. 423). In addition, while practitioner, academic and policy interest in inclusive innovation has increased, greater knowledge of this area needs to be generated (Foster and Heeks et al., 2013). A more recent study (Pellicer-Sifres et al., 2018) contends that, while the transformative potential of grassroots innovation is recognised, there is very little research undertaken "on how transformative perspectives, strategies and actions emerge" (p. 100). Based on the above considerations, the study is mainly concerned with addressing the following overarching research questions:

- In what specific ways does the social enterprise promote both grassroots and inclusive innovation?
- What are the main impacts from these innovations on urban regeneration, including on the local community?

Eliciting answers to the above questions will not only help address existing knowledge gaps such as those recognised by Doherty et al. (2014) or Pellicer-Sifres et al. (2018), but also contribute to theory building. Indeed, as Short et al. (2009) explain, while innovation is a main topic in social entrepreneurship inquiry, more effort is required to develop innovation theory related to social entrepreneurship.

Literature Review
Grassroots and inclusive innovation

According to Foster and Heeks (2013), established interpretations of innovation view 'development' in terms of general forms of economic growth. In turn, 'inclusive innovation' explicitly contemplates development in the context of genuinely considering those individuals who have been excluded from it (Foster and Heeks, 2013). Moreover, inclusive innovation acknowledges that marginal communities are challenged by additional burdens that preclude them from benefitting from innovation (Woodson, Torres Alcantara, and do Nascimento, 2019). In essence, inclusive innovation is a mechanism through which new services and/or goods are created by- or for- those individuals living in the lowest income streams (Foster and Heeks, 2013). Therefore, the purpose of inclusive innovation is to enable inclusive growth (Peerally, De Fuentes, and Figueiredo, 2018).

Reflecting on previous contributions (Altenburg, 2009; Cozzens and Stutz, 2012; Utz and Dahlman, 2007), Foster and Heeks (2013) identified four elements of inclusivity associated with innovation that should be met when conceptualising inclusive innovation:

1) Antecedents, including problems that can be tackled by innovation, and that are also of significance to the least privileged,
2) Practices, for instance, involving the needy in developing innovative services or goods,
3) Adoptions, or when "poor consumers have the capabilities to absorb innovations" (Foster and Heeks, 2013, p. 335), and
4) Impact, namely, where the effects of innovative services or goods are beneficial for "the livelihoods of the poor" (Foster and Heeks, 2013, p. 335).

The associations between inclusive innovation and social entrepreneurship have been identified in the academic literature. Chew and Lyons (2012), for instance, elucidate how social enterprise-related activities help generate spaces for innovation, particularly by contributing to the positioning of services for new users or funders. This notion is in line with the fourth element of inclusivity suggested by Foster and Heeks (2013), which emphasises the beneficial impact of innovative goods and services to improve the livelihoods of poor citizens.

Grassroots innovation has also received considerable attention among researchers. This term is used to describe organisations or activists creating original bottom-up solutions conducive to sustainable development (Seyfang and Smith, 2007). Fundamentally, these solutions are in accord with the values, interests, and local situations of those communities involved (Seyfang and Smith, 2007), and occur in unconventional settings with uncommon combinations of tools, ideas, and people (Smith et al., 2017). Grassroots innovation also comprises networks and movements of practitioners, activists, as well as academics seeking to examine alternative approaches/processes for innovation and knowledge creation (Fressoli et al., 2014). By seeking and understanding these alternatives, local ingenuity can be harnessed in ways that purposefully contribute to improved local development; consequently, grassroots innovation is a mechanism which fosters inclusion (Fressoli et al., 2014), helping to elicit the struggles, aspirations, and views of local communities (Banerjee and Shaban, 2018). Moreover, grassroots innovation can take the form of service provisions for marginalised groups, while promoting participation in technology design (Fressoli et al., 2014).

The academic literature identifies various intersections within and between grassroots innovation and social entrepreneurship. Indeed, grassroots innovation exists within social economies of social enterprises and community activities (Seyfang and Smith, 2007). For instance, through their investigation of 1,300 social and environmental enterprises operating in developing nations, Creech et al. (2014) identified the ability of entrepreneurs to create

new services and products for their communities, in part through the adoption of novel business models.

Theoretical underpinnings associated with grassroots and inclusive innovation
Bryden et al. (2017) underline the multi-dimensionality of inclusive innovation, suggesting it entails "many variables whose causal relationships are not explicated" (p. 3), and are "arguably too vague to serve theoretical purposes" (p. 3). In seeking to make a theoretical contribution, Bryden et al. (2017) presented a framework reflecting the field of research of inclusive innovation. In their framework, they referred to preconditions for inclusive innovation to occur; these preconditions can originate from institutional or 'other circumstances', and can be root causes of socioeconomic decline. Further, Bryden et al. (2017) identified processes and motivations as key drivers enabling innovative practices, or "New ways of doing things" (p. 8), which as a result led to improvements in the livelihoods of deprived individuals.

While theory development appears to be more robust concerning grassroots innovation, recent research (Hossain, 2018) identifies a need to develop models, typologies, and theories around grassroots innovation. Doing so can facilitate avenues and create ways for various stakeholders (policymakers, practitioners, scholars) to understand various aspects of this type of innovation (Hossain, 2018).

Among those authors making theoretical contributions, Hargreaves et al. (2013) reviewed previous niche theory literature (e.g., Hegger et al., 2007; Kemp et al., 2001) that provided insights to understand how this type of innovation could be supported, grown and diffused. In essence, niche theories emphasise that fundamental changes are desirable, whether in social norms, infrastructures, or technologies (Hargreaves et al., 2013). Thus, the notion of niche theories suggests an opposition to maintaining the status quo, which illustrates incremental improvements in efficiencies (Hargreaves et al., 2013).

