Actors in the Social Innovation Process: The Case of Mobile Courts in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa

Sundus Wasai[1], Muhammad Nouman[2]

Abstract

There is ample literature within the realm of innovation management suggesting that social innovation is a process characterized by different stages. However, it is not too clear how different actors perform different activities within each stage of this process, thus lending us only a parochial view of social innovation so far. Taking influence from Murray et al.'s seminal work in 2010, this paper presents the role of actors within different stages of the social innovation process including prompts, proposal of ideas, prototyping, sustainability, scaling and systemic change. The case of the mobile courts project in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa has been taken as a social innovation by employing qualitative methods. Results suggest that mobile courts as an innovation for quick and low-cost dispensation of justice went through the first three stages successfully due to the crucial role played by the then Chief Justice as one of the key actors. However, the project encountered various problems during the sustainability stage such as security, legislation, resources, defective judicial system, lack of awareness, and people's perceptions about mobile courts. Consequently mobile court as an innovation did not pass through the last two stages, i.e. scaling and systematic change. One of the key problems was weak cross-sectoral collaboration among actors. The paper concludes by suggesting implications for future research on and practice of social innovations.

Keywords: Social innovation, mobile courts, judicial system, legislation

1. Introduction

While the concept of social innovation has gained some attention of academicians and policy-makers since the last 15 years, it has mostly remained understudied (Mumford, 2002, Mumford & Moertl, 2003). International research has emphasized on the role of public sector as the innovator and facilitator of social innovation (Adams & Hess, 2010; Mulgan, Tucker, Ali, & Sanders, 2007). Public sector uses innovation in order to cope with the challenges of delivering healthcare, education, law and order, and so on (Tidd, Bessant, & Pavitt, 2005). Specifically, one of the public sector issues in managing law and order is provision of inexpensive, expeditious and accessible justice to the people, whereas delayed justice representing defects in justice administration leads to disorder in the society (Ataullah & Iqbal, 2013; Iqbal, 2013). To provide

1   *Lecturer, Shaheed Benazir Bhutto Women University, Peshawar*
2   *Assistant Professor, Institute of Management Sciences, Peshawar*

speedy and affordable justice at the doorsteps of the people, different countries such as Guatemala, Philippines, Somalia, Bangladesh, and India, launched mobile court(s) (Azcuna, 2005). According to the ex-Chief Justice of Peshawar High Court, there is a massive and unmatchable injustice in the society, and people are unable to bring their disputes to the courts because of numerous reasons such as lack of resources, costly litigation, and cumbersome legal procedures including unnecessary litigations (Dawn, 2013). However, Pakistan's constitution makes it mandatory on the state to provide inexpensive and expeditious justice to people. Therefore, revolutionary changes are required in the scheme of law that seems to have become outdated (Ataullah & Iqbal, 2013). The concept of mobile courts was initiated in July 2013 whereby the key actors of the judicial system including the judge and lawyers use a mobile court bus. The idea is to provide speedy and inexpensive justice at people's doorsteps. Since social innovation is meant to solve social problems (Nussbaumer & Moulaert, 2004) and improve the quality of life of the people (Pol & Ville, 2009), it can be concluded that mobile courts come under the purview of social innovation too.

Social innovation has been characterized as a process, e.g. Murray, Caulier-Grice, and Mulgan (2010) in their landmark work proposed six different stages of the social innovation process. These stages include prompts, proposal of ideas, prototypes, sustaining, scaling, and systematic change. Moreover, literature argues that different actors collectively carry out the process of social innovation through idea creation, idea selection, and mobilization of resources (Krlev, Bund, & Mildenberger, 2014; Osburg & Schmidpeter, 2013). The process-based approach can serve as a useful framework or tool for policy makers and innovators when considering different kinds of support mechanisms needed to make social innovations a success (Mulgan, 2006; Murray et al., 2010). Yet, there is a lack of research on the process itself (Murray et al., 2010). Moreover, a theoretical perspective is required to explain the process of social innovation in more detail by acknowledging the role of actors and their inter-actions (Nicolopoulu, Karatas-Ozkan, Vas, & Nouman, 2016). Therefore, this paper investigates the role of actors and their interactions resulting in the process of social innovation within the public sector. For this purpose, the pilot project of mobile courts launched in 2013 in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province of Pakistan is taken up as a case of social innovation.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Defining Social Innovation

