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I am pleased to present this research report entitled ‘Surveying the social innovation and higher education landscape in Hong Kong’. It forms part of the Building Research Innovation for Community Knowledge and Sustainability (BRICKS) project, commissioned by the British Council and funded by the Hong Kong government’s SIE Fund. BRICKS is a unique project that aims to find innovative solutions to social challenges in Hong Kong, by strengthening collaboration between higher education institutions (HEIs), non-governmental organisations (NGOs), social enterprises and other organisations. The research presented in this report is a key step towards fulfilling that aspiration.

HEIs have a crucial role to play when it comes to finding responses to complex global and local challenges. To meet this demand, they must reimagine their function as centres of knowledge and leadership for the future. This research is groundbreaking, in that it presents a detailed picture of the HEI social innovation ecosystem in Hong Kong for the first time, and it is the first of its kind in Asia. It will act as a baseline to understand the challenges facing universities in relation to connecting and collaborating with each other and the community on social innovation through their research, teaching and engagement. The framework of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), agreed by all nations, underscores the importance of this agenda globally, and the British Council, who are committed to supporting the sharing of knowledge and insights internationally, welcomes this report as a key milestone.

This research indicates some very positive trends in relation to social innovation in Hong Kong. There are examples of how social innovation is already addressing some of the critical challenges we face today, such as an ageing society, skills development, housing and health. However, success stories from around the world tell us that collaboration is key to unlocking the potential of social innovation, and these findings highlight some systemic barriers in Hong Kong affecting collaboration in this field, such as the way research funding is administered, and the competition between HEIs.

So, while there is significant work already happening in this arena in Hong Kong, and strong interest in social innovation from researchers and students alike, it is also clear that much more needs to be done. The report’s authors have outlined several key recommendations that we hope will make a significant contribution to shaping the debate around social innovation policy and practice in Hong Kong, and further afield, in the years to come.

Jeff Streeter
Director, British Council in Hong Kong
1. LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1 OVERVIEW

Surveying the social innovation and higher education landscape in Hong Kong is a key report commissioned as part of the Building Research Innovation for Community Knowledge and Sustainability (BRICKS) project. The BRICKS project provides an innovative and impactful approach to supporting the higher education sector in Hong Kong, by supporting students, teachers and early-career researchers to develop the skills they need to be socially innovative leaders, and to co-create social innovation cultures within the sector. This literature review seeks to set the context for this research, and informs the discussion of the findings presented later in this report. At the end of this review is an exploration of the Hong Kong ecosystem, which sets the context for the data gathered through BRICKS research. As this data suggests, there is a clear need for more embedded collaboration across the entire Hong Kong ecosystem.

1.2 DEFINING CONCEPTS AND CONTEXT

The field of social innovation is characterised by definitional ambiguity and has a multitude of definitions (Gee et al., 2019). There is no standardised or accepted definition. This ambiguity makes it difficult to understand the precursors and impact of social innovation (Van der Have and Rubalcaba, 2016), and, hence, how it can be fostered in a locality. However, the concept of social innovation has been defined in a number of ways, including as ‘a coalition to solve the specific social challenge’. Social innovation can occur across any sector of the economy, including the private, public and third sectors. Social entrepreneurship, social enterprise and social intrapreneurship are also types of social innovation, but it is important to recognise that social innovation is much broader than these concepts. This undoubtedly contributes to the definitional ambiguity of social innovation, which is further compounded by the interchangeable use of these terms (social innovation, social enterprise, social entrepreneurship) in the literature, despite their meanings being different (Sinclair et al., 2018). For the purposes of this report and for clarity, the definition proposed by Heiskala (2007) outlined above will be adopted and referred to from hereon as social innovation².

Social innovation initiatives can be reactionary, revolutionary and rapid. But, because of their reactive nature, they can also be oversimplified and based on poor levels of evidence (Halsvorsen, Traube and Rice, 2017). There is, therefore, a need to ensure that new social innovations take into account the wider social context within which they are embedded, and that they are based on the latest knowledge and research. This suggests that HEIs are perfectly placed to lead an inter-disciplinary focus on how best to solve or alleviate social problems. Indeed, as Nichols et al. (2013) argue, universities can engage in campus-community collaborations to help promote knowledge exchange and collaborative research, which can drive social innovation and help solve social problems. Such activities can help leverage investments in Research and Development (R&D), financial or otherwise, in higher education, by mobilising knowledge and creating awareness (Nichols et al., 2013). However, research by Domanski, Anderson and Jantz (2019) has demonstrated that HEIs are not sufficiently engaged in social innovation projects. Their research (ibid) mapped over 1,000 social innovation projects globally, and identified that HEIs were engaged with only 14.9% of these projects.

Whilst in a traditional university setting, compliance with academic performance indicators provides a traditional model, in a relational university model, competencies related to context are more important, as these are more likely to lead to localised innovation (Gibbons, 2000; Castro-Spila and Unceta, 2014). Relational universities are best placed to develop the transformative competencies that are best aligned with localised environments in order to develop social innovations (Castro-Spila, 2018). In this way, HEIs become the central actor in the development of localised knowledge to facilitate social innovation, and can help partners match qualification and innovation (Schröder, 2012). However, this requires universities to go through internal and external development processes related to pedagogic approaches, staff development, management practices and sustainable networking (Schröder, 2012). Without such changes to practices, certain barriers could prevent the growth of social innovation within HEIs.

Barriers to social innovation include access to resources (financial, political, intellectual, legal and human) (Dej et al., 2019), whilst, institutionally, a lack of leadership or organisational embedment can stifle the growth of social innovations (Dhondt, Dej and Schröder, 2018). This is particularly pertinent from a university perspective, as while an institution may have individuals focused on, or siloes of, activity around social innovation, a lack of institutional engagement, a lack of potential for these individuals to engage in social innovation (Weber, 1978) and, hence, disempower them. When exploring campus-community collaboration (or inter-institutional collaboration within the higher education sector), the ways in which funding is distributed (and by whom and when), institutional logics/ demands, ethical structures, and tenure/promotion criteria all affect the success of the collaboration (Nichols et al., 2013). In addition, the current fragmented state of the social innovation paradigm means that there is less structured engagement of funds from traditional sources or collaboration between different sectors (Nichols et al., 2013).

Defining social innovation education within a higher education setting is problematic, as there are no agreed definitions of what this constitutes in the literature. Furthermore, the curricula developed by different universities globally varies. However, Alden-Rivers, Howaldt and Schwartz (2018) define it as ‘the complex process of developing graduates who aspire to change the world for the better, regardless of career path’. The same authors also argue that this is carried out to produce graduates who are socially/ethically responsible, who can lead and communicate effectively, who are knowledgeable and emotionally intelligent. One of the key challenges in relation to teaching social innovation is the ability to ensure that students can engage in embedded learning, which involves ‘place-based’, experiential learning that complements intellectual capital and critical reflection (Alden-Rivers et al., 2015: 394). Indeed, Elmes et al. (2015) argue that such place-based education is critical to solving social problems, and that understanding a locality is critical to identifying, adopting, and developing social innovations. Certainly, it can be argued that all social innovation should place to fulfil these roles, as they have the community-embeddedness and the resources to enable experiential learning and deliver impact.

The teaching of social innovation is also characterised by a realisation that networks are critical, and that social innovations cannot be imposed on communities (Elmes et al., 2015). Change must be developed from a bottom-up perspective. These networks are particularly critical for enabling the collation of resources for a programme, as educators become ‘academic brokers’, by using their networks to deliver innovative courses. This can include identifying and recruiting guest lecturers, utilising action learning through site visits, and utilising the resources spread throughout a university to improve a student’s experience. The use of the ‘transformative scenario method’ (van der Have and Rubalcaba, 2016) to engage in scenario-planning social innovations that are themselves embedded in real-life cases, is also a means of empowering students to explore social innovations and consider their systemic impacts (Cederquist and Golüke, 2016). Such methods allow students to explore the complexities surrounding social problems and their solutions, and, hence, better prepare them for the complex world they will need to engage in following graduation (Cederquist and Golüke, 2016). Whilst the literature on social innovation education is still nascent, what it does demonstrate is the complex nature of teaching the subject, and the need for institutional support, multiple resources and networks to enable place-based and experientially embedded learning.

The final area to explore here relates to the long-term impact on society of teaching social innovation³. Furthermore, it is relevant within the Hong Kong higher education context, due to the introduction of the new Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) 2020 of research impact, which now accounts for up to 15 per cent of a HEI’s overall score. The measurement of social innovation and its impact is fraught with difficulty, as there is no commonly accepted definition of what social innovation constitutes, what appropriate methodologies and indicators should be used, and what the causal antecedents of social innovation are (Unceta, Castro-Spila and García-Fronti, 2016). This relates to the problem identified earlier – of measuring the change and consequences of social innovation (Van der Have and Rubalcaba, 2016). If we don’t know the inputs or outputs of a system, how can they be measured? In addition, Hart and Northmore (2011) identify the often lengthy timeframes required to accurately assess the outcomes and impact as being particularly problematic in assessing collaboration between HEIs and the community. Whilst these difficulties in measuring impact may seem unrelated to research and teaching about social innovation; they are in fact, critical. A lack of evidence of the impact that
1.3 SOCIAL INNOVATION IN HONG KONG’S HIGHER EDUCATION SECTOR

The Hong Kong social innovation ecosystem is emergent in its development, despite being in existence (at least in nascent form) in Hong Kong since the mid-2000s. Indeed, the rise of innovators in Hong Kong who ‘seek to develop solutions and organizational models that focus on sustainability, scalability, and social impact’, has been recognised, and this is beginning to lead to collaboration around and a growing awareness of social innovation in Hong Kong (Chung and Yeh Fung, 2017). The rise of the social innovation ecosystem has emerged at a time when Hong Kong is facing significant social challenges, most notably in relation to poverty, inequality and an ageing population. In June 2017, Hong Kong’s GNI coefficient – a measure of income inequality ranging from 0 (equality) to 1 (inequality) – was 0.549, the highest for 45 years. This equates to an income situation in which the wealthiest top 10 per cent of earners receive nearly 44 times the income of the bottom 10 per cent (Wong, 2018; Oxfam, 2018). Furthermore, 1.3 million people in Hong Kong live in poverty (there are 500,000 poor households), of which 60 per cent are working poor, and there has been a real-terms reduction in the purchasing power of the minimum wage ($HK34.50/hour) of over 20 per cent since 2010 (Oxfam, 2018). This is despite a budget surplus of nearly HK$700 billion and fiscal reserves of HK$1.1 trillion (Oxfam, 2018). The need for robust and innovative solutions to these problems is, therefore, of paramount importance to the Hong Kong government.

This, in part, led to the establishment of the Social Innovation and Entrepreneurship Development (SIE) Fund in 2013, which has provided HK$500 million of government funding to support social innovation initiatives (Patton, 2018). The focus on leveraging social innovation from outside social welfare/charitable organisations is one that the SIE Fund is keen to promote, as it seeks to build a larger social entrepreneurship ecosystem (Wong, 2014). This need for wider engagement between these funds, investors and corporates, and the promotion of cross-sector career paths was proposed (Alto and Wong, 2014). This need, whilst arguably still present, has been offset due to government restrictions on spending. Indeed, in a report entitled ‘Adopting the London Principles’, the need for wider engagement between these funds, investors and corporates, is barely mentioned. However, within the context of collaboration within the higher education sector, this is, perhaps, the exception as opposed to the rule. Hong Kong is not unique in this area, as inter-HEI collaboration is vital. As will be shown later in this report, without a common conceptual understanding and shared vision (with the name, the idea is that the social innovation ecosystem in Hong Kong could be centralised, strategic planning frameworks would also be useful in demonstrating the efficacy of social innovators and the social value that they create to policy-makers. However, given the breadth of social problems facing Hong Kong, outlined earlier in this report, there is a clear need for a wider range of social innovation research.

Prior research also identified a need for centralised, strategic planning frameworks to support (Alto and Wong, 2014). Indeed, there is increasing use of the SDGs in the measurement of social impact globally, with examples of this now being applied worldwide (including Hong Kong) in the higher education sector (see Times Higher for an example). Given the need for all universities in Hong Kong to align their social innovation and social entrepreneurship initiatives with the SDGs in the measurement of social impact, the inference is that the SIE Fund has demonstrated the power of learning by doing, borrowing innovation ideas from around the world (knowledge transfer), iterative course design, the value of cross-sector collaborators, transparency of impact, and value alignment between partners (Chung and Yeh Fung, 2017). However, within the context of collaboration within the higher education sector, this is, perhaps, the exception as opposed to the rule. Hong Kong is not unique in this area, as inter-HEI collaboration is vital. As will be shown later in this report, there is a clear need for a wider range of social innovation research.

There does, however, remain a lack of research collaboration in Hong Kong, as well as a paucity of applied research that can be utilised by practitioners. Indeed, social enterprises and social enterprise support organisations (and other socially innovative organisations) are important partners for NGOs and government (Chandra, 2018), and so collaboration is vital. As will be identified later in this report, the research that does exist is often theoretical in nature, and is not applicable to the wider ecosystem, being what non-academics critically label ‘blue-sky research’. Prior studies have identified the need for applied research, with social impact measurement being one specific area of applied research that the government (and specifically the SIE Fund) has been encouraged to
innovative impact. NSM (2019) identified a need for a central hub of social innovation to help map the sector and promote multi-stakeholder partnerships (NSM, 2019).

Finally, the purpose of this section is not to provide a comprehensive overview of the social innovation ecosystem in Hong Kong, but, rather, to identify the key challenges and barriers that other scholars/practitioners have previously identified. Clearly, there is a growing social innovation ecosystem in Hong Kong, that with the right support could flourish. The data presented in this report seeks to map out this support in relation to the higher education sector, to show what changes can be implemented across the sector to further drive growth in social innovation research, curriculum development and the transfer of knowledge to disadvantaged communities.

1.4 SUMMARY

The key themes explored in relation to the existing literature demonstrate that a greater understanding is required around the definition and conceptualisation of social innovation. In addition, interdisciplinary research that encompasses multiple theoretical standpoints can provide the analytical lenses required to take our understanding of these complex phenomena to the next level. The dissemination of this research through multiple formats (not just academic conferences) is also crucial in ensuring that messages around the positive value social innovation can bring will reach those with the power to drive social change. Teaching is another area that will benefit from greater collaboration, through better learning opportunities for students and more embedded learning opportunities (place-based learning) around social innovation. Equally, it can raise awareness of social innovation and lead to increased institutional support within HEIs for social innovation focused research and curricula. Finally, the need for multi-stakeholder partnerships between academics, practitioners, communities, governments and NGOs is also of paramount importance in ensuring that new innovations are culturally relevant, co-produced, and have the greatest possible impact. These, therefore, represent areas of focus for the social innovation ecosystem in Hong Kong’s higher education sector moving forwards. This report seeks to explore this development within the sector, and to understand this development in respect to systemic, institutional and practice-level enablers and barriers.