The academic literature also provides theoretical insights to gain an appreciation and understanding of urban regeneration. Roberts (2016), for example, discusses urban regeneration theory, which is primarily concerned with organisational and institutional dynamics of managing urban change. Importantly, these organisational and institutional dimensions of the theory can contribute to defining the content, operation, and role of urban regeneration.

The chosen organisation
Homebaked, both a community bakery and a Community Land Trust, was originally part of an arts commission initiative, '2Up 2Down' (Jones, 2015). The initiative, started in 2010, was co-produced by artist Jeanne van Heeswijk and Liverpool Biennial (2019), a festival of contemporary art also featuring a program of research and education (Doherty, 2015; Jones, 2015). The initiative, involving local citizens and an international social network, was designed to create alternative ways to help restore a neighbourhood (Anfield) both economically and culturally (Jones, 2015). This neighbourhood had been neglected from such regenerating activities for over a decade (Jones, 2015).

As the first urban Community Land Trust to be set up in the UK, Homebaked's original objectives were to support social enterprises, design customised housing, improve the wellbeing of the local community, and establish a community and cooperative-run bakery (Jones, 2015). This last objective was associated with the extension in the life of Mitchell's Bakery through collective efforts among Homebaked's members (e.g., management, volunteers). Mitchell's Bakery, previously owned by a local family, had ceased operations as a consequence of Housing Market Renewal, a large-scale regeneration programme, which led to a mandatory purchase order (Moore, 2014). Furthermore, the demolition and

redevelopment of the local neighbourhood (Anfield) resulted in its physical deterioration, and in the displacement of local residents (Moore, 2014).

The fundamental principle of Homebaked is to create both monetary and social value (Jones, 2015). The monetary value is reflected in the outcomes of for-profit activities. Importantly, profits are to stay within the neighbourhood and to be invested back into the community (Jones, 2015), with direct ramifications for urban regeneration. For instance, although primarily a bakery, Homebaked's management has an ambitious plan to build social housing units for local residents (Southern and Whittam, 2015).

Methodology

The present investigation focuses on the associations between grassroots and inclusive innovation, social entrepreneurship and urban regeneration. Furthermore, the study addresses knowledge gaps identified in contemporary research (e.g., Doherty et al., 2014; Short et al., 2009) by examining Homebaked, a social enterprise operating in a neighbourhood, Anfield, Liverpool (UK) affected by socioeconomic decline. As the research questions suggest, the study's unit of analysis, interpreted as "a bounded set of elements comprising the entity which is the focus of research" (Gronn, 2002, p. 444) is represented by how in specific ways in which grassroots and inclusive innovation are operationalised along with their subsequent impacts.

Drawing from existing entrepreneurship, urban studies, and social change literature (Connelly, 2011; Wood and McKinley, 2010), a constructivist methodological approach was adopted. Constructivism implies that humans can frame "objective truths about social phenomena beyond… subjective interpretations of reality" (Lindgren and Packendorff, 2009, p. 30). Moreover, constructivists presuppose that what is perceived to be objective truth and knowledge is the outcome of perspective, and that truth and knowledge "are created, not discovered by mind" (Schwandt, 1994, p. 236).

In addition, and in line with the qualitative nature of the research, an inductive approach is employed. According to Thomas (2006, p. 237), this approach entails various purposes, including:

- Condensing textual, raw data into a more succinct format,
- Creating clear associations between research goals and summary findings originating from raw data, and

Developing a model or framework related to the main structure of processes or experiences that are apparent in the raw data.

In accord with Patton (2002), a purposeful sampling methodology was employed. This approach is based on the selection of information-rich cases for in-depth investigation that "will illuminate the questions under study" (p. 230). Existing information in various studies and reports (e.g., Jones, 2015; Moore, 2014; Southern and Whittam, 2015) helped identify Homebaked's socially entrepreneurial, urban regeneration, and community development initiatives. This background material also illustrated the value of this organisation as an information-rich case (Patton, 2002), further supporting its selection for this study.

A review of various studies investigating grassroots and inclusive innovation, social entrepreneurship and urban regeneration (e.g., Ng et al., 2016; Roberts, 2016; Roberts and Woods, 2015; Swaans et al., 2014; Wallace, 1999) provided background knowledge for the design of the research questions. Fundamentally, the protocol followed during the interview process entailed various steps, with the first enquiring about participants' professional background (Table 1), and the second addressing the previously identified research questions.

Initial contact with Homebaked's management allowed the research team the opportunity to visit the social enterprise on various occasions. These visits allowed for conducting face-to-face interviews, on-site observations, and for inspecting archival documents, reports, and

brochures. The use of various techniques to gather data correspond to data triangulation (Adami and Kiger, 2005), providing this study with a robust informative foundation regarding the organisation's main strategies, activities and plans for urban regeneration.

Therefore, the data collected from Homebaked was in the form of qualitative interviews with key individuals within the organisation alongside secondary resources such as reports and brochures. Secondary data further included website information and other documents that were afforded by the social enterprise. Observations of the daily business activities and operations were undertaken during site visits where notetaking was undertaken by members of the research team.

Between September of 2016 and April of 2017, the research team visited Homebaked on nine occasions. First, both members of the management team (P1 and P2) were interviewed, and permission was granted to meet with seven other members (Table 1); thus, a total of nine face-to-face interviews were conducted. The interviews were recorded with the consent of all participants, and lasted between 40 and 120 minutes.

The recorded data were transcribed verbatim by members of the research team, which allowed for cross-checking and contributed to more accuracy. Consistent with Hsieh and Shannon (2005), qualitative content analysis was used. Essentially, this method involves "the subjective interpretation of the content of text data" (Hsieh and Shannon, 2005, p. 1278), through a systematic process of identifying and coding patterns or themes. The same process was applied to focal areas within the secondary data alongside the notes taken during observations. This undertaking was complemented with NVivo, version 11, a qualitative data analysis software, which enabled the analysis of thematic nodes clustered by word similarity (e.g., Figures 1 and 2).