Innovation is described as 'new ideas that work' (Mulgan et al., 2007). O'Sullivan (2008, p. 5) defined innovation as "the process of making changes, large and small, radical and incremental, to products, processes, and services that results in

something new for the organization that adds value to customers". However, some innovations can give rise to wider change and create value for the society such as social innovation (Murray et al., 2010). Over the last decade, social innovation has gained the attention of academicians and policy-makers, and has been studied in different disciplines (Grimm, Fox, Baines, & Albertson, 2013; Rüede & Lurtz, 2012; Osburg & Schmidpeter, 2013). Murray et al. (2010) define social innovations as "new ideas (products, services, and models) that simultaneously meet social needs and create new social relationships or collaborations" (p. 3). Moreover, Pol and Ville (2009) state that:

> Social innovation creates a new idea that has the potential to improve either the quality (i.e. living conditions) or the quantity (i.e. longevity) of life for instance better environmental quality, better education and health opportunities, law and order and longer life expectancy etc. (p. 33)

Although social innovation has gained prominence, it has remained an understudied concept (Mumford, 2002; Mumford & Moertl, 2003), whereby there is considerable space for contributions to both theory and practice (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014). However, the above definitions suggest consensus on the process-oriented nature of social innovation.

2.2. The Process of Social Innovation

Innovation is not a single event. Rather it is a process consisting of a core set of stages from idea generation to idea implementation distributed over time (Tidd et al., 2005; Mulgan et al., 2007). Our understanding of innovation as a process has shifted from a linear to a dynamic approach (Krlev et al., 2014; Rothwell, 1994). A major shift that has occurred is that the early models of innovation process, i.e. technology/science-push and market/demand-pull are superseded by non-linear models, i.e. fourth and fifth generation models of innovation process. Specifically, the fifth generation model considers innovation as systemic, non-linear & complex process (incorporating networks and taking place within a system), and focuses on the interaction of different actors of innovation (such as vertical & horizontal linkages). Similarly, social innovation process is considered as a complex & non-linear process, and social innovation stages are said to be "not always sequential [...] and there are feedback loops between them" (Murray et al., 2010, p. 11). Moreover, interactions of different actors play a significant role during the social innovation process (Phillips, Lee, Ghobadian, O'Regan, & James, 2014).

Murray et al. (2010) propose that the process through social innovations come along can be explained by six different stages: prompts, proposals, prototypes, sustaining, scaling & diffusion, and systematic change. The first stage of prompts, inspirations

and diagnoses is about becoming aware of a need or a problem that is not addressed, and symptoms & root causes of the problem (Mulgan et al., 2007; Murray et al., 2010). The second stage of proposals of ideas incorporates idea generation (Murray et al., 2010). In the third stage of prototyping and pilots, ideas are tested in practice (i.e. idea implementation) by prototypes, pilots, and experiments (Murray et al., 2010). In the fourth stage of sustaining, ideas become everyday practice, ensuring feasibility of the project including financial sustainability and so on (Murray et al., 2010). In the fifth stage of scaling and diffusion, there are issues of effective supply (the evidence that a particular model works) and effective demand (mobilizing resources of finance to pay for the idea or service) (Murray et al., 2010). The last stage of systemic change is about the ultimate goal of social innovation, i.e. establishing working prototypes of the new system where people think and see in new ways.

Stages of social innovation process serve as a useful framework that provides a significant tool for policy makers and innovators for considering different kinds of support that is needed in the process (Mulgan, 2006, Murray et al., 2010). Also, these stages demonstrate the way in which social innovation is designed, developed and diffused. However, there is a significant lack of research into the process of social innovation (Murray et al., 2010), whereas there is an urgent need to address the management of social innovation process to fully understand the practice of social innovation (Lettice & Parekh, 2010). However, Cajaiba-Santana (2014) argues that a theoretical perspecitve is required to model and explain the way social innovation emerges and spreads, i.e. social innovation process. Whereas, it is also important to consider the vital role of actors and their interactions in carrying this social innovation process. A theoretical perspective that explains the innovation development, diffusion and so on (i.e. stages of innovation process) and considers the systemic and interactive nature of innovation process is 'systems of innovation' approach (Eqduist, 2001). Based on a systematic review of social innovation literature, Phillips, Lee, Ghobadian, O'Regan, & James, (2014) recommend future research on social innovation to use systems of innovation approach as a suitable analytical framework. Therefore, systems of innovation approach can serve as a suitable theoretical & analytical approach for explaining social innovation process and the importance of interactions of different actors for carrying social innovation process.