2. RESEARCH AIMS

The objective of the BRICKS project is to build capacity of and a community amongst academic leaders in relation to the role that social innovation theory and practice can play in poverty relief and other social issues. This research directly relates to this aim, by seeking to explore the barriers to and enablers of collaboration in relation to social innovation within and between HEIs in Hong Kong. The research, therefore, explores the following aim and sub-aims:

**Research aim:** To understand the knowledge, capacity and future ambitions of the Hong Kong academic community in relation to social innovation. How is this shaped by barriers and enablers at the following three levels?

- **Systemic level:** cultural norms, traditions and incentive structures that mediate inter-HEI collaboration.
- **Institutional level:** behaviours and attitudes of faculty and staff in HEIs towards collaboration.
- **Practice level:** frontline knowledge of how to collaborate in the delivery of social innovation initiatives.

The research adopts a mixed-method approach (see Appendix A) to answer the above questions. This approach was designed to enable the broadest possible engagement of a wide-variety of stakeholder groups, ensuring that enablers and barriers at all three levels could be mapped effectively.
### 3. QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

#### 3.1 RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

Data was collected from 52 respondents, with 47 coming from nine Hong Kong HEIs, and five respondents coming from non-academic institutions (one investor, one HEI federation; one social enterprise incubator; one social enterprise start-up and one foundation). A total of 33 per cent of respondents are on academic/research career tracks, whilst 67 per cent are on teaching-led tracks. There was a broad split across age groups, with over 80 per cent aged between 25 and 54; more specifically: 2 per cent (18 to 24), 24 per cent (25 to 34), 26 per cent (35 to 44), 32 per cent (45 to 54) and 16 per cent (55 and 64). Respondents from the Social Sciences and Business academic areas account for 55 per cent of the sample (see Figure 3.1).

In relation to the academic position of the respondents, the majority are senior staff, either in Professor/Associate Professor positions, or non-academic management positions (e.g., Project Managers) (see Figure 3.2).

In relation to expertise, the respondents were asked to provide up to three areas they had expertise in, meaning a theoretical maximum of 156 data points (99 areas of expertise were submitted). The word cloud in Figure 3.3 presents these, with the size of each word indicating its prevalence in the dataset. This demonstrates that social innovation and social entrepreneurship are clear areas of expertise (unsurprisingly), whilst knowledge transfer, social policy/work/services and design (design thinking/design policy) are other major areas listed. The use of word clouds in academic research has been questioned from a validity perspective, with criticism from across the literature paraphrased by Felix, Franconeri and Bertini (2018) as being related to three key areas, namely: a lack of natural order in how words are presented; the use of font-size to communicate importance (quantitative weighting); and differences in presented word font-size based also on word length rather than quantitative value. Nevertheless, what they do offer is an opportunity to present large amounts of qualitative data (as gathered through a survey tool) in an easy to visualise manner, even if this sometimes can mean that, as Felix et al. (2018) identify, readers can be influenced by the larger words. A full list of the phrases/words has been provided in Appendix C for readers to examine alongside the word cloud, which is an effective way of ensuring they are not too easily influenced (Felix et al., 2018). The word cloud does show a huge variety of academic backgrounds/areas of expertise of those individuals engaged in social innovation, demonstrating the heterogeneity of the sector, even if from a faculty perspective it can appear slightly more homogenous.

![Figure 3.1 – Respondent by faculty](image1.png)

![Figure 3.2 – Respondent job position](image2.png)

![Figure 3.3 – Word cloud](image3.png)
3.2 RESEARCH

Participants were also asked to provide up to five areas of research activity that they are involved in, and who (individuals/institutions) this included. The type of research (empirical/theoretical), methods, funding source, and year the research took place/started were all asked. A total of 45 research projects were identified, ranging in scope from examinations of social innovation, housing and civil society, to specialist health projects and science and technology investigations (see Appendix D for a full list of research titles). Interestingly, only 12 of these projects (27 per cent) were collaborative projects spanning two or more institutions. In relation to the different types of the research, the following was also revealed in the data:

Type:
- Empirical = 77 per cent
- Theoretical = 15 per cent
- Both = 8 per cent

The data reveals that the majority of projects are empirical and qualitative in nature, usually involving case-study approaches (31 per cent of all reported research projects; 61 per cent of all qualitative studies). This is typical of the wider research globally, and speaks of the nascent nature of research in social innovation/social enterprise, as well as the need for theory building within the research community. The data also reveals that research projects in social innovation have been ongoing in Hong Kong since 2007, with three particular spikes in activity in 2013, 2015 and 2018. This shows an upward trend in research projects focused on social innovation over the previous 12 years, with a positive correlation coefficient ($R^2 = 0.3$) demonstrating this (see Figure 3.4). Whilst it is difficult to be certain of the factors behind this increase, it can be argued that the growing interest in social innovation globally (and in Hong Kong), coupled with changes to research funding and assessment (i.e., the new RAE) that reward research that delivers impact, are all factors that have contributed to this increase. Nevertheless, it remains a moderate pace of change, with only small increases in social-innovation-related research over the decade since the first social innovation research was conducted in Hong Kong.

Furthermore, as Figure 3.5 illustrates, whilst sources of funding are diverse, the two largest sources remain external grant funders and the researchers’ own HEIs (53 per cent collectively). The latter funding source would certainly not encourage collaborative research, whilst grant funding would depend on how the grant calls were established and applications assessed, which may, in part, explain the relatively low levels of collaborative research.

Data was also gathered about the research publications that that respondents had produced (see Appendix E for a full list of publications). In total, 50 publications were highlighted, (see Figures 3.6a-b for a breakdown of publication year and type). The data shows that publication frequency has been increasing since the first paper was published in 2006, with 26 per cent of all publications since then occurring in the last two years, and 64 per cent since 2015. Publication type varies from journal papers to newspaper articles, with the majority (52 per cent) published via academic outputs (journal papers and books). The latter funding source

Publication Year:
- 2019 = ten per cent
- 2018 = 16 per cent
- 2017 = 12 per cent
- 2016 = ten per cent
- 2015 = 16 per cent
- 2014 = four per cent
- 2013 = four per cent
- 2012 = eight per cent
- 2011 = eight per cent
- 2010 = six per cent
- 2009 = two per cent
- 2008 = two per cent
- 2007 = two per cent
- 2006 = two per cent.

Figure 3.4 – Social-innovation-focused research projects by year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2.8 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2.8 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2.8 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5.6 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5.6 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5.6 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>11.1 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>5.6 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>11.1 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>8.3 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>8.3 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>30.6 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>8.3 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>5.6 per cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methodology:
- Quantitative = 27 per cent
- Qualitative = 62 per cent
- Mixed-method = 11 per cent

Figure 3.5 – Research funding sources

Data also reveals that theoretical research is more popular than empirical, with only small increases in social-innovation-related research over the decade since the first social innovation research was conducted in Hong Kong.
3.3 TEACHING

Respondents were also asked to provide details of the courses that they are involved in teaching on and/or supporting, both at undergraduate and postgraduate levels (see Appendix F for a full list). In total, 64 courses were identified, with an average class-size of 37 students (minimum = three students; maximum = 100 students), with the following breakdown:

**HEI/institution:**
- University of Hong Kong = 12 courses
- Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (HKUST) = 11 courses
- Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU) = nine courses
- Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU) = eight courses
- City University Hong Kong = six courses
- Hong Kong College of Technology (HKCT) = five courses
- Chinese University Hong Kong = four courses
- Lingnan University = four courses
- Hong Kong Shue Yan University14 = three courses
- Education University Hong Kong = two courses

**Level:**
- Undergraduate = 52
- Postgraduate = 7
- Non-accredited undergraduate/postgraduate = 3
- Summer school = two

**Courses currently delivered:**
- Current = 49
- Past = 8
- Future = 7

**Compulsory courses:**
- Elective = 42
- Compulsory = 16
- Non-accredited = three
- N/A = two
- Selective = one.

Of these 64 courses, only one (Nurturing Social Minds) was a collaborative programme between three Hong Kong HEIs (albeit collaborative courses are uncommon in any area of higher education where universities share a geographic area). Nineteen of the courses were specifically focused on social innovation, whilst a further 26 were focused on social entrepreneurship/enterprise15. Of the 64 modules, five belonged to two degree programmes specifically focused on social innovation/social enterprise16. As the data shows, the vast majority of courses (81 per cent) are part of undergraduate degree programmes, with the University of Hong Kong, HKUST, Hong Kong PolyU and HKBU being the leading providers of courses related to social enterprise/social innovation. Most courses (66 per cent) were elective, whilst only eight (13 per cent) were historical and no longer running. These courses were also mapped in relation to student sizes for both faculty and HEI (see Figures 3.7 and 3.8).
This analysis enables the research to identify the HEIs that have the most students studying social-innovation-related courses, and, also, which faculties these students belong to. The data reveals that Arts, Health and Social Sciences were the biggest originator of social-innovation-related curricula, with over half (56 per cent) of all students studying social innovation courses coming from this faculty group. This was followed by Business, accounting for nearly 25 per cent of students, whilst almost 15 per cent of students are studying courses that are either not aligned to a specific faculty or are interdisciplinary. In relation to HEI by student numbers, the results were in-line with the data on the number of courses outlined earlier, with the top five HEIs being the same. Indeed, Hong Kong University retains its lead position, with 20 per cent of all social-innovation-related students.

### 3.4 KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE/TRANSFER

Respondents were also asked to identify knowledge exchange projects they had been involved in, in relation to social enterprise and social innovation. A total of 24 projects were highlighted, ranging from student support, to dance injury prevention and social inclusion projects (see Appendix G for a full list). A significant proportion of these projects are partnerships with NGOs or social enterprises (48 per cent); while the beneficiary groups are mainly (40 per cent) focused on youth (with 33 per cent of these being student-focused). Lastly, in relation to funding streams for knowledge exchange activities, the main sources are government, foundations, or the respondent’s own HEI (67 per cent). There was little funding from external research grants (6.1 per cent) (see Figures 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11).
3.5 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND SOCIETY

The last area of information that respondents were asked to provide relates to community engagement activities and perceived priority social problems in Hong Kong. A total of 38 community engagement activities were identified, ranging from Directorship/Board membership of NGOs/social enterprises (24 per cent), to committee/panel membership (34 per cent), honorary roles within organisations (21 per cent), and advisory roles (11 per cent). See Figure 3.12 for a breakdown of these activities (see Appendix H for a full list of community engagement activities). While the community engagement data does not directly pertain to research and teaching of social innovation, it does, instead, show how academics are engaging with their communities to deliver impact in ways in which traditional academic metrics centred on published research and pedagogical excellence will not always capture. It is, therefore, an important metric to capture to demonstrate the extra-curricular work that academics are engaging in, which while benefiting their career tenure tracks, is also positively impacting on the community in Hong Kong.

![Figure 3.12 – Community engagement roles](image)

Lastly, the respondents also identified their three most pressing priority social problems in Hong Kong, which research-led social innovation could impact upon, alongside the organisation types that they felt were most suitable to collaborating with to solve these problems. The data reveals that social inequality and elderly/ageing issues are the problems most likely to be solved by research-led social innovation, alongside housing. Indeed, these three areas of focus accounted for 55.8 per cent of all the social areas of need identified by respondents (see Figure 3.13).

![Figure 3.13 – Priority social problems in Hong Kong](image)

To solve these social problems, respondents felt that different organisational types were best suited to solving different issues. Respondents were able to state which organisational type was best suited to leading and collaborating on efforts to solve/ameliorate these issues (which does not mean that the lead organisational types are the only organisation that should work in this area):

- **Youth**: there was an even split between respondents believing that the government and HEIs were best placed to tackle this, and all stakeholders.
- **Housing**: HEIs were seen as the most useful in solving issues of ageing and elderly care.
- **Education**: perhaps unsurprisingly, HEIs were also seen as being best placed to deal effectively with education-based social problems, along with government and a stakeholder-wide approach.
- **Health**: this was the one area where respondents felt that a truly multi-stakeholder solution was required.
- **Food security**: this was viewed as a lead area for government.
- **Social inequality**: NGOs/social enterprises were seen as the most useful organisational type on leading solutions to inequality.
- **Environment**: NGOs/social enterprises were also viewed as being best placed to lead effectively on environmental issues.
- **Other**: these issues included increasing social entrepreneurship, democratisation, and design issues (urban and policy), and individuals were identified here as being the most likely to develop/lead on solutions to these issues.

Table 3.1 fully outlines this data, by identifying which organisational types the survey respondents felt were best placed to lead on solutions to the nine social problems outlined. The percentages indicate the number of respondents who identified each stakeholder type as best placed to lead efforts in each area, with the lead stakeholder(s) highlighted green, for easy identification of the lead entity.
Table 3.1 - social problems and best organisational solution matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social problem</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Corporate</th>
<th>NGO/social enterprise</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>HEIs</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly/Ageing</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Security</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Inequality</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nb. With only 52 respondents in total, and not all respondents identifying three priority social issues and/or the organisations best suited to solve them, the breakdown of data in some areas is limited by sample size, which skew the results. Nevertheless, this provides an indicator of preferences and perceptions of social problems and solutions in Hong Kong.

3.6 SUMMARY

This section has presented an analysis of the data gathered from the research survey completed by 52 respondents, mainly engaged in the higher education sector in Hong Kong. The data reveals that academics interested in social innovation are based in diverse faculties, albeit with a bias towards the Social Sciences (34 per cent of respondents) and Business (21 per cent). This diversity is also reflected in the range of job titles and academic positions held by the respondents, ranging from Professors/Associate Professors (37 per cent), to non-academic HEI positions (31 per cent) and Research/Teaching Associates (17 per cent). The perceived expertise of these individuals (in addition to social innovation) included knowledge transfer, social policy/work/services, and design (design thinking/design policy).

Of those respondents that are research active, the majority are engaged in qualitative (62 per cent), empirical (77 per cent) research, often through case-study methods. Active research projects and publications have been ongoing since the mid-2000s, with a growth in publications in the last few years (33 per cent of all publications reported emerged in 2018/2019). A significant proportion of these publications (42 per cent) are academic outputs, but the media, newspapers and other non-academic outlets are also utilised. A significant proportion of these projects are funded either through external grant funding or researchers’ own HEIs (53 per cent collectively), with the government accounting for 12.5 per cent of project funding. In addition, nearly 16 per cent of project funding has come from the respondent personally or other individual donors.

With regard to teaching, 49 live modules on social entrepreneurship or social innovation were identified, from a total of 64 courses, with a further seven modules due to start in the near future. The majority of these courses (81 per cent) are offered at the undergraduate level, while 66 per cent are elective courses. The main providers of these modules are the University of Hong Kong, HKUST and Hong Kong PolyU, with these three HEIs accounting for nearly 50 per cent of all modules. The courses range in size significantly, from classes of three students, to classes of 100 students, with an average class size of 37. The majority (56 per cent) of modules have originated in faculties focused on Arts, Health and Social Sciences, and Hong Kong has two degree programmes that focus specifically on social innovation/social enterprise/social entrepreneurship across its ten HEIs (20 per cent). This compares with nine such undergraduate/postgraduate courses across the 130 HEIs (seven per cent) in the UK.