In discussing qualitative rigor in inductive research, Gioia, Corley, and Hamilton (2013) present key features linked to data analysis that enhance the development of (grounded) theory. First, they suggest "maintaining the integrity of 1st [first]-order (informant-centric) terms" (p. 26) when performing initial data coding. This process is complemented by the development of a comprehensive collection of first-order terms, and then by organising "1st-order codes into 2nd [second]-order (theory-centric) themes" (Gioia et al., 2013, p. 26).

In addition, the second-order themes can be refined into predominant theoretical dimensions. A final part of the data analysis is assembling "terms, themes, and dimensions into a "data structure" (Gioia et al., 2013, p. 26). A more recent academic contribution by Gioia (in Gehman et al., 2018) highlights this step as possibly "the most pivotal… in the entire research approach" (p. 286), representing a demonstration of "rigour in qualitative research" (p. 286).

As Figure 1 and Figure 2 illustrate, the procedures utilised in the data analysis stage of the present research are partly in agreement with Gioia et al.'s (2013) key features of data analysis. For instance, first order terms emanating from participants' verbatim comments were organised into second-order themes, and then refined or 'distilled' into the theoretical dimensions presented (i.e. the innovative/strategic, and human dimension). Within this context, the development of Figures 1 and 2 is also associated with the inductive approach chosen (Thomas, 2006).

A final aspect of this study's methodology concerns data saturation. According to Walker (2012), the academic literature lacks clear recommendations, as well as specific guidelines regarding how to identify and report data saturation, or when to employ it. In the present research, during the analysis of the data, some recurring themes were identified by the eighth interview; thus, by the last transcript, it was deemed that saturation point had been reached. This outcome is partly in agreement with Guest, Bunce, and Johnson (2006). These authors noticed that, while saturation was achieved by the initial 12 interview transcripts, basic elements pertaining to 'metathemes' emerged after six.

Participants' main demographic characteristics

Table 1 reports participants' demographic characteristics. The interviews revealed that eight of the nine respondents had been part of Homebaked since its inauguration (2012). Similarly, eight of them possessed significant industry expertise, which had significant implications in ways of operating and managing the social enterprise. Hour-long interactions with PA1, PA2, and PA8, for instance, revealed extensive work in human resources, accounting, and restaurant management, respectively. PA1 had held executive positions both in the UK and overseas, and PA8 had managed his own business in his native Germany, moving to the UK to pursue personal interests. These interests eventually persuaded him to leave his full-time paying job in central Liverpool, and become strongly involved with Homebaked's initiatives, first volunteering, and now as the executive chef.

While members such as PA1, PA2, PA6, PA8, and PA9 were effectively employed by Homebaked, during the study it was noticed that they did considerable volunteering work on the premises. One example was PA5, who had worked in the educational sector all her life and was now retired. During the study, PA5 was actively engaged in supporting the social enterprise through her volunteering efforts, particularly in baking food products that would be sold on-site and mentoring apprentices or new staff. This participant, as well as two others (PA1, PA3) grew up in Anfield.

However, other members, while not born or raised in Liverpool, equally displayed passion and enthusiasm in supporting the enterprise's socially responsible and economically impactful initiatives. PA2, with decade-long involvement in the corporate world, often volunteered to be at the service front line, including during demanding game day events at Anfield. PA8's strong conviction and belief in the Homebaked project led him to increase his contribution. Indeed, several times a year, the participant recruited volunteers, predominantly chefs, in Germany to spend weeks or months supporting work at the enterprise's kitchen. This extension of PA8's passion and duties had important implications, not only resulting in positive impacts for the community and the enterprise through the goodwill of visiting chefs, but also through the new experiences and accumulated knowledge.

Table 1 Here

Findings

Ways in which Homebaked promotes grassroots and inclusive innovation
The qualitative content analysis uncovered a variety of innovative practices adopted by Homebaked's members; Figure 1 illustrates predominant themes that emerged from the clustered analysis of word similarity in NVivo. These emerging themes were encapsulated in two dimensions, the innovative/strategic and the human dimension that at the same time reflected the data structure Gioia et al. (2013) identified in their data analysis process. Importantly, the dimensions entail and illustrate a number of practical components hereafter identified and discussed.

The innovative/strategic dimension
The importance of technology, in this case social media, provided a powerful complement to the strategic and innovative philosophy of the social enterprise. Moreover, social media contributed to capturing consumers' attention, not only concerning Homebaked's products, but also in creating awareness about the needs of the local community:

> PA1: *…we do have people, fans of ours tweeting pictures of different pies… we now have people with pictures of our pies inside the stadium. So that link between*

7

the football and here [Homebaked] … by buying a pie they are helping their community…

PA2: *… social media has helped… to get fans of the [professional] club who have never been here…*

These points are linked to earlier research (Alvord et al., 2002) emphasising the importance of the dissemination of a package of innovations, one of which relates to reconfiguring technical resources and information in user-friendly ways.