2.3. Role of Actors and their Interactions in Social Innovation Process through the Lens of Systems of Innovation

A system of innovation is considered to be a set of independent and interrelated sub-systems that contributes collectively towards innovation development. Systems of innovation approach focuses on the importance of interactive learning, supporting the

view that innovation is not an isolated event and organisations are not lone innovating entities, rather innovation is shaped by interactions between different actors (Phillips et al., 2014). That is, network-innovations, innovations arising from combination of skills and knowledge from different actors play a significant role (ibid.). Similarly, lone heroic innovators do not undertake social innovation in isolation (Leadbeater, 2006), rather networks or systems play an important role, i.e. social innovation requires co-operation & collaborations between different actors (Philips et al., 2014). Also, social innovation in public sector is pioneered by a wide range of actors such as government, non-governmental organizations, philanthropists, business academics, or a combination of these groups (Rana, Weerakkody, Dwivedi, & Piercy, 2014). Whereas, government can be viewed as a key lever that encourages and establishes social innovation (Berzin, Pitt-Catsouphes, & Peterson, 2014). Moreover, according to systems of innovation, the interactions between actors can be market interactions such as transactions between organizations, or non-market interactions such as collaborations through sharing knowledge, resources and so on (Phillips et al., 2014; Edquist, 2001). Also, social innovation is often the result of joint authorship that combines the inputs of many people where several actors (within sector or across-sector) collaborate in discursive terms (consultation) and operative terms (project realization) to reach a common goal (Bulut, Eren, & Halac, 2013). Such interactions between actors highlight the importance of partnerships and linkages that social innovator must develop in order to mobilize capabilities and resources, which also play an important role in social innovation process. Social innovation process depends on the combination of new capabilities, and collective learning between a range of actors that may belong to different sectors (Phillips et al., 2014, Neumeier, 2012). Cross-sector partnership is a crucial aspect of social innovation, such as between public and private actors that require cross-sector collaboration of resources, competencies, and knowledge sharing in which key players try to solve social issues (Adams & Hess, 2010, Edwards-Schachter, Matti, & Alcántara, 2012; Osburg & Schmidpeter, 2013).

Specifically, the important role of actors (individuals or organizations) and their interactions in facilitating social innovation process is discussed in literature as follow. In the first two stages of social innovation process, 'prompts and proposals', actors generate ideas (Krlev et al., 2014) and recognize opportunity that refers to the ability to see problems as opportunities to start social innovation (Osburg & Schmidpeter, 2013). Innovators are good at identifying new ideas, and they try out things and quickly adjust the ideas according to experience (Mulgan, 2006). Whereas, ideas that are co-designed and/ or redesigned with actors belonging to different backgrounds are critiqued from different perspectives, finding best solutions (Brown, 2008, Murray et al., 2010). Moreover, social innovator understands problem and designs workable solution by thoroughly understanding the social cause that needs to be addressed and

the relevant contextual factors. This stage requires explicit knowledge of innovator that refers to his/her familiarity with a specific need or problem (such as unemployment, its spread and causes) (Krlev et al., 2014). In the third stage of social innovation process, 'prototyping', ideas selection by actor(s) enhances. This stage requires tacit knowledge of innovator to put idea/solution into action that solves the problem. Tacit knowledge is about bringing the right people together, having a feel for the situation, stimulating regional development with help of attraction of finances, or connections of key players etc. (Krlev et al., 2014). In the fourth stage of social innovation, 'sustaining -turning ideas into practice', the mobilization of resources by the actor(s) is emphasized (Krlev et al., 2014). Osburg and Schmidpeter (2013) assert that social innovator needs to have knowledge of required resources & of attracting resource, consequently forming partnerships with other actors to mobilize capabilities and resources. Moreover, social innovator needs to measure social value to assess that solution works or not and initiate changes to make solution more effective, this consequently increases the credibility and effectiveness of social innovations (Osburg & Schmidpeter, 2013). Social innovator(s) must demonstrate the benefits of social innovation in a relatively short period, obtain the benefits at relatively low cost and the benefits must be technologically and culturally appropriate (Mumford, 2002). However, in literature there is not much discussion on the role of actors or their interactions in last two stages of social innovation process i.e. stages of diffusion and systemic change. Moreover, Phillips et al. (2014) found in a systematic review that research on social innovation has focused on the role of the individual in bringing social innovation. Yet, recently the significance of different actors and their interactions (specifically cross-sector collaborations) in social innovation process is realized in the literature, as discussed above, therefore there is a need to conduct such a research.

Research Question: How are the actors (including individuals, public sector organizations, and other organizations) placed with regards to social innovation process in the public sector?

3. Research Methodology

The case study strategy has been used in the present study because it investigates issues concerning "how are the actors placed with regards to social innovation process in the public sector". The case of mobile courts cannot be considered without the context (Yin, 2003), i.e. it was the context of Pakistan's judicial system that led to mobile court project. The case of mobile court is selected as it is unique and current example of social innovation. In the context of a developing country like Pakistan, the mobile courts were launched for the first time and have the potential to provide speedy and inexpensive justice to poor litigants. Therefore, this case is academically

and contextually significant. Moreover, the project of mobile courts has been selected as unit of analysis, dictated by the case chosen. Also, the project follows initiation and implementation which is emphasized in the social innovation process.