A total of 24 knowledge exchange activities were identified, with 48 per cent being partnerships with NGOs or social enterprises, focused on youth issues (40 per cent), accounting for 56 per cent of all responses. HEIs are identified as being the lead stakeholder in four of the nine main social problems identified (youth, elderly/ageing, housing and education). NGOs/social enterprises are identified as having the lead role in solving social inequality and environmental issues, whilst government is seen as having the lead in solving issues of food security, within a co-lead for the issues of youth, elderly/ageing and education. Respondents also stated that health required a multi-stakeholder approach, which was also the co-lead solution for youth and education.

The data presented in this section has identified a burgeoning interest in social innovation from a research and teaching perspective. The issues behind the trends identified will be further unpacked in the next section, which explores the qualitative data, as well as in the final discussion section. There is an upward trend in social innovation research and the teaching of social innovation-related modules/courses. Whilst it is difficult to be certain about the reasons for this growth, the growing interest in the phenomenon globally (and in Hong Kong), the increasing recognition of impactful research in the RAE, and a generational shift in which young people are more focused on social issues than their parents/grandparents, have all created the space and motivation for this growth. Indeed, given the relatively small size of the HEI sector in Hong Kong (compared to other countries, such as the UK) the concentration and breadth of social innovation/social enterprise modules/courses is comparatively strong.

There is, therefore, a combination of institutional and personal agency factors at play, which create the opportunity for socially innovative academics to secure funding for social innovation research, develop social innovation modules/courses and work in their communities to deliver social value/impact. This suggests a burgeoning social innovation ecosystem within the HEI sector in Hong Kong, that, with further support, could increase its growth rate. The potential enablers and barriers to this growth will be explored in the following sections, in order to develop recommendations for the higher education sector in Hong Kong.
4. QUALITATIVE RESULTS

4.1 QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS SUMMARY

As seen in Appendix A, the qualitative data has been analysed using a Constant Comparative Method (CCM) (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). This data was gathered from the 17 semi-structured interviews with 22 participants from a range of sectors, including HEIs, foundations, government, NGOs, investment firms and social innovators. These interviews followed sequentially from the qualitative survey phase discussed in Section 3, with the initial data analysis from the survey data informing the design of the interview schedule (see Appendix A for a full methodological overview).

This process led to the identification of 52 ‘units of analysis’ (see Appendix I for a full list of these units), which were coded into 13 separate ‘themes’, namely: Social Innovation Complexity, Power and Institutions, Social Innovation Learning, and Personal Agency. Figure 4.1 illustrates this analytical process, while the content of each individual theme is discussed within Section 4.2. The numbers displayed in the ‘categories’ boxes in Figure 4.1 correspond to the relevant units of analysis contained in that category, aligned with the numbers assigned to ‘units’ in Appendix I. The numbers in the ‘themes’ boxes correspond to the relevant category numbers contained within that theme, as numbered in Figure 4.1. For example, Theme A ‘Social Innovation Complexity’ contains categories one (Social Innovation Ecosystem) and six (Definition); while Theme B ‘Power and Institutions’ contains categories two (Partnership and Collaboration), three (Pluralism), five (Institutional Frameworks), eight (Policy) and 13 (Funding). This allows the reader to develop an audit-trail of how the emergent themes have been identified from the data. A CCM approach means that the process is iterative, in that the data emerges from the participant’s interview transcripts and is not pre-determined or pre-coded in any way. However, the analysis can be grounded in and informed by the prior literature and previous phases of data collection (i.e., the survey), ensuring that the final findings are holistically embedded.

It should also be noted that the four themes have been grouped into two meta-themes of ‘Barriers’ (Themes A and B) and ‘Solutions’ (Themes C and D). This has been done to show the interrelated nature of the themes and was based upon peer-review feedback from the BRICKS steering committee members. Social innovation is a complex phenomenon, and developing a vibrant social innovation research/teaching environment within HEIs is, therefore, equally complex. By adopting this approach, the intention is to acknowledge that the four themes identified are not independent, but rather, interdependent.

4.2 THEMEATIC ANALYSIS

4.2.1 SOCIAL INNOVATION COMPLEXITY (THEME A – BARRIER)

When discussing social innovation in Hong Kong, discussions invariably turned towards the social problems and the inequality that exist there. Here, participants discussed health as a key focus (alongside the ageing population, housing and wealth inequality), but they also talked about how most social problems are interrelated. This complexity means that no single solution (including social innovation) has the ability to solve social problems; rather, collaborative responses are required (see Theme B: Power and Institutions), with the direct involvement of government.

‘So, I think that is the problem, the challenges we have to work on but it seems that there are some structural issues. Even with the social innovation, social enterprise, you cannot deal with it. And some are policy issues; it depends on how the government’s going to modify their policy. Not easy, I know.’

4.2.2 SOCIAL INNOVATION ECOLOGY (THEME B – BARRIER)

‘Health is one of the key focuses of my work, hence the topic I pick. When we talk about health issues, it’s actually related to a few other issues … for example food security, elderly/ageing, social inequality, environment all can be related to our health issue. Innovation comes in when we can think from a bigger picture rather than addressing immediate needs. From Primary Health talking about prevention and early intervention, from corporate wellness and company policies to ageing population and younger population to having chronic illnesses. From an urban design to coordination among stakeholders, social innovation plays an important role. With a system that’s not sustainable, thinking out of the box is necessary.’ (P19 – Practitioner)

In relation to the wider social innovation ecosystem, participants discussed the lack of joined-up thinking around social innovation, with too many stakeholders working individually and there being no strategic direction behind the development of the ecosystem. Indeed, this was linked to a lack of policy and funding support, definitional issues and low awareness of social innovation and what it means/constitutes.

‘I think perhaps for me it is difficult to grow really organically as an ecosystem because it seems like there is no – because the government would not give assets up to bottom bottom-up, so it’s more like they let you grow on your own. So, without a very clear definition or guidelines it can be good or bad, because they can grow as depending on what we want. But at the same time, I think we don’t know where to go and there’s a lack of people to steer or co-ordinate in between because no matter the investor or the players or even the beneficiary we don’t know what to expect from a social entrepreneur or the social innovation.’ (P9 – NGO)

‘So, I think we need to have a bigger umbrella, what do we want to achieve in Hong Kong as a whole? To achieve in the next ten years in the space of social entrepreneurship, in the space of social innovation. These could be totally separate or some overlap, but I think that’s quite separate.’ (P7 – Academic)

The lack of awareness of social innovation was a key focus in the vast majority of interviews. Indeed, it was argued that there is a lack of awareness of the concept amongst the government, the general population, investors and corporations. This lack of awareness is also one of the reasons behind the lack of a strategic direction outlined above, in relation to driving the development of the social innovation ecosystem, and, perhaps, also explains the difficulties in embedding social innovation research and teaching within HEIs.

‘I think the other thing is that in Hong Kong we have been talking about social innovation for many, many years. Let me put it this way, these two terms become more prevalent in Hong Kong maybe starting 15 years ago or so. But if you look at the wider community, we are yet to demonstrate the impact of it so that people who are not familiar with these concepts would say: “Wow, this is the way to go.” You know, in Hong Kong people think about the economy, economic development. Of course, they are concerned about social injustice, they are concerned about...’
healthcare systems in Hong Kong, so on and so forth, but they also look at the government for how much money is devoted to building, say, elderly homes, to building more hospitals, to increasing the pay of our healthcare professional. But discussion seldom touches on how social enterprises and social enterprises can help in these regards.” (P4 – Academic)

‘I think social innovation is still quite a new concept in the Hong Kong community. Actually, I joined the team about two years ago, and before I joined the team I had never heard of social innovation, so I think we still have a lot of work to do to raise the awareness and understanding of the community as to what social innovation is and how it can help address the social issues in Hong Kong. So, this is one of the challenges that I can think of.” (P15 – Government)

Barriers to social innovation, over and above those already identified, were also discussed in relation to the NGO sector at large and the funding behind it. Smaller NGOs are seen as being at the mercy of government funding priorities and larger foundations, while the larger NGOs are seen as being well endowed - having a team of architects and among them, like the social enterprises. So, in general I have a few comments. First, can we expect this kind of model to really generate people with good ideas? I mean, one day, two days training, what do you want from it? So maybe just a taste of social innovation, which is fine. Now first is repeating, so if you just want to provide some events, activities for people to have a taste of social innovation, that’s fine but you don’t have to keep on doing it. And everyone is doing it, so basically people are repeating the same model. And if you have this first stage of tasting social innovation you should have a second stage to follow up on that, but there’s no second stage. There’s nothing beyond this.’ (P1 – Academic)

‘I think this has now changed. We have been doing a lot of co-creation among ourselves, among the teams. What I can do in my team is that we do a lot of cross-disciplinary co-creation among them, like the social workers, the therapists, the nurses, the doctors, the designers. And we have a team of architects and technical staff who are surveyors. So, we have actually a number of disciplines which are rich enough to enable them to cross over with each other. And so that’s how we work.’ (P11 – Foundation)

From the higher education sector perspective, he articulated for greater collaboration between universities and the private and third sectors, as current efforts are often restricted by a lack of value alignment between partners and a lack of applied research. It was recognised that the government is committed to raising R&D spending as a proportion of GDP to encourage further cross-sector collaboration. ‘So up to now it’s around 0.73 per cent of the GDP is spend on R&D. The current administration is committed to doubling that to 1.5 per cent. And that’s part of the policy package leading to the injection of, particularly in Hong Kong, into the sector. How far that condition will be realised, I think we will really have to wait. But there’s far greater interest in trying to get the universities to liaise with the private sector and one of the things the government has rolled out something called a Research Matching Grant. The government is providing matching funds for universities if they can secure private support for their research activities. So that is one attempt to see whether they could get more private support. So that’s quite a concrete step.” (P14 – Academic and Funder)
efficient to simply fund a research without any application projects when the manpower cost for a research project may cover up to 80 per cent of the whole funding. From the perspective of an NGO, where we’ve been partnering on research with institutions, as well as developing research of our own, the whole process from doing modeling, literature review, analysis and deriving a way forward from the research may take some time, and certainly a better way of publishing and promotion will need to be explored as well.’ (P19 – Practitioner)

There is also a need for greater need for collaboration between HEIs (as was shown in the quantitative data by the relative lack of collaborative research). This isn’t to say that collaboration isn’t occurring between universities or academics, but rather that this collaboration is often ad-hoc and between individuals, rather than being truly cross-institutional. Greater facilitation of this through different institutional frameworks (i.e., the UGC) is viewed as one way to drive this collaboration further.

‘I think in Hong Kong it is quite easy [to collaborate]. We (HEIs) are competing for grants, for money; we compete for donations, we compete for good students, so we are in competition, but we also work closely with other people … we serve on committees, advisory committees of each other, and the UGC, the University Grants Committee, which is the funding body, always promotes inter-institutional collaboration in terms of teaching and learning projects, research projects or even teaching awards.’ (P4 – Academic)

‘… because Hong Kong is a very small place. We have seven million people, among which very few people actually in the field. The good thing is that we actually know one another; we have a very tight-knit network, so to speak. I think that is an advantage, but also a disadvantage, because the whole development of the sector actually relies on the driving force from very few people. And if these people are not really like: “OK, I have to understand the global trend, I have to think in a very pioneering way”, then we are kind of doing the same thing over and over again.’ (P7 – Academic)

Interviewees elaborated on this in relation to the focus of applied research. It was argued that research is replicative (i.e., HEIs are working on similar subject areas, but are unaware what each other is doing), but also that it should utilise the intellectual capital of the university for the benefit of the community. Barriers were identified in relation to the tenure system, curriculum rigidity and traditional research funding structures, but these should not be allowed to inhibit impactful research and collaboration.

‘I do know that, being an academic myself, not wearing my [funding body] hat, academics are supposed to be pushing the boundary of knowledge and doing cutting-edge research. But we are also at the same time, we are conservative in terms of the discipline, how are things defined, the way we’ve been trained, the kind of methodologies we use, and the potential publication. So, for creating new areas, it is a challenging task. Your area, for example, the fact that you have a Chair [Professorship in Social Innovation], you have such a position in this area already quite - you are making progress. In some academic institutions, this is not easy.’ (P14 – Academic & Funder)

‘… to foster the knowledge transfer of the university with a mission on, I think, to lend the resources and the teaching to the community. And also develop intellectual capacity and capital, which can contribute to the development of the university and the wider community and also to serve the needs of educational development, both locally and regionally.’ (P5 – HE Knowledge Transfer)

‘Yes, so we did the research on ageing and it’s exactly the feedback we got. Everyone who’s doing research didn’t know that their counterparts were doing research at other universities. Same with the practitioners obviously, because they’re very protective of their intellectual property, so there’s no reason or incentive for them to be transparent with what they are doing. So, effectively, you had a lot of stakeholders within the same set that were doing very, very similar things, which is a very inefficient use of resources.’ (P15 – Government)

Interviewees repeatedly highlighted the institutional barriers to social innovation, in relation to publishing, funding, teaching and policy. The most common point was that universities are inherently conservative organisations, which are slow to change and resistant to new ideas such as social innovation. This is exacerbated by the administrative ‘red-tape’ that is present in large institutions, and especially universities (in Hong Kong, as in the rest of the world), which stifles and limits the scope for social innovation.

‘I think the universities, they understand the skills needed. It’s basically a mindset problem. They don’t believe in cross-disciplinary. Or they do, but they say the funding does not allow them to bring in any cross-disciplinary, and the thought is the truth.’ (P3 – Incubator)

‘We are introducing that in our next round of our RAE 2020, so that is the 15 per cent in our [score]. This is a matter of considerable interest among Hong Kong academics. Because this is the first time we are doing it. And, again, we look at cases in the UK, lessons learned. We invited several academics from the UK who were … invited to panels, and there was also one who was (the person) at her own university in … advising them how to prepare those cases. … The rationale is actually the same, that we need to - government spending a lot of money, research and development, how are they helping society. (something that is often easier to achieve with blue-sky research than with applied research). This should change to a degree in the coming years, as the new Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) 2020 seeks to reward research for its impact with up to 15 per cent of the overall score.

‘I think the universities, they understand the skills needed. It’s basically a mindset problem. They don’t believe in cross-disciplinary. Or they do, but they say the funding does not allow them to bring in any cross-disciplinary, and the thought is the truth.’ (P3 – Incubator)

‘We are introducing that in our next round of our RAE 2020, so that is the 15 per cent in our [score]. This is a matter of considerable interest among Hong Kong academics because this is the first time we are doing it. And, again, we look at cases in the UK, lessons learned. We invited several academics from the UK who were … invited to panels, and there was also one who was (the person) at her own university in … advising them how to prepare those cases. … The rationale is actually the same, that we need to - government spending a lot of money, research and development, how are they helping society. (something that is often easier to achieve with blue-sky research than with applied research). This should change to a degree in the coming years, as the new Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) 2020 seeks to reward research for its impact with up to 15 per cent of the overall score.