Another practical component representing how grassroots and inclusive innovation were promoted was through new product-service offerings, which also extended to the diversification of the social enterprise. For example, the opening of a café provided another revenue stream, employing local residents, increasing the involvement of volunteers (e.g., PA5), and promoting social entrepreneurship (PA2). However, as PA2 acknowledged, this diversification approach, while useful, needed to be supported by other ways to solve fundamental problems: *"the thing we clicked to very quickly was that getting the café working would not sustain us."* To increase the revenue stream from bread sales and cafe operations, a pie shop was established. This strategy also helped increase the number of paid and volunteering staff, thus, providing more opportunities for inclusiveness and community involvement. In the meantime, Homebaked's pie shop and café have become critical factors, not only as revenue streams, but also in promoting the social enterprise's initiatives and mission (PA1): *"Every journalist in Liverpool congregates outside our pie shop on match day."*

Despite the constant search for innovative ways to become financially viable and make a stronger impact on the local community, there was recognition that Homebaked's most powerful strategy to promote grassroots and inclusive innovation rested on basic SE principles (PA2): *"…we realised that our unique selling proposition (USP) is actually… that we are a community-owned food business that provides good quality…"*

The human dimension

As illustrated (Figure 1), the human dimension was also strongly manifested through numerous verbatim comments. The interviews revealed that Homebaked is an eclectic mix of local and non-local residents, volunteers and paid staff, who have not only embraced social entrepreneurship, but also possess different professional skills that make unique contributions. For example, the extensive corporate background of various members (PA1 and PA2) provided guidance through the initial organisational, planning, and execution processes needed to initiate and implement strategic, innovative community-centred activities. In fact, PA2 referred to the value of accumulating experience in the corporate world, and how such experience was useful in establishing a collaborate partnership with one of the area's influential professional sport organisations:

> *…it is amazing how much stuff you learn and you use it in corporate life… we have been negotiating with the [professional local] club… We sit down and have a commercial conversation… and that is because of our background and all the things you learn; you just applied it in a different context.*

These critical skills were strongly complemented by operational skills needed for procurement and sales (PA6); hands-on skills, in preparing and maintaining the quality and consistency of the food products (PA8, PA9), and volunteering (PA3, PA5). Other complementing skills included accounting (PA7) and community development (PA4).

Initially, Homebaked focused on producing bread to cater primarily for the local neighbourhood, and for wholesale to earn much-needed income. However, this initial

approach proved to be financially unviable (PA8): *"… for every loaf of bread we actually incurred a deficit …* The variety of skills and professional backgrounds among Homebaked members was again critical, in revising and radically altering this strategy in favour of offering products and services with more appeal to consumers.

Figure 1 Here

In part, these findings are associated with earlier research investigating social enterprises (Alvord et al., 2002) that highlighted the significance of building local capacity. This form of innovation, which also spills over into the human dimension, refers to working with marginalised populations in order to identify various capacities required for self-help, and to assist in developing such capacities (Alvord et al., 2002). In the present study, building local capacity was demonstrated in the initial stages of Homebaked's life, in giving the locals a voice to find ways to improve the existing conditions in the neighbourhood (PA4):

> *Local expertise is the first expertise you need in order to do a development… You are an expert in your place; that is all it means… it is a way of creating places that are sustainable, because the people that are building it are taking care of it. They will also come shop in here.*

Resulting impacts associated with grassroots and inclusive innovation
Employing content analysis again identified emerging themes that illustrated practical components where both types of innovation had positive impacts (Figure 2). Fundamentally, as evidenced by the various comments, four dimensions were predominant although there were some overlapping of the corresponding themes.

Tangible – sustainable dimension
Homebaked's focus on product quality consistency and affordable prices for the local community, coupled with established relationships with other businesses and organisations, were perceived to produce tangible impacts. Indeed, at the time of the interviews, Homebaked had reached an agreement to become a pie supplier for a local professional sports organisation. This event undoubtedly provided a financial boost, and represented a long-term partnership to consolidate the social enterprise's activities and have a positive impact on the local community. At the same time, it created opportunities for members of the professional club to become more knowledgeable, active, and conscious citizens (PA1): *"I offered a deal over the pies… [to provide] team building and training for… youth team players… It gives them some light skills, grounds them in society… It builds roots for them, it engages [them] with the local community…"*

This newly created strategic association is partly aligned with contemporary social entrepreneurship research. In fact, Gupta et al. (2015) highlighted the need for social enterprises to manage and cultivate formal as well as informal partnerships with various stakeholders, from the public to for-profit sectors. Such partnerships can help enterprises acquire various resources, including financial, technical, as well as "gaining "buy-in" from communities" (Gupta et al., 2015, p. 103).

Figure 2 Here

Intrinsic – sustainable dimension

9

Figure 2 also illustrates the significance of intrinsic impacts, in terms of inclusiveness, involving people, or in equipping members of the local community with various skills. As previously noted, increasingly, the café and pie shop have provided opportunities for inclusiveness among both individuals and businesses from the local community (PA6): *"...whenever possible, we use our local suppliers. Everyone who works here is local, be that paid or voluntary work. So some of the paid staff are coming through; they were local people who got into the training courses."*

These forms of inclusiveness and community support help develop a stronger rapport between the social enterprise and members of the community. As earlier research (Crosbie, 2005; Kemp, 2002) suggests, having access to training and volunteering opportunities can not only result in newly acquired skills, but also have positive effects on individuals such as boosting their self-esteem. In addition, the experience and acquired skills could prepare them for current or future professional endeavours, in essence, turning them in productive members of their community.

Inclusiveness was also evident in the way former Anfield residents, now living in other parts of the world, wanted to continue being part of and contribute toward their community. PA2, for instance, referred to a past crowdfunding event, where inclusiveness was reflected in an unusual way:

> *[We]… got money from as far as Alaska, from people who had grown up in the area and remember the Mitchell's and then moved away... A bloke came in last season and said 'I put £10, and… I was not expecting anything from it, but to see you are still here, and growing… I told my friends: I own part of that.'*

Strategic – sustainable dimension
A third dimension identified (Figure 2) related to strategic impacts, particularly in extending the life of current innovative approaches to consolidate growth and to continue producing beneficial outcomes. Importantly, the operationalisation of grassroots and inclusive innovation, illustrated in Homebaked's strategic partnership discussed previously, and its commitment to product quality (PA8, PA9), has enhanced its reputation and popularity. As a result, there has been a rapid increase in demand, which has led to capacity concerns (PA2, PA8). Investments in technology, particularly acquiring new and larger equipment to manage rising demand effectively, was perceived to be at the top of the priority list. Moreover, new and unexpected business propositions were continuously emerging. As the following remarks suggest, these newly developed or considered revenue streams could help fine-tune Homebaked's future business model, help raise awareness, and further contribute to urban change (PA1):

> *We never planned to be a wedding caterer, but the father of the bride went to a conference… we did the food for, and heard about us and thought: I like the pie, I like the idea of this being community minded because me [sic] and my family and my daughter are very community minded…. So let's talk about making the food for the wedding… it landed on our doorstep and we seized the opportunity.*

On the other hand, however, PA1, PA2, PA8 and PA9 expressed their concern, and the imperious need to manage expansion and growing expectations, while maintaining quality standards and continuing to make a positive impact. Because of infrastructure and human resource limitations, and the potential to compromise standards and image, new business opportunities are now systematically and strategically assessed (PA8).