The study used purposive/criterion sampling for selecting interviewees, whereby the criterion was those individuals who have participated in the mobile court project or have relevant knowledge about it. The data were collected from fourteen interviewees out of which ten were directly involved in the project and four were indirectly related to it and had sufficient knowledge about the project. The respondents included senior civil judges (2), district and session judges (2), Director General of KP Judicial Academy (1), senior faculty from KP Judicial Academy (1), lawyers working in the mobile courts (2), project manager of Strengthening Rule of Law in Malakand Project, UNDP (1), M&E Specialists from UNDP (3) and legal aid officers from UNDP (2).

Semi-structured interviews have been conducted to collect data whereby interview questions were derived from the review of literature on the social innovation process and nature of actors within innovation processes. The data has been analyzed using qualitative analysis techniques i.e. coding (including descriptive and interpretive codes). A star-list of thirteen codes was prepared with the help of research questions and literature review for understanding and organizing large amounts of data more effectively, as suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994). The data collected was subjected to splitting and splicing of codes as recommended by Dey (1993) in order to dig deeper into data and discover new ideas and information, help in categorization and bring consistency in the analysis. The splitting process resulted in 108 codes while splicing resulted in reduction of these codes back to 29 key themes. For achieving triangulation, documents relevant to the mobile court project were also reviewed including documents obtained from the High Court Registrar's office with respect to mobile court overview, training manuals used for training mobile court judges, and lawyers on mediation. The document prepared providing recommendations after the visit of mobile court stakeholders to Philippines was also reviewed (this particular document was considered confidential and not given to researchers for copying. The researchers were only allowed to review it and take notes).

All this analysis resulted in development of a role-ordered matrix. In the role-ordered matrix, rows displayed the actors, whereas columns displayed the different steps of social innovation process. Consequently, the cells built through combination of rows and columns display actors' roles in specific stages of the social innovation process (Miles & Huberman, 1994), consequently revealing the role of cross-sectoral collaborations as well.

4. Analysis and Discussion

4.1. Mobile Court as a Social Innovation

Social innovation is a new idea that meets social needs, involves collaborations and improves collective well-being (Murray et al., 2010, Pol & Ville, 2009). Almost all interviewees agreed that mobile court is a new idea launched for the first time in the history of Pakistan and meant to meet the social need of easy, accessible, inexpensive and expeditious justice at people's doorstep.

Mobile court system has been working in different countries, Guatemala (started in 2003), Philippine (started in 2004), India (started in 2007) and Bangladesh (started in 2009), providing inexpensive justice. Pakistan got inspired from Philippine's Justice on Wheels (Mobile Court) and established it in 2013 (Ataullah & Iqbal, 2013). Interviewees stated that mobile court is extremely useful innovation as it supplements formal court system (i.e. first time informal and formal systems are linked in Pakistan) and provides an option to solve cases on the spot through mediation. This relieves people from social stress, tension and pressure related to litigation, and they feel safer than going to traditional Jirga system, consequently improving collective well-being. Moreover, interviewees mentioned that mobile court created cross-sectoral collaboration between judiciary including high court, district court & Judicial Academy, and UNDP, as well as other stakeholders such as police department etc. Thus, mobile court is a prominent example of social innovation.

4.2. Analysis of Actors Role in Social Innovation Process

4.2.1. The Role of Actor(s) in Prompts

Interviewees mentioned that Chief Justice of Peshawar High Court worked for innovation in judiciary as a social innovator. He exhibited the will and carried the activity of problem identification informally with help of his explicit knowledge based on his familiarity with the problems (lack of accessible justice, costly litigation, and delay in justice), cases pendency data (with Peshawar High Court), and National Judicial Policy emphasizing inexpensive and expeditious justice (developed by committee where Chief Justice was committee member). As one interviewee commented;

"No formal study was conducted to assess the need for mobile courts in our region. It was mainly the initiative of the-then Chief Justice Mr. Dost Muhammad who was inspired by the idea after looking at some real-world examples in other countries. He was the one who took the idea forward."

No formal mechanism was in place to identify the social need based on which the

mobile court project could have been put in place. Rather the realities of Pakistan's judicial system and its problems were too obvious for key stakeholders to initiate things.