‘I think the universities, they understand the skills needed. It’s basically a mindset problem. They don’t believe in cross-disciplinary. Or they do, but they say the funding does not allow them to bring in any cross-disciplinary, and the thought is the truth.’ (P3 – Incubator)

‘We are introducing that in our next round of our RAE 2020, so that is the 15 per cent in our [score]. This is a matter of considerable interest among Hong Kong academics because this is the first time we are doing it. And, again, we look at cases in the UK, lessons learned. We invited several academics from the UK who were … invited to panels, and there was also one who was (the person) at her own university in … advising them how to prepare those cases. … The rationale is actually the same, that we need to - government spending a lot of money, research and development, how are they helping society. (something that is often easier to achieve with blue-sky research than with applied research). This should change to a degree in the coming years, as the new Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) 2020 seeks to reward research for its impact with up to 15 per cent of the overall score.

Interviewees elaborated on this in relation to the focus of applied research. It was argued that research is replicative (i.e., HEIs are working on similar subject areas, but are unaware what each other is doing), but also that it should utilise the intellectual capital of the university for the benefit of the community. Barriers were identified in relation to the tenure system, curriculum rigidity and traditional research funding structures, but these should not be allowed to inhibit impactful research and collaboration.
newest service models are and what might apply to Hong Kong. Constantly looking for these ideas to be incorporated into services.” (P10 – Foundation)

“Exactly. I think it would be very, very helpful, very healthy as well for the universities in Hong Kong collaborating with someone - USA or UK. Actually, at (University Name), we have a sustainability programme. It’s a long-term collaboration with the (UK) University Name, so in the space of sustainability. So, I think that would be something that I would like to see in the future.” (P7 – Academic)

Global learning was also discussed in relation to international NGOs, both as hubs for knowledge and through funding programmes. The work of the British Council was specifically highlighted for its powerful impact on the Hong Kong social innovation ecosystem, alongside the willingness of other NGOs to explore innovative models due to their funding and political independence.

“Well organisations like the British Council OK? But if it comes from the – still, British Council has done a lot and you have heard about it also in the ecosystem in Hong Kong for many, many years; social enterprises, they have done a lot. I respect them tremendously.” (P4 – Academic)

“But this time we worked with (International NGO) because they don’t receive any government subsidy. So, for them it is more easier to try new models. So, for social innovation on this finance side, we observe that next time when we structure this project maybe those receiving less government subsidy, or those purely independent organisations, maybe they will be more open to this option.” (P8 – NGO)

Many interviewees also want universities to do more, arguing that too much academic research is ‘blue-sky thinking’, and not enough is applied research that benefits social innovators on the ground. This was also highlighted in relation to social impact measurement, with a strong social impact measurement sector in Hong Kong being viewed as a way to drive some of this applied research. This critique comes back to the issues highlighted in the first two barrier themes, but these areas offer some solutions, as applied research and social impact measurement offer possible research and teaching mechanisms that can deliver impact and support social innovation.

“I think it’s very important. If you think about - a lot of times the new service models might come from universities, but they are unproven, or at least unproven in the local context. So, we need to bring the knowledge from universities to the NGOs, and get them to adopt and test and so on.” (P10 – Foundation)

“However, we also need to have some research that can actually help the practitioner some guidance. Some of the research is very theoretical. It benefits academia or the pioneering of knowledge, etc., but it doesn’t really help the practitioner. And in order for this field to be developed, you need the practitioner to be really strong.” (P7 – Academic)

”Actually, we encourage some large projects to really incorporate social impact assessment in the project context, so that we are very happy to fund that part of the project, so as to really let us know that the real impact of the projects and also to promote the use of social impact assessment in assessing the social interventions. So that is one of the areas that we have been promoting all along.” (P15 – Government)

Lastly, many interviewees expressed a need for embedded teaching, with experiential classes, the use of non-academic teachers (i.e., from corporate backgrounds) and new degree/Master’s programmes all being proposed. A particularly innovative idea was put forward by one social innovator, who argued that there should be a general qualification on social enterprise agreed by a collection of HEIs, with each delivering specific modules related to their expertise: Students would be able to then move from one HEI to another to study modules and gain the credits required to achieve a qualification. Such courses, it was argued, would also reduce the burden on those practitioners and experts who provide their time to deliver seminars or act as mentors. This relates to issues around greater engagement of practitioners in teaching, as well as better quality teaching. Academics need support/training in relation to teaching social innovation, whilst training delivered by HEIs to practitioners is required. The type of embedded teaching espoused by Ashoka through their Changemaker Campus Ashoka UP platform offers indicators as to how this can be achieved.

“Well, I think we can formulate a so-called General Diploma or General Degree in social enterprise, and then I don’t think all universities should have the same courses. But maybe they are strong in some aspects, some particular subjects. And then we can allow them, allow the students, to move around to find a basic requirement…” (P6 – HE Knowledge Transfer)

... Then I think that will be a good exchange and exposure for them. But, of course, it means that there should be a very strong, powerful platform to co-ordinate and also help with the mutually recognised other universities’ subject qualifications, and also the professor or the lecturer who is teaching them. I think that is a better system.” (P18 – Social Entrepreneur)

4.2.4 PERSONAL AGENCY (THEME D – SOLUTION)

Agency versus structure remains a key debate in social sciences, and certainly in relation to social innovation and social entrepreneurship. Whilst structure was explored in Section 5.2.2 (Theme B: Power and Institutions), here the focus is on personal agency and the role that individuals can play within the ecosystem. The interviews revealed that participants see individuals as key drivers of change, both on campus and in the social innovation ecosystem more widely. The role that academics and students can play in being entrepreneurial and pushing for new courses or creating socially innovative organisations (see further on in this section) is seen as being of paramount importance.

“I think universities play an important role in moving beyond the initial notion of doing good and doing well. I mean, there’s enough rah, rah [participant referring to too much talking], around this conversation, around that. I think the current crop of students who are currently in universities, they deserve better in terms of, OK we’ve moved past that stage of the ‘hey, you can do good and do well, but here are the notions. If you want and you care about social impact in terms of what you do, you don’t necessarily have to give up your offer from Deloitte or Mackenzie or what have you, but you actually say: here are the

“… the third part is to promote or to cultivate entrepreneurship in our campus. We understand that for an entrepreneurial environment to be cultivated, we need some training, or we need to give some knowledge to both the student or the academic staff, because entrepreneurship is about making business, and then, at least, they have to have some knowledge in doing a business or doing the entrepreneurship activities.” (P6 – HE Knowledge Transfer)

“Then we first piloted the course at [University Name], and this was before my time, the topic itself was not necessarily one that was known at the university, social innovation, social entrepreneurship. And they did not necessarily think that this was a topic of importance here, and so they were rather skeptical.” (P12 – Foundation)

“Many see socially innovative and entrepreneurial staff and students as key to driving awareness of social innovation and the growth of the ecosystem in Hong Kong. For staff, the ability to create their own socially innovative initiatives (either on their own or as university spin-outs) is an area that was discussed; whilst for students, the ability to engage in real-life learning, by working with particular social issues, problems, is seen as valuable, even for those looking for corporate jobs afterwards.

“I also play another pretty active role within the (University Name) ecosystem, in the sense that I’m a consultant for the professors who are really keen on turning their research into social enterprises to create tangible impact. So, at (University Name), we actually have a programme called (University Fund), so the professors can apply for some funding to help them to set up these social enterprises.” (P7 – Academic)

“I think social inequality, environmental pollution and the very high cost of housing are the most pressing issues in Hong Kong, while the other issues on your list are certainly also social challenges here as well. And many [our] students have worked with a range of social enterprises on some of the issues mentioned, including the food banks, organisations supporting the elderly, education, ethnic minority communities, people with disabilities, fund raising for charities, etc.” (P12 – Academic & Practitioner)

Lastly, there is also an awareness that the new generation of students and young people in Hong Kong have different priorities to their parents and grandparents, wanting to solve social problems and create as much social value as financial value. It was argued that this generational shift could drive the development of the social innovation ecosystem organically, but that HEIs could do more to foster and support this.
different ways. These are social innovations, social enterprises, work in the private sector’… These are all different mechanisms and tools for that to do well and do good. But don’t confuse the two.’ (P13 – Investor)

“We have the same experience. Our students also are quite satisfied with helping those people they think they want to help, instead of making money. It is interesting to think they want to help, instead of helping those people they students also are quite satisfied ‘We have the same experience. Our (P6 – HEI Knowledge Transfer)"

The aim of this research project is to understand the knowledge, capacity and future ambitions of the Hong Kong academic community in relation to social innovation, and, specifically, how this is enabled or prevented by systemic, institutional and practice-level factors within the ecosystem. The quantitative and qualitative data has allowed this report to build a picture of the social innovation ecosystem in Hong Kong, with a specific focus on higher education and the role that universities can have in creating social value, through research and teaching, as well as through knowledge transfer and community engagement. This will now be discussed in relation to the three levels (practice, institutional and systemic), with the relevant quantitative and qualitative data being triangulated, to provide recommendations designed to support the development of social innovation research, teaching and community engagement in Hong Kong.

5.1 PRACTICE-LEVEL

There is clearly a growing research base in Hong Kong centred on social innovation, and 45 academic publications (journals, book/chapters, conference papers and reports) have been identified27. Considering the nascent development of the social innovation field in Hong Kong, this represents a significant body of work, especially considering that nearly one-third of these have been published in the last two years. Much of this ‘social innovation’ research is, in fact, focused on social enterprise/entrepreneurship specifically, and like much of the global research, is primarily qualitative and case-study focused (62 per cent). The growth in research and publications over the last 13 years has also been moderate, with positive trends identified in the number of research projects that have commenced each year28, as well as the numbers of research outputs being published each year29. This demonstrates that there is growing social innovation research within the Hong Kong higher education sector, from which we can infer increased academic interest. This is consistent with the global growth in social innovation research, with the emergence of specific research centres and institutes at universities focusing on social innovation and related issues, including: the Centre for Social Impact (Australia), the Skoll Centre for Social Entrepreneurship (University of Oxford, UK), the Centre for Social Innovation (University of Cambridge, UK) and the Center for Social Innovation (Stanford University, USA)28. There has also been a growth in conferences that specifically focus on social innovation (e.g., the annual International Social Innovation Research Conference30) or that have streams related to it31.

However, a key issue identified in relation to this research is that much of it is what participants call ‘blue-sky thinking’, which is inapplicable (or at least less relevant) to practitioners and policy-makers. This theoretical (often qualitative and case-study based) research is viewed by non-academic stakeholders as less interesting/impactful than applied research. The reasons behind this are complex and heterogeneous (related to research funding, publishing and career progression systems), and these will be explored further in the sections focusing on the institutional and systemic levels later in the discussion. Nevertheless, they do point to a need for more applied (and potentially quantitative) research that can provide more useful data to practitioners and policy-makers. One area that may offer an opportunity for this is in the burgeoning field of social impact measurement (SIM), which could provide one way of encouraging applied research and more collaboration with practitioners. Therefore, funding that specifically supports academics to conduct SIM research would be helpful to the sector, and could help to align values between partners, which is of critical importance (Chung and Yeh Fung, 2017). Research that seeks to identify the antecedents to and consequences of social innovation, and to identify appropriate methods and indicators for measuring it, would also be welcome, and would act as an underpinning precursor to the impact measurement outlined above (Van der Have and Rubalcaba, 2016; Unceta, Castro-Spila and Garcia-Front, 2016).

The teaching of social innovation is also an area that has grown since 2013/2014, when previous reports made significant critiques of the curriculum landscape in Hong Kong (Alto and Wong, 2013). At present, 49 live courses on social entrepreneurship or social innovation have been identified, with a further seven due to start in September 201932. However, the majority (66 per cent) of these are/were elective (or non-accredited) undergraduate courses, and the need for greater collaboration and embedded teaching (i.e., with real-life engagement with social innovation) was identified by numerous research participants. However, the breadth and depth of courses related to social innovation and social enterprise across the ten Hong Kong HEIs is impressive, and compares favourably with other higher education ecosystems, such as the UK.
Additionally, some practitioner and foundation-based participants noted that the lack of collaborative programmes puts too much pressure on their time (as they have to give the same guest lecture three times). Arguments were given for joint programmes, to lessen the impact on practitioners through shared guest lectures (even if the course accreditation and delivery is not shared). It can be debated as to whether the solution here is joint programmes, or whether deeper engagement of a wider group of practitioners, along with training and support to develop teaching capacity amongst said practitioners provides a better solution. Whilst the answer may well be neither, both the need for further embedded teaching within programmes was articulated by the interviewees. The global Ashoka U network and their Changemaker Campus programme provides a good example of how embedded teaching can happen within HEIs in relation to social innovation, and how this can be tied into a wider institutional focus on social innovation at a strategic level. Certainly, social innovation solutions cannot be imposed on communities, but the development of networks between HEIs and practitioners (and the wider community) are critical to the success of teaching social innovation (Elmes et al., 2015). Place-based, experiential learning is a fundamental element of social innovation education, and so network development between academics and practitioners, HEIs and communities, are critical to supporting this (Alden-Rivers et al., 2015).

Knowledge exchange and community engagement are other areas explored in the research, and they provide interesting data for analysis. A total of 24 knowledge exchange projects were identified during the research, with 48 per cent of these being partnerships with NGOs/social enterprises, with funding for these initiatives coming mainly from government, foundations or a respondents’ own HEIs (67 per cent). Indeed, very few are funded through External Research Grants (6.1 per cent). In relation to community engagement work by academics, 79 per cent is in the form of board/ honorary roles or panel/community membership, rather than active research-led engagement.34 There is, therefore, a clear need to incentivise academics to engage in knowledge exchange and community engagement. Better funding streams and more recognition through career/ promotion structures are obvious routes to encourage such engagement (this will be explored further in the next two sections).