Dana et al.'s (2019) case study of a failed social enterprise project (Paper Block, in Namibia) provides useful insights into the realms, intricacies, and complexities concerning the long term sustainability of an initiative. These insights are also aligned with Homebaked's members concerns regarding the future. Dana et al. (2019) argue that in order to deliver on their promise, for instance, in contributing to address socioeconomic or environmental challenges, grassroots innovation projects should have to make a successful transition of three key phases, notably, inception, adoption and scaling up. Moreover, the successful transition between these phases could lead to reaching market sustainability and maturity (Dana et al., 2019). At the same time, equally important is the local community's 'buying' into the idea of grassroots' innovation. Indeed, as Dana et al.'s (2019) findings regarding the original launching of the Paper Block project revealed, lack of involvement among members of the local community, particularly in developing and testing ideas associated with the project was a key shortcoming and reason for its subsequent demise.

Fomenting change – sustainable dimension
Figure 2 also underscores the impact of promoting and encouraging change in various forms. The main perceived ways included raising awareness about the community, working toward socioeconomic prosperity by providing apprenticeships or jobs, and ultimately, influencing urban regeneration. These findings partly support the third form of innovation suggested by Alvord et al. (2002), which entails the creation of a movement to mobilise grassroots alliances. This movement can generate a stronger political voice among marginalised groups and help solve existing problems (Alvord et al., 2002). The previously presented case of the impact of crowdfunding and employing social media to reach a wider community no longer residing in Anfield can significantly spur such movements. PA1's comments further underlined the implications of such movement in the case of Homebaked: *"If we rebuild the High St., we will keep more money locally, locally spent. And if we do that, we will generate local interaction… we will get a stronger network locally, and… we [will] have more community."*

Discussion
Aligned with the notions of inductive research concerning model development (Thomas, 2006), and those associated with rigour in qualitative research (Gehman et al., 2018; Gioia et al., 2013), this study revealed six distinct dimensions. One framework (Figure 1) comprises two of these, which are related to ways in which Homebaked promotes grassroots and inclusive innovation, while the second framework (Figure 2) illustrates four linked to impacts resulting from these forms of innovation. As the themes associated with these the dimensions demonstrate, there is a strong practical component to each. Indeed, the importance of technology (e.g., equipment) emerged in the findings, further supporting innovative practices and initiatives. Within this context, crowdfunding events and more recent social media activities have helped reach and draw the attention of former residents world-wide (PA2), or address new and growing issues resulting from increased product demand (PA8).

The positive role of Homebaked also became apparent through its engagement with local and non-local residents who shared a passion for reverting the negative effects of urban decline. These forms of encouraging inclusiveness, such as providing jobs, or offering learning and volunteering opportunities, highlight the significance of development movements of practitioners (Fressoli et al., 2014). Conceptualisations presented by various authors (Bryden et al. 2017; Hargreaves et al., 2013) further suggest tangible outcomes from grassroots innovation.

Moreover, through harnessing their diverse professional expertise, these participants helped find new ways and strategies to operate, address, and solve existing problems faced by

the social enterprises. For example, individuals with a background in the hospitality-restaurant business (PA8, PA9) rapidly assimilated existing ways of food production, and also integrated new, innovative ways of operating, while others with managerial or volunteering experience filled other key gaps.

Furthermore, Homebaked's for-profit business initiatives have progressively led to identifying specific forms of improving its financial resources. The initiatives have also strengthened the social enterprise strategically and operationally, motivating members to continue searching for innovative ways to improve the socioeconomic conditions of the surrounding neighbourhood. One illustration was the recently established commercial agreement with a near-by professional sport organisation.

In addition to practical components, several theoretical underpinnings were also reflected through the study's findings and resulting dimensions. One of these is represented by the different tenets of strategic niche management theory (Hargreaves et al., 2013), including strategy and innovative initiatives. Homebaked's trial-and-error phases designed to develop alternative revenue streams, illustrate the strategic and innovative dimensions. The insightfulness of urban regeneration theory (Roberts, 2016) was also underscored in the findings. Indeed, organisational dynamics (i.e. Homebaked), and institutional dynamics, in this study identified as government agencies, are vital in implementing strategies to encourage urban regeneration. This study underlined the role of Homebaked, in fomenting socioeconomic development, and in creating a movement that includes and empowers local residents, as well as fostering socioeconomic development. These points are further supported by PA6's comment:

> *When I saw this job [advertisement], I came in… to meet people… and realised how connected it [Homebaked] was to its actual community… the local people are this bakery. And once I had seen that, I knew I wanted to be here...*

The movement, which rests on implementing grassroots and inclusive innovation, could be complemented by institutional dynamics to enhance social entrepreneurial activities. This point is partly supported in research conducted among entrepreneurial women (Kimbu and Ngoasong, 2016). Through the discussion of six cases, Kimbu and Ngoasong (2016) articulate the strong linkages between the participants' start-up pathways, the different community needs they fulfil, as well as their commercial and socially transformational goals. Moreover, while commercial goals of women entrepreneurs were predominantly geared towards subsistence, and supporting extended family members, their role simultaneously supported socioeconomic development (Kimbu and Ngoasong, 2016). Moreover, while serving the needs of international and domestic travellers, their socioeconomic support was notably visible in enabling underprivileged individuals to grow and develop.