4.2.2. The role of Actor(s) in Proposals

According to interviewees, mobile court idea is Chief Justice's brainchild, and he recognized problems as opportunities to start mobile court, proposing it as best solution. He showed a strong vision to provide expeditious and inexpensive justice at doorstep of people and mobile court was his modus operandi to do so. Chief justice generated mobile court idea based on his experience and knowledge of people needs, procedures in judiciary (where executive magistrates and judges conduct visits for trials of petty issues), and mobile courts working in other countries. Moreover, interviewees indicated that chief justice exhibited tacit knowledge by creating a team of stakeholders (i.e. bringing the right people together). The team (consisting of Peshawar High Court staff, judicial academy, district judiciary, police department member, and UNDP personnel) visited Philippine and on the return, judicial officers prepared a detailed report and submitted it to Chief Justice, who examined and approved the report, and selected the proposed idea. This all added to idea generation of mobile court. It is important to point out that alternate dispute resolution (ADR) and mediation remained the cornerstones when preparing the proposal for mobile court. As two of the respondents pointed out;

"...the idea suggested in the report was that mobile courts will be visiting different parts of the countryside whereby lawyers will be accompanied by the judge in that mobile bus. The methodology, the approach of the disposal of cases would be based on the notion of mediation."

4.2.3. The role of Actor(s) in Prototyping and Pilots

In this stage, Chief Justice was the main actor to direct implementation (e.g. decided where to send the bus and where cases should be handled) since it was Project of Peshawar High Court. Chief Justice asked UNDP and directed judicial academy & district judiciary to support the implementation of the idea. UNDP (under 'Strengtening Rule of Law in Malakand' program) provided financial support (by financing study tour to Philippines, financing Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) training imparted to judges & lawyers, and procurement of prototype of mobile court bus under UNDP system procurement, where a private vendor was selected). UNDP also offered technical support to hire experts to develop standard operating procedures, to study best models of mobile court etc. Judicial academy acted as implementation partner and provided academic & intellectual support. The Judicial Academy conducted research and studied working of mobile courts in different countries, searched for the relevant laws, developed terms of references & indigenous operation method,

and provided ADR training (prepared a training manual, training material, study on training evaluation etc.). Also, Judicial Academy established a Mediation Centre, and did some preparatory work for research on working of Pakistan's mobile court (i.e. prepared database forms, sent to mobile court judges to fill etc.). As one interviewee from the KP Judicial Academy remarked;

"We had to support that idea, because...(it)...was very much within the statutory mandate under which we are working. We have to impart trainings and conduct research, so if someone approaches us...we look at our portfolio and if the request is compatible with the mandate of our academy, we go ahead with providing assistance. Mobile court was no different for us."

Interviewees further said that Chief justice and UNDP Country Director inaugurated mobile courts, whereas Chief Justice launched it as a pilot project through administrative orders. It was mentioned that district judiciary (i.e. district and session judge and his team) carried operations of mobile court, whereas senior civil judges presided over the mobile court as 'Judge Mobile Court'. Moreover, Director General of Judicial Academy supervised mobile court visits, and lawyers mediated and presented cases to the judge in mobile court (whereas quick disposal of cases was dependent on mediation skills and expertise of mobile court lawyers and judges). The judiciary asked police to provide security while the mobile court was in operation at a particular location and judiciary asked for facilities (parking area, washroom etc) from Director General of the government building where the mobile court bus was parked. Respondents mentioned that provincial government is supported and provided funding (budget) for mobile courts. Interviewees also indicated that to show achievement and effectiveness of mobile court, a record of 141 cases resolved on the spot was also maintained by the mobile court judges. Moreover, in a relatively short period, in pilot testing, the benefits of mobile court (in terms of expeditious, inexpensive, easy and accessible justice) became visible.

4.2.4. The role of Actor(s) in Sustaining

According to interviewees, security is the first priority of government. Judiciary (specifically Peshawar High Court) should conduct security assessment of mobile court, and judiciary & provincial government should provide separate arrangement for security of mobile court i.e. direct police to provide security. Moreover, provincial government needs to show willingness, allow mobile court operations, pass mobile court bill and provide legislation for mobile court (as legal cover is not difficult for Provincial government). For legislation tbe procedure is that the Chief Justice (High Court) requests the Law Department (executive branch) to prepare the bill (Mobile Court Act); the bill is then presented in provincial assembly and provincial assembly refers it to the select committee. Once reviewed by the committee the provincial

assembly can proceed with passing the act. Interviewees said that provincial government should allocate human resources (such as police, staff etc.), physical resources (additional buses, usage of government buildings for mobile court proceedings) & financial resources (budget) for mobile court, and judiciary should provide human resources (such as judicial staff), whereas UNDP promised funds for peon, drivers, conductors and all staff. However, the above-mentioned issues remained mostly unaddressed leading the sustainability problems of mobile court as a social innovation. As pointed out by a senior judge

"In my view the sustainability of the mobile court project was threatened due to three factors, the security situation in the province in general, lack of constitutional or legislative cover when it comes to innovation in government function and lack of continued resources both financial and manpower."