Lastly, in relation to the personal agency of HEI staff and students, the data also reveals that such agency is a key factor to drive social innovation on campuses, and to ensure the growth of socially innovative businesses off-campus (i.e., through university spin-outs). Whilst there is no doubt that institutional barriers can (and have) stifled social innovation in Hong Kong in recent years (see more about this below), the nature and extent of these barriers as leaders/agents in driving institutional change (including through moral agency) should not be underestimated (Debourny and Nyssens, 2017; Cooney, 2018; Bull and Ridley-Duff, 2018; Dey and Styaert, 2014). Indeed, the number of those contributing to the research publications and modules identified through this research demonstrates this, with certain individuals appearing repeatedly (just six academics have lead authorship of nearly half of all publications identified). There is, therefore, a need to recognise the importance of key individuals in relation to driving leadership in this area, and to empower them to further expand (and, more importantly, to facilitate others to expand) social innovation activities in Hong Kong’s HEIs.35

5.2 INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL

As noted earlier, there is a lack of research collaboration between HEIs across Hong Kong. Only 28 per cent of the research projects identified can be classified as collaborative, and there is a significant degree of replication across institutions. Collaboration is a key component of social innovation approaches. It is, therefore, important to build an ecosystem that encourages closer working between stakeholders. This is an area that chimes with prior research in Hong Kong, which has identified the lack of and barriers to collaborative research/teaching and the need for greater collaboration between Higher Education Institutions and industry (Alto and Wong, 2014; Chandra, 2018; NSM, 2019). Indeed, the barriers to collaborative teaching identified by NSM (2019) can equally be applied to research, with a lack of social innovation/social enterprise champions in universities (and top-down support for impact research) being particularly problematic. Furthermore, those outside of universities are keen to see more applied research, although it is accepted that research funding and tenure systems can discourage such work, as was previously identified by Nichols et al. (2013). As most research funding comes from HEIs and research grant funders (5.3 per cent), and universities strive for publication in high-ranking academic journals, it is easy to see why so much research remains theoretical.

There needs to be more innovative funding streams and recognition from universities about the value of impactful research.36 These funding streams should recognise and encourage applied research, as well as partnerships with NGOs and corporations. This shift would rely on wider changes to research structures at an institutional level, wherein research impact is rewarded, as is networking and the professional level through the RAE 2020.37 However, more can be done, through HEI funds that focus solely on multi-disciplinary, collaborative research. In addition, tenure tracks and career progression structures should recognise the value and importance of applied, impactful research – both through the contribution that this research can make to the community, and through the beneficial impact it can have on a university’s RAE score. Applied/impactful research should also be a fundamental performance KPI beyond tenure, with university professors encouraged to lead such research funding bids and to conduct such research (and subsequent publication), as well as mentoring early career researchers to do the same. These all relate to the institutional and resource barriers to social innovation identified in prior research (Dhondt, Oej and Schröder, 2018; Oej et al., 2019), which are a feature of the Hong Kong higher education ecosystem.

The research also identified the institutional barriers to embedded and collaborative teaching, echoing what Nurturing Social Minds (2019) identified as the boundary issues facing cross-institutional accreditation and the institutional barriers preventing the sharing of resources. One possible way around this, suggested by one participant, is to establish a pan-HEI degree, within which universities deliver their own accredited modules, which, together, lead to the degree being awarded. There are inherent issues here admittedly, such as identifying which HEI will be the degree awardee, which perhaps make this a longer-term aspiration. But it is an idea that the sector could consider. In the short- to medium-term, a solution might be found through the engagement of more practitioners, and the training and practitioner/lecturers to teach social innovation. Programmes that fund training for social innovators and practitioners/lecturers to teach social innovation/social enterprise (whether as spin-outs or not), and to engage in volunteering and work placements, both as part of degrees and as extra-curricular activity, it would not only drive social innovation in Hong Kong, but would also meet the needs of the more socially aspirational younger generations. It would, therefore, help to overcome what Alto and Wong (2013) identified as the gap in relation to universities meeting their consumers’ (i.e., students’) demands. Funding pots within HEIs or from external bodies (e.g., government) could facilitate the creation of socially innovative organisations and directly lead to impact through research and teaching-led creations. Certainly, a best-practice scenario might be cutting-edge applied research informing embedded teaching, in which students and staff (and possibly other stakeholders) co-design social innovations to help alleviate/solve some of Hong Kong’s key social problems. Such institutional structures could facilitate personal agency and social action (Weber, 1978), encouraging the bottom-up creation of solutions to social...
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5.3 SYSTEMIC LEVEL

The wider systemic issues facing the expansion of social innovation research and teaching in the Hong Kong higher education sector have been touched upon in Sections 5.1 and 5.2. Namely, the lack of incentive within current research funding structures for social innovation research, funding streams that aren’t always supportive of cross-disciplinary research (especially in the social sciences), and the competition for students that exists between HEIs in what is a fiercely competitive (and geographically small) higher education sector. At a systemic level, changes are needed to enable research funding to recognise impact. Whilst change has already been implemented through the RAE 2020, where 15 per cent of the score is aligned to research impact, post-2020 there could be a greater focus on impact, as has been the case in the UK for the last five years, where REF 2021 allocates 25 per cent of an HEI’s score to research impact. Such an increase would be a systemic driver for higher interest amongst HEIs in impactful research, and would, therefore, drive growth in applied research that engages more deeply with policy and practice (as is the experience in the UK over the last five years).

The Hong Kong government’s commitment to double its R&D budget over the coming years can also benefit applied research. Certainly, it was argued by participants that government funding is key, as it can shape socially innovative behaviour, particularly if such R&D funding includes streams focusing on social innovation. Participants also noted that smaller, more innovative NGOs are (often) reliant on state income, and so funds that encourage knowledge exchange between HEIs and NGOs (as well as with corporations) could help to increase and scale innovations. Furthermore, the growth of the intermediary market (supported by the SIE Fund) may also be important here, as it can encourage greater pluralism, which can lead to increased social innovation (Hazenberg et al., 2016). Increased funding in these areas would naturally encourage deeper university engagement.

Research participants identified the key social problems in Hong Kong that could be addressed through research-led social innovation as social inequality, an elderly/aging population and housing (accounting for 55.8 per cent of the social problems identified). Health was identified as a key determinant of all other issues and, therefore, it requires a collaborative, multi-agency approach. Given that most countries around the world are facing similar problems, and that it has long been acknowledged that solutions to such deeply embedded problems require multi-agency/collaborative approaches, government and other key funders should encourage multi-sector, collaborative research to identify, test and implement socially innovative solutions. This includes inter-disciplinary research, but also co-creation and community-led social innovations. As was noted by many research participants, the co-opting of social innovation by the elites in Hong Kong has advantages and disadvantages. In terms of advantages, it allows for the recognition of social innovation by those with resources (financial and otherwise), but it also means that community-led and co-created solutions to problems may be more difficult. Programmes such as the SIE Fund, which aim to develop an intermediary market that can facilitate partnerships between different stakeholders around social innovation, should be welcomed, but a clearer understanding of how universities can be truly embedded within this, and their financial and intellectual resources brought to bear, require further thought.

Lastly, from a wider systemic perspective, there remains definitional myopia around the concept of social innovation, which creates issues when it comes to encouraging social innovation within universities. The lack of clarity makes it difficult for senior managers and strategic leaders to understand what it is they are trying to implement. Ho and Chan (2010) highlighted the need for a more supportive policy and regulatory environment in Hong Kong nearly ten years ago, whilst Alto and Wong (2014) have previously identified the impact that hybrid legal structures could have on impact investment and scale in the wider social innovation ecosystem. Interview participants argued for definitional clarity, believing that a centralised vision of what social innovation constitutes might facilitate better understanding and growth of social innovation in Hong Kong’s universities.

5.4 A HIGHER EDUCATION SOCIAL INNOVATION ECOSYSTEM FOR HONG KONG

The research findings and discussion outlined above have been used to create a map of the social innovation ecosystem within Hong Kong’s higher education sector, including key relationships between stakeholders (see Figure 5.1). The map has been designed to represent a weather ecosystem, to help show the linkages and flows of different types of capital between different elements of the ecosystem. This analysis focuses on the four capital clusters identified by Mair et al. (2012) as being critical to the emergence of social entrepreneurship globally: political capital, human capital, economic capital and social capital. The map traces the flow of these different types of capital between different stakeholders within the ecosystem and shows how they are transformed at different stages into social value. In addition, the model also builds upon the work by Mair et al. (2012), by identifying the role that HEIs play in supporting social innovation through the creation of intellectual capital and how this flows out into the ecosystem.
SURVEYING THE SOCIAL INNOVATION AND HIGHER EDUCATION LANDSCAPE IN HONG KONG

Figure 5.1 – Higher education social innovation ecosystem
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The pluralistic social innovation ecosystem for Hong Kong outlined above shows the interdependencies and relationship between the key stakeholders in the social innovation ecosystem. By placing HEIs at the centre of the ecosystem map, we demonstrate their central importance as knowledge creators in driving the emergence, development and growth of social innovations. Indeed, HEIs have access to a significant amount of economic capital, that they can use to fund research, the development of new teaching modules/courses, and even the creation of social innovation start-ups. Universities also have access to significant human capital through their staff and students, which can be used (given the right institutional environment) to empower social innovation leaders or to develop the social innovation leaders of tomorrow. This can be achieved academically by focusing on tenure tracks, but also through innovative approaches to educating students across the curriculum (not just Business students). An HEI’s social capital can also be used to create social value within the community and to increase awareness of social innovation through their social networks (e.g., alumni). The higher education sector can also utilise its political capital with government (through evidence-based policy advocacy) and businesses (through training and corporate engagement). This advocacy can change the flow of key resources in the ecosystem, such as funding (financial capital) and policy innovations (political capital).

However, underpinning all these four types of capital is a university’s key resource: intellectual capital. Intellectual capital, created through original research and leveraged through global research and partnerships, as well as the innovative ideas of staff and students, can be used to generate political, human, economic and social capital, leading to new social innovations, social value and community engagement (as represented by the ‘rain’ in Figure 5.1). Table 5.1 also outlines how HEIs can utilise these different types of capital.

Table 5.1 - HEIs, capital clusters and social innovation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Cluster</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Policy advocacy</th>
<th>Community engagement</th>
<th>Corporate engagement</th>
<th>Global partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5 RECOMMENDATIONS

The following eight recommendations are put forward to contribute to the development of the higher education social innovation ecosystem in Hong Kong. They are based on the research data presented in this report, the review of existing literature and the discussion above. These recommendations recognise the existing breadth of excellence that is already in place across research, teaching and community engagement in the Hong Kong higher education sector, and they seek to offer insights as to how this excellence can be built upon.

1. **Definitional clarity around social innovation (systemic):** the Hong Kong government (through the SEF Fund) and academic funding bodies (notably the UGC) should take centralised strategic action to raise awareness of social innovation amongst key stakeholders and the public. Also, a common practical definition of social should be agreed amongst key stakeholders.

2. **Knowledge sharing (systemic):** Knowledge Transfer Offices should encourage HEIs to share IP with the wider ecosystem and the creation of IP to the RAE (as recognised impact). The UGC and international NGOs (e.g., British Council) should encourage cross-sector collaboration and partnerships in research and teaching, through the creation of applied impact funds and international knowledge exchange programmes.

3. **Research funding (systemic/institutional):** Funding streams that encourage multi-disciplinary, pan-institutional, applied research should be established. This could be aligned to the new focus on impact in the RAE, to assist universities to develop research that can have tangible pathways for impact. This funding should come from government (e.g., the UGC) and internally from universities themselves, and the UGC and Policy Innovation Coordination Office should include streams for social innovation/social entrepreneurship as recognised fields in their grant application forms (General Research Fund, Early Career Scheme and Public Policy Research).

4. **Impact-led tenure track (institutional):** current academic tenure tracks appear to limit the willingness to engage in applied/impactful research. Universities should make changes to tenure criteria to acknowledge the value of applied, impactful research. This would also align with the new focus of the RAE. Academic staff performance indicators (where relevant) that are related to applied/impactful research (even for those academics with tenure) should also be introduced to encourage engagement with applied social innovation research.

5. **Embedded curriculum and training (institutional):** four main sub-recommendations:
   a. HEIs should collaborate with each other on degree programmes in relation to teaching (e.g., shared guest lecturers) and possibly full joint degree programmes where possible. They should also look to make changes to university accreditation procedures that make the latter possible.
   b. Universities should ensure that social innovation courses have embedded teaching and learning (guest lecturers, student placements, competitions), so that learners can engage in applied learning.
   c. There is also space in the market for certificated training courses delivered between HEIs, or in partnership with NGOs and social enterprises, both within and outside of Hong Kong. Pathfinder courses focused specifically on social innovation (i.e., whole degree programmes) should also be developed, to build on the existing courses already in existence at PolyU and HKCT.
   d. Both the government and HEIs should ensure that sufficient training and support is in place to develop the capacity and skills of lecturers and practitioners in relation to embedded, practice-led teaching.

6. **Social innovation funding (institutional):** HEI funds should be created to support staff/student social start-ups and spin-outs. Where these new businesses emerge from research and teaching, universities should ensure that this is recognised and valued in tenure tracks and the RAE. There should also be recognition that some organisational start-ups will not be social businesses, but could still deliver significant impact.

7. **Empower individuals (institutional/practice):** HEIs should recognise key individuals leading on social innovation research and teaching within the Hong Kong higher education sector, and support them to further develop research, teaching and knowledge exchange activities. They should also enable them to empower others to do the same, and promote their roles as ‘chameleons’ within their institutions.

8. **Facilitate community engagement (practice):** HEIs should facilitate community engagement and co-production in social innovation research, in order to develop innovative solutions to existing social problems that communities actually need. This would allow university resources to be brought to bear in developing, testing and implementing new social innovations that deliver social impact in communities.

5.6 FURTHER RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES

This research provides a starting point for mapping the ecosystem in Hong Kong, and provides the baseline data from which future progress in relation to social innovation research, teaching and community engagement can be mapped. Nevertheless, further work is required to continue to develop our understanding of the
social innovation ecosystem in the Hong Kong higher education sector. Here are four possible future areas of research:

1. **Research impact:** the impact delivered by social-innovation related research in Hong Kong still remains unclear, and the research data presented in this report suggests, anecdotally, that it may not be high, with a need for more impactful research moving forwards. The introduction of research impact into the RAE 2020 framework can help to demonstrate impact more clearly. Therefore, future research that seeks to ascertain the impact of research projects/publications both qualitatively through interviews with academics, but also quantitatively through the analysis of RAE submissions, can help to identify what real-world impact HEI research is having in relation to social innovation.

2. **Teaching:** whilst this report has mapped out the social innovation teaching that currently exists in Hong Kong, what the research does not show is what students think about the quality of the teaching in these courses, their relevance to the subject matter and careers, as well as the impact they deliver. Future research should seek to explore student perceptions of social-innovation-related courses through a large-scale survey.

3. **Training:** where training does exist (current or future) for social innovation practitioners and those teaching social innovation, research should be undertaken that seeks to understand the efficacy of this training and the impact that it has on the quality of training/teaching delivered (related to the student survey above).

4. **Global benchmarking:** whilst this report has sought to make comparisons between Hong Kong and the rest of the world (notably the UK), a comprehensive mapping of social innovation research and teaching globally was outside the remit of this project. Future research should identify comparable higher education ecosystems in other countries, and then comprehensively map the research and teaching that exists. This is important, as it will provide context in relation to Hong Kong’s global position, and will highlight areas where Hong Kong is a global leader and where it may need additional capacity.