Aligned with Creech et al.'s (2014) argument, there is a need for government as well as institutions to support the future efforts of this and other social enterprises. Together with social enterprises' innovative practices, community inclusiveness and engagement, and the resulting proactive movement, there could be tangible and significant impacts on urban change and community regeneration.

These notions are also in agreement with another study (Yalçın-Riollet, Garabuau-Moussaoui, and Szuba (2014), which highlighted efforts to achieve energy autonomy through initiatives led by local citizens. These efforts, which entailed "the hybridisation of actors, socio-techniques, discourses and objectives" (Yalçın-Riollet et al., 2014, p. 354), and overall, collective commitment, are clearly reflected in various facets of this study's findings. Fundamentally, the 'hybridisation' process Yalçın-Riollet et al. (2014) refer to can be construed through the engagement among members of Homebaked, in building and in

strengthening the nexus with local citizens, notably, through their food products, interactions, training, or even by providing employment and volunteering opportunities.

Conclusions

By selecting Homebaked, a social enterprise based in Liverpool, UK, the present study examined how grassroots and inclusive innovation are promoted, as well as their resulting impacts on urban regeneration. In doing so, the study proposes two frameworks based upon various dimensions related to grassroots and inclusive innovation as revealed through qualitative content analysis. In addition, the study addressed persistent knowledge gaps highlighted in contemporary research (Doherty et al., 2014; Foster and Heeks et al., 2013; Pellicer-Sifres et al., 2018; Short et al., 2009), and uncovered various important outcomes concerning the addressed research questions.

More specifically, the importance of Homebaked members' expertise, knowledge, skills and engagement emerging in the findings. These resources were vital in completing various developmental stages that helped strengthen financial resources, and make an impact on the local community. The stages, which involved innovative practices to solve ongoing problems, resulted in changing and fine-tuning business processes, a diversification of Homebaked's offerings, and in the building of strategic partnerships (both with local organisations and with residents and non-residents). The importance of technology to support both types of innovation became evident, particularly in the utilisation of social media tools to strengthen and widen awareness, or through acquisition of equipment to address issues of capacity as a product of increasing demand. Overall, the progressive achievements have contributed to various tangible and intangible benefits. For example, employing new staff, or increasing opportunities for training and volunteering illustrate direct ways to encourage inclusiveness. However, equally important is the ongoing effort to involve members of the community, or those who do not live within the community (e.g., sport fans) to 'buy' into the social enterprise's initiatives.

Implications

From a theoretical point of view, the study presents two frameworks (Figures 1 and 2) illustrating key dimensions associated with ways in which grassroots and inclusive innovation are operationalised by the social enterprise, and their associated impacts. As many as six dimensions emerged from the research. These dimensions, together with their preceding themes from participants' verbatim comments provide an insightful roadmap illustrating the significant contribution social enterprises can make towards urban regeneration and resulting socioeconomic outcomes.

While clearly social enterprises face numerous challenges, this study highlights, for instance, how innovative/strategic forms of grassroots and inclusive innovation go hand in hand with human aspects, whereby engaging individuals and harnessing their skills and potential (Figure 1) could result in numerous valuable contributions. Thus, considering both dimensions is useful in understanding the mechanics involved in building capacity to improve socioeconomic conditions and positively affect communities. In addition, and reinforcing the role of the previous two dimensions, the second framework (Figure 2) illustrates the merit of understanding sustainability-related impacts of grassroots and inclusive innovations. Moreover, with limited external support, consideration of the four emerging dimensions could prove vital for social enterprises and their respective communities, notably, in finding inspiration to continue their engagement in grassroots and inclusive innovation.

From a practitioner perspective, the findings demonstrate the enormous potential that could be harnessed by having individuals with skills and motivations, by building partnerships, and by encouraging inclusiveness. Indeed, the strategic agreement with a local

professional sports organisation, or the adoption of social media to 'spread the word' about the need to support a neighbourhood facing decline are clear examples. Moreover, the process of stakeholder involvement can be further strengthened through the inclusiveness of local and non-local residents. Among other alternatives, the first group could be, for instance, the beneficiary of training and learning skills or become engaged in mentoring and volunteering. In addition, and as the findings illustrate, the next group could participate and contribute in other ways, such as buying products or be active in crowdfunding campaigns. In line with various authors (Anguelovski, 2013; Alvord et al., 2002; Fressoli et al., 2014), all these forms of grassroots and inclusive innovation also underscore the significance of building a movement that raises awareness about the challenges of communities facing socioeconomic decline, including through the 'hybridisation' of actors (Yalçın-Riollet et al., 2014). Awareness and hybridisation of actors could also represent useful platforms or vehicles for residents to voice their concerns, and that these could be further channelled by social enterprises to institutional (government) stakeholders.

Limitations and Future Research

Although the study provides various insightful details concerning grassroots and inclusive innovation from the perspective of social enterprises, it is not free of limitations. For example, focusing on only one social enterprise may prevent making broad generalisations based on the findings. Future investigations could extend the scope of this study and incorporate other social enterprises elsewhere in the UK, or in other nations. Indeed, Indeed, Tracey and Stott (2017) draws attention to how the challenges social enterprises face vary depending on institutional and geographic factors. However, these differences are typically "glossed over in the literature, with researchers seemingly reluctant to build theory about how the practice of social innovation differs" (Tracey & Stott, 2017, p. 57), in this case between different hemispheres. Consequently, a larger number of participating organisations, coupled with the opportunity to make comparisons across national or international boundaries, could produce more robust and potentially more generalizable results.