Additionally, four interviewees also suggested that for sustaining mobile courts the judiciary is required to modernize the formal judicial system and create awareness so that people use, accept and perceive mobile court positively. While initiatives were undertaken they were not continued for long resulting in sustainability issues.

4.2.5. The role of Actor(s) in Scaling and Diffusion

Interviewees said that even without huge publicity, a lot of litigants have used mobile courts (shown by 141 cases resolved) as people need easy and accessible justice, and want such innovative services. This is clear evidence that effective demand is present. Moreover, if the project is successful, mobile courts will be demanded by citizens (specifically poor litigants) in other provinces, meaning it can expand to other provinces. On supply side, judiciary and the provincial government have expressed willingness to continue and spread mobile court to the whole province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. . Provincial government is willing to provide resources such as mini-buses for expansion in geographically tough areas, and has allocated budget for mobile court. However, delay in formal legislation in the shape of Mobile Court Act for proper establishment, diffusion, institutionalization of mobile court remained a key impediment for considerable amount of time. The Act was eventually passed in June 2015 but by that time other key stakeholders had lost interest and the act was not backed up with resources. This resulting in scaling and diffusion challenges.

"Yes, the Act is there but on the ground I mean for operations and maintenance you require a lot of human and financial resources. Otherwise the mobile courts cannot diffuse into the mainstream judicial system and become self-operational."

4.2.6. The role of Actor(s) in Systematic Change

Interviewees did not mention any role of actor(s) in this step. This is primarily assessed from the problems encountered by mobile courts in the preceding stages of sustaining and scaling and diffusion. However, one interviewee mentioned that the mobile court will exhibit an impact if judiciary (specifically High Court) makes serious efforts to change the whole judicial system from traditional to automatic/ modern setup (involving use of technologies including computers and laptops). It was remarked;

"...change can occur if our judiciary is willing to let go of the cumbersome and complex documentary procedures and litigation mechanics that bog down the whole process. Use of technologies and a change of mindsets will be needed. Mobile court demonstrated the evidence for the possibility of this systemic change but somehow the key actors did not continue the effort with the same energy that they exhibited at the start."

4.2.7. The role of Cross-Sectoral Collaborations in the Social Innovation Process

Although in first two stages of social innovation process chief justice (representing high court) played a dominant role as social innovator i.e. becoming aware of social needs and social issues and developing best solution for it. However, as stated in literature that lone social innovator cannot carry social innovation. Similarly, chief justice collaborated with actors within judicial sector i.e. district court, judicial academy and so on, and actors belonging to other sectors such as UNDP and so on. These actors played a significant role in developing the prototype and further carrying the pilot testing of mobile court i.e. third stage of social innovation. Judicial academy's contribution was in terms of providing academic and intellectual support that was its main expertise, as said by an interviewee that the mandate of judicial academy is to provide such trainings as was required in case of mobile court, and also judicial academy has expertise to develop terms of reference, conduct research and search for relevant laws for mobile court. Similarly, UNDP contributed by providing technical, and mainly financial support since UNDP works as a donor and in accordance with its mandate it provides funds to strengthen the government functioning in providing public services. District judiciary carried the operations of mobile court project. However, provincial government played a significant role as government acts as a key lever in public sector social innovation. Furthermore, other actors such as police department, Director General of government buildings and so on contributed by providing the capabilities and resources that they possess. However, later mobile court faced sustainability issues (such as lack of security, legislation, different resources, awareness and modern formal justice system) and was stopped. In order to deal with

Table 1: Role-ordered Matrix – Actors and their Interactions in the Social Innovation Process (Adopted from Miles & Huberman, 1994)

Actors/Agents	Professional Characteristics	Prompts	Proposals of ideas	Prototyping and pilots	Sustaining	Scaling and Diffusion	Systematic Change
Judiciary (Ju) Mandate of judiciary to provide inexpensive and expeditious justice Judiciary role is to plan and execute of JA	-CJ was instrumental person and leader. -CJ was administrative head of the province of KP -CJ was chairman of JA	-CJ carried PI based on explicit knowledge	-CJ generated MC idea -CJ made a team based on tacit knowledge -CJ approved the report	-CJ asked UN to support II -CJ directed judicial academy & district judiciary to support II - CJ inaugurated MC II	-CJ requested law department to rate the MC bill	NR	NR
MC (owner) Judiciary has high court, district court, and judicial academy.	Peshawar High Court (PHC)	NI	NI	NI	-Ju (PHC) should provide MC security assessment and security arrangement -Ju should: provide human resources, modernize judicial system and create public awareness	-Ju is willing to expand working of MCs	-Ju (PHC) needs to change the judicial system
	- D&SJ and his team is responsible for MC implementation -D&SJ see things in a new way	NR	NR	-D&SJ and his team visited Philippine and prepared a report. -D&SJ supervised operations of MC -SCJ presided MC bus and maintained a record of cases.	NR	NRPY	NRPY
	-Mandate of JA is to impart trainings. -DG (JA) is very effective, man of change and innovation.	NR	NR	-DG (JA) visited Philippine & supervised MC visits -JA provided academic and intellectual support -JA established a Mediation Centre and did some preparatory work for MC research	NR	NRPY	NRPY