---

**REFERENCES**

17. Dey, P. & Steyaert, C., (2014). Rethinking the space of ethics in social entrepreneurship: Power, subjectivity and practices of


ALEX NICHOLLS

Over the past two decades, there has been an increasing level of interest in how social and environmental change can best be achieved. This has, at least in part, been a result of a growing recognition that the existing institutional boundaries of the public sector and the non-market were ill-suited to address a new set of global, so-called ‘wicked’, problems (Rittel and Webber, 1973) effectively. Such problems include climate degradation, endemic inequality (and all its attendant effects on health, education and social cohesion, as highlighted by Wilkinson and Pickett (2009)), the collapse of liberal democracy and the consequence of both extremist politics and an insulated elite separated from the conventions and norms of a social contract. These issues have manifested themselves at multiple levels of social action, from the macro-institutional structures of politics and power, to the mezzo-level of organisations and markets, and the micro-level of individual lived experience.

At the same time, digital technologies have transformed access to information, the nature of social interactions, and, even, the contours of market organizations. Social innovations were largely led by ‘hero’ entrepreneurs in Silicon Valley, who subsequently became a group of ‘youth’businesses unprecedented in business history. The consequence of these two phenomena was the rise of ‘social entrepreneurship’ (Nicholls, 2006). This new construct suggested that the ‘hero’ entrepreneur model found in modern businesses could be translated to address social and environmental challenges with the same focus on innovation and scale typical of commercial start-ups. It was proposed that such a ‘hybrid’ approach (Pache and Santos, 2013) could span across the traditional institutional boundaries of the market, public and non-market sectors to more effectively address ‘wicked’ problems. It was, perhaps, no coincidence that some of the leading advocates of such an approach were, themselves, the new ‘hero’entrepreneurs of the digital economy, such as Jeff Skoll, Bill Gates and Pierre Omidyar, each of whom focused on growing and nurturing a new cadre of social entrepreneurs (Nicholls, 2010).

However, despite some powerful examples of the impact of social entrepreneurship models going to scale (notably micro-finance), it became increasing evident that the micro-level focus on supporting the social entrepreneur, and mezzo-level focus on helping scale her organisation/innovation, could not, alone, deliver significant social or environmental change. A consequence of this was a shift in focus, from the entrepreneur and her organisation/innovation, toward a new approach to understanding the systems that drove ‘wicked’ problems at the macro-level, as a diagnostic toward identifying key points of leverage where action could best alter such structures. This shift reified itself in a recasting of the narrative around social change, from social entrepreneurship to social innovation (Nicholls and Murdock, 2011; Van der Have and Rubalcaba 2016).

However, such a recasting required more than a simple semantic change. It also required a quite different approach to diagnosing the nature of effective social change action based upon a systems analysis that understood institutional factors as central to the creation and maintenance of negative social and environmental value. A key part of this was a recognition of the inherently political nature of systems change, in the sense that both the maintenance and disruption of (failing) systems was, ultimately, an exercise in allocating and enacting power (Heiskala, 2007). Such a realisation was in stark contrast to the almost religious belief in the power of socially ‘disempowered’ actors to effect change. When the Social Grid is overlaid on a systems problem, it allows an analysis of the macro-level drivers of the issue to be revealed, as well as, simultaneously, suggesting how interventions in one or all elements of the Social Grid can destabilise the status quo to bring about systems change.45 In terms of action for change, the role of social networks is central here. Coalescing groups around a social innovation agenda offers the prospect of disrupting extant cognitive frames to, in turn, alter or challenge the institutional norms that perpetuate a system. Important historical examples can be observed in the construction of social movements (such as the civil rights movement in the US or the suffragettes in the UK) or new representative bodies that rearticulate power (such as co-operatives or trade unions). More recently, digital technologies have facilitated the creation of ‘virtual’ social networks for social change that span across countries and operate in real time to mobilise for systems change (such as #MeToo or the Extinction Rebellion).

In this context, the role of education, as a neutral space that codifies and transmits knowledge, is significant. At its most effective, education builds discursive communities that can analyse systems and offer alternative readings of established ways of thinking and doing as social innovation. In this sense, they may fulfill the largely unfulfilled claims made for ‘hero’ social entrepreneurs described above, by socialising systems change beyond the individual or organisation within the dynamics of the Social Grid. Moreover, higher education can be a particularly potent driver of systems change through research and teaching across social networks.

Given this, the BRICKS project’s focus on the landscape of social innovation in Hong Kong’s higher education sector is an important contribution to furthering our understanding of how to actualise and enact a particular social innovation system specifically addressing poverty. To this end, the stated objectives are:

• To build capacity and community amongst leaders from academia around the role that social innovation theory and practice can play in poverty relief and related social issues.

The four levels of analysis set out in the project – research, teaching, knowledge exchange and transfer, and community engagement – can be observed in the construction of social networks, starting with students then moving outwards to the wider community. Moreover, the qualitative data analysis set out in the project reveals how power and institutions relate to personal agency. The discussion and conclusions further articulate how institutional material at the Social Grid level relate both to micro-level practice and macro-level systems norms, articulated as:

• Systemic level: cultural norms, traditions and incentive structures that mediate inter-HEI collaboration.

| Institutional level: behaviours and attitudes of faculty and staff at HEIs to collaboration. |
| Practice-level: frontline knowledge and practice to collaborate in the delivery of social innovation initiatives. |

The BRICKS research makes some important empirical contributions too. Despite the proliferation of academic research and teaching on social innovation globally, the landscape of such work in Hong Kong is limited. This is, at least in part, due to institutional barriers around funding, intellectual capital, and human resources norms for this relatively new area of research. Moreover, examples of social network building – evidenced by research collaborations across the Hong Kong universities and engagement of knowledge transfer with practice – is relatively limited. The research notes that:

‘There remains a paucity of collaboration between HEIs and the wider social innovation ecosystem, with competition often stifling co-production and both HEIs and NGOs being too protective over IP’.

This suggests a further institutional barrier around resource limitations.

Finally, the BRICKS research offers a range of practical recommendations based upon its empirical and theoretical insights. Drawing upon the theory of multiple capitals, the report concludes that academic communities can be built as social networks for social innovation in Hong Kong by an enhanced allocation of resources from government, as well as greater leadership from key actors across the
ecosystem. Social innovation as something changes demand both a diagnosis of existing ecosystem dynamics – as suggested, for example, by the Social Grid – and a prognosis of how best to realign current institutional material via the mobilisation of social networks to reconfigure co-creation and legitimating social action. However, as this research notes in its conclusions, this will also require greater attention to impact management and measurement of social innovation – though this is a matter beyond the purview of the specific project (although, Nicholls (2009) provides some insights into this).

In conclusion, the BRICKS project explores how the universities in Hong Kong are currently acting as systems change agents from this point of view, and offers valuable recommendations for how to move forward. Today, there is an opportunity for universities to act as a key catalytic player in developing social innovation as a trusted social network builder. They occupy an historically unique position in society as neutral spaces for discussion, analysis and new thinking. The BRICKS project has set an agenda for Hong Kong in this regard. However, the implications of this research stretch further beyond this narrow geography.

REFERENCES

3. Nicholls, A., (2009), ‘We do good things, don’t we? Blended value accounting in social entrepreneurship’, Accounting, Organizations and Society, 34.6-7, pp. 755-769

1. It is not the intention of this report to engage in definitional debates around these concepts, but readers interested in finding out more can see Parkinson and Howorth, (2008); Dart et al. (2010); Nicholls (2007); Zahra et al. (2009); Kodrick and Beamish (2010).
2. The Heiska (2007) definition is one of the more recognised and oft-cited definitions of social innovation (145 citations according to Google Scholar). Furthermore, as this definition and others are based on structures and empowerment, it is in line with the focus of this research.
4. It should be noted that the use here of the terms ‘nascent’ and ‘emergent’ only relate to contemporary scholarship and understanding of social innovation in Hong Kong. It is recognised that, in reality, social innovation as elsewhere in the world will have been occurring for centuries.
6. Again, as discussed earlier, this is a problem around the world. However, this gives Hong Kong an innovation opportunity where it could take an international lead to do something that hasn’t really been done before in HE.
7. 67 % of post are male: 26 % are female: seven per cent did not state.
8. Three of the five non-academic respondents hold Associate positions within an HEI.
9. 47 projects were disclosed in the survey, but two of these were duplicates, resulting in 45 projects overall.
10. One of these collaborative projects was with a HK, HEI, meaning that only 40 per cent of research projects involved cross-HEI collaboration within Hong Kong.
11. Y-axis represents the number of social-innovation focused research projects in a given year.
12. Government funding here relates to finance that is not part of an HEI’s own funding pots, or traditional research grant funding streams, even though both of these could be classed as government money in origin.
13. Online citations online could only be identified for 50 publications, and these are listed in Appendix E. Five citations for media publications could not be identified online. A further two non-academic publications were identified through the survey.
14. Of the 50 identified research outputs. These were identified through the survey, as well as through academic databases and university libraries.
15. Three of the five non-academic respondents hold Associate positions within an HEI.
16. While 41 community engagement activities were provided, three of these were removed from the dataset, as they related to membership of academic journal editorial boards, which was not considered as community engagement for the purposes of this research.
17. 49 projects were disclosed in the survey, but two of these were duplicates, resulting in 45 projects overall.
18. This should be helped to a degree by the focus in the next RAE 2020 of impact from research accounting for 15 per cent of a university’s score.
As was noted earlier, 15 per cent of an HEI's RAE score now relates to research impact.

Whilst not technically an NGO, the British Council is included here as a key stakeholder and importer of international ideas into the ecosystem.


As noted earlier, one 4* REF Impact Study can be worth as much as £100,000 (HK$1 million) to a UK HEI, and impact maps are now being created for the UK higher education sector (see https://re.ukri.org/research/ref-impact/).

It is important to note that social impact and social innovation are not the same thing, and that one can occur without the other. This should also be recognised when looking at how best to utilise research impact to grow social innovation.

Table 5.1 merely seeks to identify the key capitals for each area of HEI activity. In reality, all five capitals could be represented in every area of activity considering the scope of university work.

This refers to the career progression paths for academics, moving from a post-doctoral position to a full professorship.

A social start-up relates to a new social business created; spin-outs relate to university departments that leave the HEI to become an independent business, or research innovations that are commercialised.

It should be noted that, of course, such systems change can have negative as well as positive social or environmental outcomes, depending on the objectives behind the action of systems disruption.
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As noted, this research adopted a mixed-method approach to data collection, so as to ensure the broadest possible dataset (both in relation to participant and data types). Such an approach allowed the research to ensure it explored the broadest range of opinions and so would, therefore, be able to identify the enablers and barriers to collaboration around social innovation in higher education in the Hong Kong ecosystem.

**DESIGN**

The research has adopted a sequential mixed-method research approach to data collection, that consisted of five stages: an in-depth literature review, an online survey, semi-structured interviews, ecosystem mapping and data triangulation. This approach was undertaken to provide a holistic overview of the social innovation ecosystem in the higher education sector in Hong Kong, by embedding the research design and data analysis in prior literature. This theoretical embedding was then complemented by data capture from the survey, that provided a wider overview of the trends facing the Hong Kong higher education ecosystem around social innovation. These trends were then explored in-depth through the semi-structured interviews, before all the data was brought together through a process of triangulation (McLeod, 1994) to develop the research discussion and recommendations outlined in Section 5. Figure A1 the research design (including sample sizes where applicable).

**MEASURES AND PARTICIPANTS**

The research data gathered information from a total of 52 survey participants (sample breakdown for survey participants is presented in Section 3) and 17 interviews involving 22 participants. Five of the 22 interview participants also participated in the online survey, meaning that a total 69 unique individuals participated in the research. Nevertheless, there are obvious sample biases within the data that are rooted in the research focusing on recruiting senior academics and other stakeholders outside of academia. In relation to the former, this means that it is possible that some of the issues faced by junior and early-career researchers on the ground may not emerge from the data; whilst for the latter, there is a danger that the research findings focus too strongly on non-academic issues faced by practitioners and policy-makers. Whilst it is impossible to overcome these issues fully, the report has also gone through an extensive peer-review process by the members of the BRICKS Steering Committee, to try to ensure that the research findings and recommendations are as embedded in the higher education context as possible, and remain true to the original aims of the research.

**ONLINE SURVEY**

The survey was designed to capture information from academics based in Hong Kong, so as to identify the teaching and research that is ongoing in these areas, whilst also identifying gaps in knowledge and capacity in the ecosystem. The survey was administered by the British Council through the online SurveyMonkey platform, and was live between 21 November 2018 and 31 May 2019. The survey sample was purposive and snow-balled, in that participants were targeted based upon their role within social innovation in higher education, but they were also free to pass the survey link on to their colleagues or other individuals they felt would be relevant. The survey explored:

- Demographic data
- HEI affiliation
- Academic expertise
- Research being undertaken or planned (including publications)
- Teaching being undertaken or planned (including specific courses/modules)
- Knowledge transfer and partnerships that exist
- Perceived social problems in Hong Kong
- Community engagement.

**PARTICIPANT INTERVIEWS**

The interview procedure was explained to participants in full, and they were provided with signed consent forms (see Appendix B). The interview used a semi-structured interview schedule that explored areas including the Hong Kong social innovation ecosystem, research/teaching challenges in relation to social innovation, community engagement by HEIs, the key social problems facing Hong Kong, and perceptions of what could be done to strengthen social innovation collaboration in Hong Kong (see Appendix B). However, as the interviews were semi-structured, participants were also free to explore other issues they felt were pertinent. Of the 17 interviews, 15 took the form of semi-structured interviews (13 in-person and two on the telephone). Two respondents, who were unable to arrange a time to participate in the interviews, submitted written responses to the interview questions. The average length of each audio-recorded interview was 49 minutes and 20 seconds, with a total of 740 minutes of total interview data gathered from the 15 participants. All audio interview data was transcribed for analysis, whilst the data from the two written responses was also treated as direct quotes. The sample overview of interviewees is provided in Table A1.
Table A1 – Interview breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview no.</th>
<th>Stakeholder type</th>
<th>Participant ID number</th>
<th>Interview length (minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Incubator</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>HEI Knowledge Transfer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Investor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Academic &amp; Funder</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Social Enterprise</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Social Enterprise</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(written response)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Academic &amp; Practitioner</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(written response)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. Total interview duration across the 15 audio-recorded interviews of 740 minutes (average of 49 minutes and 20 seconds per interview).