Furthermore, although this study included local residents (PA1, PA3, PA5), it only examined the perspectives of the members of the social enterprise. Future research could also include the views of non-social enterprise members, particularly local residents, regarding the initiatives and the impact of these on their community. These data could then be channelled back to the management of the social enterprise in order to assist and inform them of needs of community members, their concerns and/or willingness to engage in urban regeneration.

References

Adami, M.F., Kiger, A. (2005), "The use of triangulation for completeness purposes", Nurse Researcher, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 19-29.

Altenburg, T. (2009), Building inclusive innovation systems in developing countries: Challenges for IS research, In B.A. Lundvall, K.J. Joseph, and C. Chaminade. (Eds.) Handbook on innovation systems and developing countries: Building domestic capabilities in a global context (pp. 33-57). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Alvord, S.H., Brown, L.D., and Letts, C.W. (2002), Social entrepreneurship and social transformation: An exploratory study. Working Paper 15, November 2002. The Hauser Center for Nonprofit Organizations and The Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Anguelovski, I. (2013), "New directions in urban environmental justice: rebuilding community, addressing trauma, and remaking place", Journal of Planning Education and Research, Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. 160-175.

Banerjee, S., and Shaban, A. (2019). Reimagining the social enterprise through grassroots social innovations in India. In P. Eynaud, J-L. Laville, L.L. dos Santes, S. Banerjee, F. Avelino, and L. Hulgård (eds.). Theory of social Enterprise and pluralism (pp. 116-129). Oxon, UK: Routledge.

Baxter, P. and Jack, S. (2008), "Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers", The Qualitative Report, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 544-559.

Bryden, J., Gezelius, S.S., Refsgaard, K. and Sutz, J. (2017), "Inclusive innovation in the bioeconomy: concepts and directions for research", Innovation and Development, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 1-16.

Chell, E., Nicolopoulou, K. and Karataş-Özkan, M. (2010), "Social entrepreneurship and enterprise: International and innovation perspectives", Entrepreneurship and Regional Development, Vol. 22 No. 6, pp. 485-493.

Chew, C. and Lyon, F. (2012), Innovation and social enterprise activity in third sector organisations. Third Sector Research Centre Working Paper Series, 83. http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/generic/tsrc/documents/tsrc/working-papers/working-paper-83.pdf

Clark, D. (2013), Urban decline (Routledge Revivals). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Codagnone, C. (2009), Vienna study on inclusive innovation for growth and cohesion. European Commission, Brussels.

Connelly, S. (2011), "Constructing legitimacy in the new community governance", Urban Studies, Vol. 48 No. 5, pp. 929-946.

Cozzens, S. and Sutz, J. (2012), Innovation in informal settings: A research agenda. Otawa: IDRC.

Creech, H., Paas, L., Gabriel, G.H., Voora, V., Hybsier, C. and Marquard, H. (2014), "Small-scale social-environmental enterprises in the green economy: supporting grassroots innovation", Development in Practice, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 366-378.

Crosbie, R. (2005), "Learning the soft skills of leadership", Industrial and Commercial Training, Vol. 37 No. 1, pp. 45-51.

Dana, L. P., Gurău, C., Hoy, F., Ramadani, V. and Alexander, T. (2019), "Success factors and challenges of grassroots innovations: Learning from failure", Technological Forecasting and Social Change, forthcoming.

Doherty, C. (2015), Out of time, out of place: Public art (now). London, UK: Art Books Publishing Ltd.

Doherty, B., Haugh, H. and Lyon, F. (2014), "Social enterprises as hybrid organizations: A review and research agenda", International Journal of Management Reviews, Vol. 16 No. 4, pp. 417-436.

Foster, C. and Heeks, R. (2013), "Conceptualising inclusive innovation: Modifying systems of innovation frameworks to understand diffusion of new technology to low-income consumers", The European Journal of Development Research, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 333-355.

Fressoli, M., Arond, E., Abrol, D., Smith, A., Ely, A. and Dias, R. (2014), "When grassroots innovation movements encounter mainstream institutions: implications for models of inclusive innovation", Innovation and Development, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 277-292.

Galera, G. and Borzaga, C. (2009), "Social enterprise: An international overview of its conceptual evolution and legal implementation", Social Enterprise Journal, Vol. 5 No. 3, pp. 210-228.

George, A.L. and Bennett, A. (2005), Case studies and theory development in the social sciences. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gehman, J., Glaser, V.L., Eisenhardt, K.M., Gioia, D., Langley, A. and Corley, K.G. (2018),

"Finding theory–method fit: A comparison of three qualitative approaches to theory building", *Journal of Management Inquiry*, Vol. 27 No. 3, pp. 284-300.

Gioia, D.A., Corley, K.G. and Hamilton, A.L. (2013), "Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive research: Notes on the Gioia methodology", *Organizational Research Methods*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 15-31.

Gronn, P. (2002), "Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 423-451.

Gupta, S., Beninger, S. and Ganesh, J. (2015), "A hybrid approach to innovation by social enterprises: lessons from Africa", Social Enterprise Journal, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 89-112.

Guest, G., Bunce, A. and Johnson, L. (2006), "How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability", Field Methods, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 59-82.

Hargreaves, T., Hielscher, S., Seyfang, G. and Smith, A. (2013), "Grassroots innovations in community energy: The role of intermediaries in niche development", Global Environmental Change, Vol. 23 No. 5, pp. 868-880.

Hegger, D.L.T., Van Vliet, J. and Van Vliet, B. (2007), "Niche management and its Contribution to regime change: the case of innovation in sanitation", Technological Analysis and Strategic Management, Vol. 19 No. 6, pp. 729–746.

Hickling, A. (1974), Managing decisions: The strategic choice approach. London, UK: Tavistock Institute of Human Relations.