Stakeholder							
UNDP (UN) Mandate of the UN to strengthen the judiciary.	-Under UN's "Rule of Law" program, UN supported MC	NR	NR	-UN personnel visited Philippine -UN provided financial support -UN offered technical support -UN country director inaugurated MC	-UN promised funds for MC staff	NRPY	NRPY
Lawyers (La)	La acted as friends of MC	NR	NR	-La mediate and present cases to judge in MC	NR	NRPY	NRPY
Private Vendor (PV)	NI	NR	NR	-PV has prepared MC bus	NR	NRPY	NRPY
Police (Po)	NI	NR	NR	-DIG police department visited Philippine -Police provided security	Police has to provide security	NRPY	NRPY
DG of building (DG-B)	NI	NR	NR	- DG of the building where MC bus visits, are asked to provide facilities	NR	NRPY	NRPY
Provincial Government, KP (PG)	NI	NR	NR	-PG is supporting, -PG provided funding	-PG should provide security arrangement -PG should pass MC bill and provide legislation -PG should allocate resources such as human, physical and financial resources for MC	-PG will expand MC -PG will provide resources for expansion of MC -PG should provide MC Act for diffusion of MC	NRPY
Citizens (Ci)	NI	NR	NR	NR	NR	Citizens' demand will expand MC idea	NRPY

MC = Mobile Court CJ = Chief Justice Peshawar High Court PHC = Peshawar High Court DJ = District Judiciary D&SJ = District and session judge SCJ= Senior civil judge
JA = Judicial Academy PG= Provincial Government NR = No Role played, indicated by respondent NRPY = No role played yet NI= No information provided by respondent

these issues, interviews mentioned different actors should play their role i.e. chief justice, high court, provincial government, and UNDP. Moreover, for facilitating scaling and diffusion of mobile court, citizens, judiciary, and provincial government can play a significant role by demanding mobile court, spreading mobile court services, providing resources and Mobile Court Act. Lastly, judiciary (specifically High Court) can facilitate the systemic change of social innovation.

5. Conclusion and Implications

In this paper, actors and their interactive or collaborative role in the social innovation process has been investigated by taking mobile court project as a case. Therefore, the paper contributes by expanding the current literature on social innovation and by examining the role of actors within various stages of the social innovation process through empirical data. Findings suggest that social innovation projects in public sector are carried out by different actors that may belong to different sectors, i.e. through cross-sectoral partnerships or collaborations. However, a significant role is played by the public sector organizations initiating social innovation (mobile court in this case) and also the government. This research will help organizations who participate in social innovation projects to understand the importance of each step of the social innovation process as well as the role that actors and their interactions play in influencing the process of social innovation. With this information, organizations can carefully plan and execute each step and organize resources and collaborate with key players to make social innovations successful.

However, the generalizability of this study is limited due to various factors such as the study's focus on a specific public sector and a particular social innovation project that is embedded in its context. However, two theoretical generalizations can be drawn from the case of mobile court: 1) social innovation projects progress through several stages whereas each stage adds or contributes something to the next stage. 2) The public sector organization that initiates the social innovation project acts as the main actor and plays a significant role during different stages of the process, specifically initial stage of problem identification and idea generation. It also needs support from other key stakeholders as partners to carry the project and make it successful, whereas each partner contributes based on its mandate and expertise. This study also concludes that social innovation has the potential to improve collective well-being and society's capacity to act. It is recommended that organizations belonging to different sectors should collaborate and create social innovations, consequently making society a better place to live. Moreover, future research should explore the potential of social innovation system by investigating other components of systems of innovation (such as institutions, demand, learning process etc.) and their interactions, influencing social

innovation process. Also, future research should select a specific variant of systems of innovation such as sectoral, regional or national, rather than focusing on the broad approach of systems of innovation.

References:

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

Ataullah, Q., & Iqbal, K. (2013). First Mobile Courts – ADR Training For Judges and Lawyers of District Peshawar. Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Judicial Academy, Peshawar.

Azcuna, H. A. S. (2005). The justice on wheels of the Philippines. International Conference and Showcase on Judicial Reforms. Makati City, Philippines.