Homebaked (2019), About, available at: http://homebaked.org.uk/

Hossain, M. (2018), "Grassroots innovation: The state of the art and future perspectives. *Technology in Society*, Vol. 55, pp. 63-69.

Hsieh, H.F., Shannon, S.E. (2005), "Three approaches to qualitative content analysis", Qualitative Health Research, Vol. 15 No. 9, pp. 1277-1288.

Jones, S. (2015), "Becoming Homebaked: Employing citizens, culture and networked media in the creation of new local economic models", Cultural Science, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 72-84.

Kanter, R.M. (1984), The change masters – Corporate entrepreneurs at work. London, UK: International Thomson Publishing Inc.

Kemp, S. (2002), "The hidden workforce: Volunteers' learning in the Olympics", Journal of European Industrial Training, Vol. 26 No. 2/3/4, pp. 109-116.

Kemp, R., Rip, A. and Schot, J. (2001), Constructing transition paths through the Management of niches. In R. Garud and P. Karnoe, P. (Eds.), Path dependence and creation (pp. 269-299). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kerlin, J.A. (2006), "Social enterprise in the United States and Europe: Understanding and learning from the differences", Voluntas, Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 246.

Kimbu, A.N. and Ngoasong, M.Z. (2016), "Women as vectors of social entrepreneurship", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 60, pp. 63-79.

Lindgren, M., Packendorff, J. (2009), "Social constructionism and entrepreneurship: Basic assumptions and consequences for theory and research", International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 25-47.

Liverpool Biennial (2019), About, available at: http://www.biennial.com/about

Moore, T. (2014), Affordable homes for local communities: The effects and prospects of community land trusts in England. Centre for Housing Research. University of St Andrews.

Ng, B.K., Kanagasundram, T., Wong, C.Y. and Chandran, V.G.R. (2016), "Innovation for inclusive development in Southeast Asia: the roles of regional coordination mechanisms", The Pacific Review, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 573-602.

Patton, M.Q. (2002), Qualitative research and evaluation methods (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks,

CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Pearson, L., Newton, P. and Roberts, P. (2014), Resilient sustainable cities: A future. London, UK: Routledge.

Peerally, J. A., De Fuentes, C. and Figueiredo, P. N. (2018), "Inclusive innovation and the role of technological capability-building: The social business Grameen Danone Foods Limited in Bangladesh", *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 52 No. 6, 101843.

Pellicer-Sifres, V., Belda-Miquel, S., Cuesta-Fernández, I. and Boni, A. (2018). Learning, transformative action, and grassroots innovation: insights from the Spanish energy cooperative Som Energia. *Energy Research and Social Science*, Vol. 42, pp. 100-111.

Perrini, F. and Vurro, C. (2006), Social entrepreneurship: Innovation and social change across theory and practice. In J. Mair, J. Robinson, and K. Hockerts (Eds.), Social entrepreneurship (pp. 57-85). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Roberts, P. (2016), The evolution, definition and purpose of urban regeneration. In P. Roberts, H. Sykes, and R. Granger (Eds.), Urban regeneration (2nd ed., pp. 9-43). London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.

Roberts, P., Sykes, H. and Granger, R. (2016), Urban regeneration (2nd. ed.). London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.

Roberts, D. and Woods, C. (2005), "Changing the world on a shoestring: The concept of social entrepreneurship", University of Auckland Business Review, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 45-51.

Schwandt, T.A. (1994), Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. In Denzin, N.K., Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 118-137). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.

Seyfang, G. and Smith, A. (2007), 'Grassroots innovations for sustainable development: Towards a new research and policy agenda", Environmental Politics, Vol. 16 No. 4, 584-603.

Short, J.C., Moss, T.W. and Lumpkin, G.T. (2009), "Research in social entrepreneurship: Past contributions and future opportunities", Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 161-194.

Smith, A., Fressoli, M., Abrol, D., Arond, E. and Ely, A. (2017), Grassroots innovation movements. London, UK: Routledge.

Southern, A., Whittam, G. (2015), The re-appropriation of enterprise and urban entrepreneurialism. In C. Mason, D. Reuschke, S. Syrett, and M. van Ham (Eds.), Entrepreneurship in cities: Neighbourhoods, households and homes (pp. 80-102). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham.

Schwandt, T.A. (1998), Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds.), The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues (pp. 221-259). London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.

Swaans, K., Boogaard, B., Bendapudi, R., Taye, H., Hendrickx, S. and Klerkx, L. (2014), "Operationalizing inclusive innovation: lessons from innovation platforms in livestock value chains in India and Mozambique", Innovation and Development, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 239-257.

Tallon, A. (2013), Urban regeneration in the UK (2nd ed.). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Thomas, D.R. (2006). A general inductive approach for analysing qualitative evaluation data. *American Journal of Evaluation*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 237-246.

Tighe, J.R. and Ganning, J.P. (2015), The divergent city: unequal and uneven development in St. Louis. Urban Geography, Vol. 36 No. 5, pp. 654-673.

Tracey, P. and Stott, N. (2017), "Social innovation: a window on alternative ways of organizing and innovating", *Innovation*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 51-60.

Utz, A. and Dahlman, C. (2007), Promoting Inclusive Innovation. In M.A. Dutz (Ed.)

Unleashing India's innovation: Toward sustainable and inclusive growth (pp. 105-129). Washington DC: World Bank.

Walker, J.L. (2012), "The use of saturation in qualitative research", Canadian Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 37-46.

Wallace, S.L. (1999), "Social entrepreneurship: The role of social purpose enterprises in facilitating community economic development", Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 153-174.

Wood, M. and McKinley, W. (2010), "The production of entrepreneurial opportunity: a constructivist perspective", Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 66-84.

Woodson, T., Alcantara, J. T. and do Nascimento, M. S. (2019), "Is 3D printing an inclusive innovation?: An examination of 3D printing in Brazil", *Technovation*, Vol. 80, pp. 54-62.