Berzin, S. C., Pitt-Catsouphes, M., & Peterson, C. (2014). Role of state-level governments in fostering social innovation. *Journal of Policy Practice*, *13*(3), 135 -155.

Brown, T. (2008). Design thinking. *Harvard Business Review,* June, 84-92.

Bulut, C., Eren, H., & Halac, D. S. (2013). Social innovation and psychometric analysis. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *82*(2013)**,** 122-130.

Cajaiba-Santana, G. (2014). Social innovation: Moving the field forward. A conceptual framework. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *82*(2014)**,** 42-51.

Dawn. (2013). Mobile court inaugurated: 'State bound to provide justice', retrieved on March 06, 2016 available at http://www.dawn.com/news/1032448

Dey, I. (1993). *Qualitative data analysis: A user-friendly guide.* London: Routledge.

Edquist, C. (2001). The systems of innovation approach and innovation policy: An account of the state of the art. Lead Paper Presented at the DRUID Conference, June 12–15, Aalborg.

Edwards-Schachter, M. E., Matti, C. E., & Alcántara, E. (2012). Fostering quality of life through social innovation: A living lab methodology study case. *Review of Policy Research*, *29*(6), 672–692.

Grimm, R., Fox, C., Baines, S., & Albertson, K. (2013). Social innovation, an answer to contemporary societal challenges? Locating the concept in theory and practice. Innovation: *The European Journal of Social Science Research*, *26*(4)**,** 436-455.

Iqbal, J. (2013). The role of the judiciary as a catalyst of change in Pakistan. The Supreme Court of Pakistan, Article No. 9, Islamabad.

Krlev, G., Bund, E., & Mildenberger, G. (2014). Measuring what matters – Indicators of social innovativeness on the national level. *Information Systems Management, 31*(3), 200-224.

Leadbeater, C. (2006). The socially entrepreneurial city. In Nicholls, A. (Ed.), Social

Entrepreneurship: New Models of Sustainable Social Change, Oxford: UK, Oxford University Press,

233-46.

Lettice, F., & Parekh, M. (2010). The social innovation process: Themes, challenges and implications for practice. *International Journal of Technology Management, 51*(1), 139–158.

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, M. A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Mulgan, G. (2006). The process of social innovation. *Innovations, 1*(2006)*,* 145-162.

Mulgan, G., Tucker, S., Ali, R., & Sanders, B. (2007). Social innovation: What it is, why it matters and how it can be accelerated. Skoll Centre for Social Entrepreneurship, London: The Basingstoke Press.

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

Murray, R., Caulier-Grice, J., & Mulgan, G. (2010). The open book of social innovation, National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Art, London: The Young Foundation.

Neumeier, S. (2012). Why do social innovations in rural development matter and should they be considered more seriously in rural development research? Proposal for a stronger focus on social innovations in rural development research. *Sociol Rural, 52*(2), 48 – 69.

Nicolopoulou, K., Karatas-Ozkan, M., Vas, C., & Nouman, M. (2016). An incubation perspective on social innovation: The London hub – a social incubator. R&D Management, (in press).

Nussbaumer, J., & Moulaert, F. (2004). Integrated area development and social innovation in European cities: A cultural focus. *City, 8*(2)*,* 249-257.

Osburg, T., & Schmidpeter, R. (2013). Social innovation: Solutions for a sustainable future, London: Springer Science & Business.

O'Sullivan, D. (2008) *Applying Innovation.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.

Phillips, W., Lee, H., Ghobadian, A., O'Regan, N., & James, P. (2014). Social innovation and social entrepreneurship: A systematic review. *Group & Organization Management, 40*(3), 428-461.

Pol, E., & Ville, S. (2009). Social innovation: Buzz word or enduring term? *The Journal of Socio-Economics, 38,* 878-885.

Rana, N. P., Weerakkody, V., Dwivedi, Y. K., & Piercy, N. C. (2014). Profiling existing research on social innovation in the public sector. *Information Systems Management, 31*(3), 259-273.

Rothwell, R., (1994). Towards the fifth-generation innovation process. *International Marketing Review, 11*(1), 7–31

Ruede, D., & Lurtz, K. (2012). Mapping the various meanings of social innovation: Towards a differentiated understanding of an emerging concept. EBS Business School Research Paper, (12-03).

Tidd, J., Bessant, J., & Pavitt, K. (2005). *Managing innovation: Integrating technological, market and organizational change*. New York, NY: John Wiley.

Westley, F., & Antadze, N. (2010). Making a difference: Strategies for scaling social innovation for greater impact. *Innovation Journal, 15*(2), 1-19.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and method*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.