ANALYSIS

The quantitative data outlined in Section 4 was analysed using descriptive statistics to explore population averages, using the Statistics Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22.0. The qualitative data in this report was analysed using Constant Comparative Method (CCM) (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Lincoln and Guba, 1985), a method based on ‘Grounded Theory’ (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). CCM allows for the qualitative analysis of text (in this case interview transcripts) through an iterative analysis procedure. The process inherent to CCM involves the inductive identification of emergent units of analysis from the researcher’s transcript analysis, rather than through coding based upon predetermined codes (Maykut and Morehouse, 1994). CCM involves five main stages:

1. Immersion – ‘units of analyses’ are identified from the data.
2. Categorisation – ‘categories’ emerge from the ‘units of analysis’.
3. Phenomenological reduction – ‘themes’ emerge from the ‘categories’ and are then interpreted by the researchers.
4. Triangulation – support for researcher interpretations of ‘themes’ is sought in additional data.

• Interpretation – overall interpretation of findings is conducted in relation to prior research and/or theoretical models.

(Keleid, 1994).

This process led to the identification of 52 ‘units of analysis’ that were then coded into 13 separate ‘categories’, which were then reduced to four individual ‘themes’: Social Innovation Complexity, Power and Institutions, Social Innovation Learning, and Personal Agency.

APPENDIX B – CONSENT FORM AND INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

A. CONSENT FORM: RESEARCH BEING CONDUCTED AS PART OF THE BRICKS PROJECT

This research is being conducted as part of the wider project titled ‘Building Research Innovation for Community Knowledge and Sustainability’ (BRICKS) project in Hong Kong. The project provides an innovative and impactful approach to supporting the higher education sector in Hong Kong, by supporting students, teachers and early-career researchers to develop the skills that they need to be socially innovative leaders, and to co-create social innovation cultures within the sector. The research is being conducted by the Institute for Social Innovation and Impact at the University of Northampton, UK. The Institute is an external research partner, independent from the wider BRICKS project and its Partner Organisations.

Your participation in today’s interview that is part of the research is voluntary, and you have the right to withdraw at any time. The interview will be audio recorded to ensure that we are able to obtain the richest dataset from the session. The recordings will be transcribed for analysis. All data will be stored in a confidential manner, which means that no-one outside of the research team will have access to the transcriptions or recordings.

The information from today’s interview will be used to compile a report exploring the wider social innovation/social enterprise ecosystem in Hong Kong, that will be presented to the BRICKS Steering Committee and partners and possibly also published publicly. The research data may also be used by the University of Northampton for the production of journal papers. All quotes provided by yourself will be presented only in an anonymous form in the report, so that you are not identifiable in the wider research. This means that it will not be possible to identify you by name or connect the information you have given to any of your personal details. However, it is important to be aware that given the context of what you discuss, some people within the BRICKS project may be able to identify you from the quotes.

Should you wish to access the findings from this research then you can contact a member of the research team at their email below. Your participation in this research is very much valued and is extremely important to the research team in allowing them to understand the impact of the programme.

If you are happy to take part in this research and proceed with the interview, then please complete the section below.

Name: ……………………………………………. Signature: ……………..………………………………..

Date: …………………………..

Professor Richard Hazenberg richard.hazenberg@northampton.ac.uk at the Institute of Social Innovation and Impact (ISII), the University of Northampton.
B. BRICKS SOCIAL INNOVATION AND SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP INTERVIEW QUESTIONS:

1. Please tell me a little about your role at your University and your work on SI/SE?
2. Can you describe how you see the SI/SE ecosystem in Hong Kong?
3. In relation to research, what are your main challenges in relation to (if applicable):
   a. Funding?
   b. Publishing?
   c. Collaboration?
4. In relation to teaching, what are your main challenges in relation to (if applicable):
   a. Utilising research to inform teaching?
   b. Collaborating with other partners (HEIs, NGOs, SEs etc.)?
   c. Engaging students with SI/SE?
5. In relation to knowledge exchange, what are your main challenges in relation to (if applicable):
   a. Funding?
   b. Securing partnerships?
   c. Linking KE to teaching/research?
6. Please tell me about your community engagement work (if applicable)?
7. In relation to your expertise and perception of what is the most pressing social problem facing Hong Kong, please pick one and tell me how you think the SI/SE ecosystem can be used to solve/reduce the issue?
   a. Youth
   b. Housing
   c. Elderly/Ageing
   d. Education
   e. Health
   f. Food Security
   g. Social Inequality
   h. Environment
8. What do you think needs to be done to strengthen the SI/SE ecosystem in Hong Kong?
   a. Networks/Collaboration?
   b. Skills development?
   c. Scale projects (number and impact)?
9. Is there anything that I haven’t asked you that you think is important or wish to discuss?

APPENDIX C – AREAS OF EXPERTISE

(In alphabetical order)
1. Age-Friendly City
2. Architecture
3. Business Ethics
4. Chemistry & Data Science
5. Civil Society
6. Civil Society and Social Innovation
7. Co-Living
8. Community Development
9. CSR x 2
10. Design & Health
11. Design and Value Creation
12. Design Management
13. Design Policy
14. Design Thinking x 2
15. Developmental and Educational Psychology
16. Elderly
17. Entrepreneurship x 6
18. Environmental Management
19. ESG
20. Genetics
21. Health Care
22. Health Policy
23. Health Tech
24. Higher Education
25. Hong Kong Social Enterprise
26. Human Factors
27. Human Rights
28. Impact Investing x 2
29. Innovation x 2
30. Innovation Management
31. IP
32. Knowledge Exchange
33. Knowledge Transfer x 4
34. Labour Rights
35. Marketing
36. NGO Governance
37. Osteoarthritis and Dance Injury
38. Organisation of Voluntary Actions
39. Philanthropic Capital Intermediary
40. Physiotherapy
41. Public Management
42. Public Policy
43. Rehabilitation
44. Research Related to Back Pain
45. Risk Management
46. Scoliosis
47. Service-Learning
48. Social Design/Curating
49. Social Enterprise
50. Social Enterprise Development
51. Social Enterprise Start-ups
52. Social Innovation x 10
53. Social Innovation in Community
54. Social Innovation in Higher Education
55. Social Impact Measurement
56. Social Innovation in Community
57. Social Innovation in Higher Education
58. Social Policy x 3
59. Social Services x 2
60. Social Work x 2
61. Sports Science
62. Theory of Social Enterprise
63. Third Sector Studies
64. Town Planning x 2
65. Urban Planning
66. Wearing/Implantable Medical Device
67. Young, Old and Sustainability x 2
68. Youth Development
APPENDIX D – LIST OF RESEARCH PROJECTS

Listed alphabetically:

1. a) Co-authors; b) Lead Institution

   a. HKCT Institute of Higher Education.
   a. K.C., Wong, M.
   b. Asia Value Advisors
   a. Jack Qiu and Terence Yuen
   b. City University Hong Kong
4. Comparative Analysis of Social Enterprise in Hong Kong and Taiwan: Scope and Dynamic (2010):
   a. Ho, A., Kam-Tong Chan, Kuan, YY, Wang, S.T.
   b. The Hong Kong Polytechnic University
5. Corporatist governance in Hong Kong (2017):
   a. Yeung, R., Chiu, F., & Kwok, J.
   b. Hong Kong University
   b. The Hong Kong Polytechnic University
   a. Siu, D.
   b. HKUST
   a. Tui, C., Rong, T., Hu, X.W.
   b. The University of Hong Kong
   b. The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology.
    a. Alto, P. & Wong, M.
    b. Asia Value Advisors
11. Evaluation of SIE Fund (Forthcoming):
    a. Hon, C.C. & Yip, P.
    b. Hong Kong University
    b. The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology
13. From Single to Diversified: Looking Forward to The Trend of Social Enterprise Development in Hong Kong (2018):
    a. Yuen, T. & Chan, K.M.
    b. City University Hong Kong
14. Gifted Education (Not Stated):
    a. Siu, K.C.
    b. The Hong Kong Polytechnic University (in partnership with HKAGE, Johns Hopkins U. EdU)
15. Hong Kong’s third international airport runway (2015):
    a. Yeung, R., Li, A., & Hung, S.
    b. Hong Kong University
    b. The Hong Kong Polytechnic University
    a. Lee, S. & Lee, E.
    b. HKCT Institute of Higher Education (in partnership with HKBU)
    a. Yuen, T. & Chan, P.
    b. City University Hong Kong (in partnership with The Hong Kong Polytechnic University)
    a. Wang, N., Chan, K.N., & Leung, M.F.
    b. The Hong Kong Polytechnic University
    b. The Hong Kong Polytechnic University
    a. Chandra, Y.
    b. City University Hong Kong
22. On-Site Pre-School Rehabilitation Services (2019):
    a. Kong, S.T. & Wang, N.
    b. The Hong Kong Polytechnic University
    a. Qiu, J. & Yuen, T.
    b. City University Hong Kong
25. Policy (Not Stated):
    a. Chow, K.
    b. HKUST (PPPLO) (in partnership with PICO, CSDTI, SPRU (Sussex U))
    a. Fan, M.
    b. Federation for Social-financing Tertiary Education
    a. Wang, N., & Ace, T.
    b. The Hong Kong Polytechnic University
    a. Yim, R.C.M.
    b. Hong Kong Social Enterprise Incubation Centre
29. Social Impacts of Work Integration Social Enterprise in Hong Kong: Workforce and Beyond (2019):
    b. The Hong Kong Polytechnic University
30. Social Return on Investment (SROI) for Hong Kong Third Runway (2015):
    a. Yeung, R., Lai, A., Hung, S., Li, A.
    b. Hong Kong University
31. STEM Education (Not Stated):
    a. Chow, K.
    b. HKUST (PPPLO) (in partnership with EDB & HKUST)
32. Study On Social Impact of Work Integration Social Enterprise in Hong Kong (2016):
    b. The Hong Kong Polytechnic University
33. Tech Management (Not Stated):
    a. Chow, K.
    b. HKUST (PPPLO) (in partnership with IBM, Google, Cisco & HKSTP)
34. The Development of Learning Materials in relation to Chinese as a Second Language for Post-Secondary Education (Not Stated):
    a. Fan, M.
    b. Federation for Social-financing Tertiary Education
35. The Experiences of Social Volunteering and Service Learning: A Case Study of a Service Learning Project at Crossroads Foundation (2013):
    a. Lee, S. & Lee, E.
    b. HKCT Institute of Higher Education (in partnership with HKBU)
    a. Lee, E.
    b. Hong Kong Baptist University
37. The Mechanisms of Performance in Social Enterprises (Not Stated):
    a. Chandra, Y. & Wang, L.
    b. City University of Hong Kong
38. The Practice of Social Mission: A Case Study By My Concept (I):
    a. Lee, E. & Chiu, S.
    b. Hong Kong Baptist University (in partnership with Hong Kong Baptist University)
    a. Ho, H. & Chan, K.T.
    b. The Hong Kong Polytechnic University
    a. Yeung, R.
    b. Hong Kong University
41. Transitional Social Housing in Hong Kong (Not Stated):
    a. Lok, C.W.
    b. Design Institute for Social Innovation, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University
    a. Yuen, T.
    b. City University Hong Kong
    a. Chandra, Y.
    b. City University of Hong Kong
44. What Makes Social Enterprise Effective in Hong Kong (2013):
    a. Yim, R.C.M.
    b. Hong Kong Social Enterprise Incubation Centre
45. Work Integration Social
APPENDIX E – LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

Published journal papers:


2. Chan, K., Kuan, Y.Y., Ho, P.Y. & Wang, S.T., (2010), Comparative analysis of social enterprises in Hong Kong and Taiwan: scope and dynamic. Hong Kong: Centre for Third Sector Studies, Dept. of Applied Social Sciences, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, http://hdl.handle.net/10397/54517


8. Yeung, R., Lai, A., Hung, S., Li, A., (2014), Study on Social Return on Investment (SROI) for Hong Kong Third Runway Project: Final Report, Friends of the Earth (Hong Kong) and the Hong Kong Dolphin Conservation Society Funded Research.


12. Books and chapters in books:


Theses:


Media:


3. Yim, R.C.M., (2012), From cradle to grave social enterprise, Newspaper Article.

4. Yim, R.C.M., (2009), Hong Kong Social Enterprise, Podcast/Internet Radio.

### AppenDix f – Undergraduate and Postgraduate Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course name</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Programme name</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Module type</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>HIE</th>
<th>Course leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Social Entrepreneurship and Innovation</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Gateway Education</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>City University Hong Kong</td>
<td>Yanto Chandra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social Entrepreneurship and Cross-Sector Collaboration</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>BA Social Sciences</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>City University Hong Kong</td>
<td>NK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Service Leadership in an Uncertain Era</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>City University Hong Kong</td>
<td>NK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social Innovation and Public Policy</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>BA Social Sciences in Public Policy and Politics</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>City University Hong Kong</td>
<td>NK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Applying Psychology to Contemporary Issues</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Master of Social Sciences (Psychology)</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>City University Hong Kong</td>
<td>NK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social Innovation and Entrepreneurial Venture Exploration (SEVE)</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>City University Hong Kong</td>
<td>Toni Tong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Management for Social Innovation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>BSc Social Development Studies</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>HKCT Institute of Higher Education</td>
<td>Samuel Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Introduction to Social Innovation and the Environment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>BA (Hons) in Social Innovation</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>HKCT Institute of Higher Education</td>
<td>Chung Wai Keung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Advanced Practice Workshop: Social and Solidarity Economy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>BA (Hons) in Social Innovation</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Institute of Higher Education</td>
<td>Raymond Yuen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Introduction to Social Entrepreneurship and Innovation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>HKCT Institute of Higher Education</td>
<td>NK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Social Entrepreneurship: Opportunities to Change the World</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Bachelor of Social Sciences (Hons) in Social Policy</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Hong Kong Baptist University</td>
<td>NK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Social Venture Planning</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Hong Kong Baptist University</td>
<td>NK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Marketing Practicum for Social Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>BCom in Marketing / Nurturing Social Minds</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Hong Kong Baptist University</td>
<td>NK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Community Development for Social Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>BCom in Marketing / Nurturing Social Minds</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Hong Kong Baptist University</td>
<td>NK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Social Innovation and Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>BCom in Marketing</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Hong Kong Baptist University</td>
<td>NK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Marketing Field Study for Social Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Hong Kong Baptist University</td>
<td>NK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Social Enterprise Management and Social Impact Strategies</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>BCom in Marketing</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Hong Kong Baptist University</td>
<td>NK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Design of Culture and Social Business</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Social Design</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>Health and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Health and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Brian Lee &amp; Siu King Chung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Social Entrepreneurship and Enterprise</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Social Policy and Administration</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Health and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Health and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Norah Wang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Creating Innovation in Social Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>BA (Hons) in Social Policy and Social Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>Health and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Health and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Raymond Yuen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Attachment for Social Policy and Social Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>BA (Hons) in Social Policy and Social Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>Health and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Health and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Raymond Yuen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Human Capital Development</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Social Policy and Administration</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Health and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Health and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Norah Wang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Strategic Leadership in Civil Society Organizations</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>BSc in Public Administration</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Health and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Health and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Norah Wang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course name</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Programme name</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Module type</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>HIE</td>
<td>Course leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Social Innovation and Entrepreneurship Seminars</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>High Potential Entrepreneurial Leadership (HiPEL) Programme</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Institute for Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Social Entrepreneurship: Innovating Social Change</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>General Education Course</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Shaw College</td>
<td>Chinese University</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Social Innovation and Social Change for Good</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Bachelor of Social Work</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>Chinese University</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Social Enterprise</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Master of Social Science in Social Work</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>Chinese University</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Social Entrepreneurship and Impact Investment</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>All MBA Programmes / Nurturing Social Minds</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Chinese University</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Public Administration</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Government &amp; Business</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>Hong Kong Social Enterprise Incubation Centre</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Road to Social Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Bachelor of Social Science</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Hong Kong Social Enterprise Incubation Centre</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Poverty, Social Policy and Social Innovation</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Bachelor of Social Science</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Hong Kong Social Enterprise Incubation Centre</td>
<td>Lam Gigi</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Policy and Technology for Urban and Rural Sustainability</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Lingnan Cluster Course / Design Innovation Programme</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Lingnan University</td>
<td>Nicholas Ou</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Joint Humanitarian Entrepreneurship Summer Academy</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Summer Programme</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Office of Service Learning</td>
<td>Lingnan University</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Social Technology Development Scheme</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Integrated Learning Programme</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>No Credits</td>
<td>Office of Service Learning</td>
<td>Lingnan University</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Social Innovation Hub Programme</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Lingnan Entrepreneurship Initiative</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No Credits</td>
<td>Social Innovation Hub</td>
<td>Lingnan University</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Design for Global Health</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>SiGHT</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Big Data for Social Good</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>SiGHT</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Design Thinking for Innovation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>SiGHT</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>No Credits</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Course name**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course name</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Programme name</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Module type</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>HIE</th>
<th>Course leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43. Community Services Project</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>BBA in General Business Management</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Business and Management</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Social Enterprise Internship Program</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Bachelor of Social Work</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Business and Management</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Public Service Project</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>BBA in Global Business</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Business and Management</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Capstone/Corporate Project</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>BBA in Global Business</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Business and Management</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Social Entrepreneurship and Venture Philanthropy</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>BBA in General Business Management</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Business and Management</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Social Innovation and Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>General Education / Minor Program in Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Business and Management</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Entrepreneurship Seminars and Readings</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>General Education / Minor Program in Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Business and Management</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Social Entrepreneurship and Venture Philanthropy</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>MBA / Nurturing Social Minds</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Business and Management</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Values Driven Innovation</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Bachelor of Business Administration</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Business and Economics</td>
<td>The University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Becoming A Change Maker</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Bachelor of Social Work</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Health and Social Sciences</td>
<td>The University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Community building and the civil society</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Bachelor of Social Work</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Health and Social Sciences</td>
<td>The University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Behavioural economics for social change</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Bachelor of Social Work</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Health and Social Sciences</td>
<td>The University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Social Policy Issues in Hong Kong</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Bachelor of Social Sciences</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Health and Social Sciences</td>
<td>The University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Introduction to social entrepreneurship and social innovation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Bachelor of Social Sciences (Government and Law) / Bachelor of Social Work</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Health and Social Sciences</td>
<td>The University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Theories and practice of social leadership</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Bachelor of Social Sciences (Government and Law)</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Health and Social Sciences</td>
<td>The University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An online search was undertaken for undergraduate and postgraduate degree courses in the UK that specifically focused on social innovation/social entrepreneurship/social enterprise (the course had to be explicitly focused on these three areas rather than just contain relevant modules), to act as a comparator for the Hong Kong ecosystem in which two such social innovation/social enterprise specific courses exist (BA (Hons) in Social Innovation (HKCT); BA (Hons) in Social Policy and Social Entrepreneurship (PolyU)). This search identified the following 11 UK courses:

1. **Foundation Degree (L4) in Business and Social Enterprise** (Ruskin College/Oxford Brookes University)
2. **CertHE (L5) Charity and Social Enterprise Management** (Anglia Ruskin University)
3. **BA (Hons) Social Enterprise and Creative Care** (University of Hull)
4. **BA (Hons) Innovation and Skills for Social Change** (Leeds Beckett University)
5. **Master of Studies Social Innovation** (University of Cambridge)
6. **MSC Social Innovation and Entrepreneurship** (LSE)
7. **MSC Social Enterprise** (University of Stirling)
8. **MSC Social Innovation** (Glasgow Caledonian University)
9. **MA Social Innovation** (University of Northampton)
10. **MA Design for Social Innovation and Sustainable Futures** (University of the Arts London)
11. **MA Social Entrepreneurship** (Goldsmiths University)

**APPENDIX G – KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target issue</th>
<th>Initiator</th>
<th>Collaborator (please fill in collaborator's name &amp; affiliated institution)</th>
<th>Beneficiary group</th>
<th>Activity type</th>
<th>Funding source</th>
<th>HEI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Raising Students' Interest in Social Innovation</td>
<td>Yanto Chandra, CUHK</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Designing live case materials via vlogs and advocacy of social innovation in public events</td>
<td>CUHK Teaching Innovation Award</td>
<td>CUHK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Raising Students' Interest in Social Issues and How Social Entrepreneurship Can Play a Role as a Solution</td>
<td>Yanto Chandra, CUHK</td>
<td>Kaho Yu, School of Creative Media, CUHK, Cheuk Hing, Chan Wai Yu, To Wing Ki</td>
<td>Students of all ages, adults, the public, teachers and professors</td>
<td>The world’s first comics on social entrepreneurship</td>
<td>CUHK 2016 Teaching Excellence Award Grant</td>
<td>CUHK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Helping Social Enterprise Operators to be Financially Savvy</td>
<td>Yanto Chandra, CUHK</td>
<td>Professor Sidney Leung, School of Accountancy, CUHK</td>
<td>SEs, NGOs</td>
<td>Applied knowledge transfer research plus seminar</td>
<td>CUHK Grants Council</td>
<td>CUHK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Nurturing Social Media, <a href="http://www.nism.hk">www.nism.hk</a></td>
<td>Yeh Family Philanthropy, SIE Fund, social enterprises in Hong Kong</td>
<td>Local social enterprises and HKUST students</td>
<td>Project collaboration for grant funding</td>
<td>Yeh Family Philanthropy, SIE Fund</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Entrepreneurship Workshop for Grassroots Community</td>
<td>Social services agencies</td>
<td>满torp's WTO entrepreneurship workshop</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship Workshop Ministry Ltd.</td>
<td>Communityori for grant funding</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Students Joined the Fifth Ethical Consumption Movement (TECM)</td>
<td>Social Services Agencies</td>
<td>Fullness Social Enterprises Society (FSES)</td>
<td>Youth, social enterprises</td>
<td>Volunteer services</td>
<td>Home Affairs Bureau</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. University Students</td>
<td>Fullness Social Enterprises Society (FSES)</td>
<td>HK Social Enterprise Incubation Centre</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Service delivery</td>
<td>HK Shue Yan University</td>
<td>HKSocial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. University Students</td>
<td>HK Social Enterprise Incubation Centre</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>HK Social Enterprise Incubation Centre</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. University Students</td>
<td>HK Social Enterprise Incubation Centre</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
<td>HK Social Enterprise Incubation Centre</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Poverty and Social Inclusion</td>
<td>HK Baptist University</td>
<td>NGOs and social enterprises</td>
<td>Elderly, youth, people with physical disabilities, ethnic minorities, and new arrivals</td>
<td>Capacity building &amp; training programmes, funding for proof-of-concept, idea generation and prototyping</td>
<td>SIE Fund</td>
<td>Polytechnic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target issue</td>
<td>Initiator</td>
<td>Collaborator (please fill in collaborator’s name &amp; affiliated institution)</td>
<td>Beneficiary group</td>
<td>Activity type</td>
<td>Funding source</td>
<td>HEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Improving Hygiene and Health Education for Inhabitants in Siem Reap, Cambodia</td>
<td>HK Polytechnic University</td>
<td>NGO partner (HVTO) and Siem Reap.</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Provide HVTO with the skills to educate students about sanitary issues in Cambodia, and initiate a soap-making business to raise revenue</td>
<td>UGC and donors</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Develop an Effective and Precise EMRS able to Transmit the Patient’s Information Among Stations and Record them in the Database System</td>
<td>Sight, HKUST</td>
<td>NGO partner (One-2-One) in Phnom Penh</td>
<td>People on a low income</td>
<td>Developed a mobile app with training modules</td>
<td>UGC and donors</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Develop a New Virtual Keyboard UI that would Assist Students with Muscular Disabilities (e.g. MPS Patients) in Typing Mathematics Symbols and Equations</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
<td>HKMPS (Hong Kong Mucopolysaccharidoses &amp; Rare Genetic Diseases Mutual Aid Group), Hong Kong Red Cross John F. Kennedy Centre</td>
<td>Students with disabilities</td>
<td>Software</td>
<td>UGC and donors</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Dance Injury Prevention</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
<td>Patrick Yung, Dino Samaritsis, Veronika Schoeb, Darwin Chan, Gilbin Chan, Claire Hiller</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Interviews, sharing and survey</td>
<td>Health Care &amp; Promotion Scheme</td>
<td>HK Polytechnic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Prevention of Dance Injury and Promote Safe Dance Practice</td>
<td>Arnold Wong</td>
<td>Arnold YL Wong, Samuel Ling, Dino Samaritsis, Grace Chau, Kitty Lam, KW Kong, Henry Pang, Patrick Yung</td>
<td>Youth, adults</td>
<td>Educational talks, workshops</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>HK Polytechnic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Transitional Social Housing</td>
<td>Henry Lam</td>
<td>Hong Kong Council of Social Service, Urban Renewal Authority, Light Be</td>
<td>Socially disadvantaged people in sub-standard housing</td>
<td>Co-creation workshops, public seminar, action projects</td>
<td>Hong Kong Jockey Club Charities Trust</td>
<td>HK Polytechnic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Empathizing with Elderly in Workplace</td>
<td>K.K. Ling, Jockey Club Design Institute for Social Innovation</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>Co-creation workshops, public seminar, action projects</td>
<td>Hong Kong Jockey Club Charities Trust</td>
<td>HK Polytechnic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Education for a Complex Future-incorporation of Social Innovation and Design Thinking in Secondary Education Curriculum</td>
<td>K.K. Ling, Jockey Club Design Institute for Social Innovation</td>
<td>Education Bureau</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Experimentation school workshops, co-creation workshops, public seminar, school workshops for 24 schools</td>
<td>Hong Kong Jockey Club Charities Trust</td>
<td>HK Polytechnic University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target issue</th>
<th>Initiator</th>
<th>Collaborator (please fill in collaborator’s name &amp; affiliated institution)</th>
<th>Beneficiary group</th>
<th>Activity type</th>
<th>Funding source</th>
<th>HEI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Hawker Reload</td>
<td>K.K. Ling, Jockey Club Design Institute for Social Innovation</td>
<td>School of Design, HK Polytechnic University</td>
<td>Street sellers and their customers</td>
<td>Street survey, co-creation workshop, prototype production, product design and implementation</td>
<td>UGC and donors</td>
<td>HK Polytechnic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Hong Kong Red Cross Humanitarian Education Centre</td>
<td>K.K. Ling, Jockey Club Design Institute for Social Innovation</td>
<td>Hong Kong Red Cross</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Product design</td>
<td>UGC and donors</td>
<td>HK Polytechnic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Organizational Health Index</td>
<td>K.K. Ling, Jockey Club Design Institute for Social Innovation</td>
<td>Lois Lam, Hong Kong Council of Social Services</td>
<td>Non-profit organisations</td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>HK Polytechnic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. NGO Governance</td>
<td>Norah Wang, HK Polytechnic University</td>
<td>Stella Ho, Hong Kong Council of Social Services</td>
<td>Non-profit organisations</td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>HK Polytechnic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Strategic Leadership and CEO competency model</td>
<td>Norah Wang, HK Polytechnic University</td>
<td>Lois Lam, Hong Kong Council of Social Services</td>
<td>Non-profit organisations</td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>HK Polytechnic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Women in Poverty</td>
<td>Norah Wang, HK Polytechnic University</td>
<td>Yanto Chandra &amp; Erica Leung, CityU</td>
<td>Disadvantaged women</td>
<td>Training marginalised women to design the micro-landscapes for sale by founding the MicroForests social enterprise</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>CityU Knowledge Transfer Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SURVEYING THE SOCIAL INNOVATION AND HIGHER EDUCATION LANDSCAPE IN HONG KONG**
### APPENDIX H – COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>HEI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Executive Committee Member</td>
<td>Hong Kong Physiotherapy Association</td>
<td>The HK Polytechnic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Voluntary Classifier</td>
<td>Hong Kong Paralympic Committee and Sports Association for the Physically Disabled</td>
<td>The HK Polytechnic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Vice President</td>
<td>Hong Kong Association of Dance Medicine and Science</td>
<td>The HK Polytechnic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Management Committee Member</td>
<td>HK Red Cross Youth and Volunteer Management Committee</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Committee Member</td>
<td>Hospital Authority Kowloon Regional Advisory Committee</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Management Committee Member</td>
<td>Hospital Authority Blood Transfusion Service</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Vice Chairman</td>
<td>Federation of Hong Kong Higher Education Staff Associations</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Honorary Treasurer</td>
<td>Asia Pacific Student Services Association</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Honorary Director</td>
<td>Fullness Social Enterprises Society</td>
<td>Hong Kong Baptist University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Organising Committee Member</td>
<td>Fullness Social Enterprises Society</td>
<td>Hong Kong Baptist University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Volunteer Trainer</td>
<td>Fullness Social Enterprises Society</td>
<td>Hong Kong Baptist University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Advisor</td>
<td>Walk DVRC Ltd</td>
<td>The HK Polytechnic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Director</td>
<td>Center For Development of Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Project Coordinator</td>
<td>STEM@UST</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Hong Kong Board Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>HKUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Advisory Committee Member</td>
<td>Empower <a href="http://www.empowerweb.org">www.empowerweb.org</a></td>
<td>HKUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Board Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asia Value Advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Multiple</td>
<td>Twopresents <a href="http://www.twopresents.com">www.twopresents.com</a></td>
<td>Asia Value Advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Honorary Secretary</td>
<td></td>
<td>HK Social Enterprise Incubation Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Design Incubation Admission Panel Member</td>
<td>Harvard Club of HK Education Fund NGO</td>
<td>The HK Polytechnic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Studio Admission Panel Member</td>
<td>Various NGOs</td>
<td>The HK Polytechnic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Youth Entrepreneurship Programme Panel Member</td>
<td>HKU Space Alumni Council</td>
<td>The HK Polytechnic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Honorary Treasurer</td>
<td>Hong Kong Design Centre</td>
<td>HK Social Enterprise Incubation Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Honorary Director</td>
<td>PMQ</td>
<td>HK Social Enterprise Incubation Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Honorary Director</td>
<td>Po Leung Kuk</td>
<td>HK Social Enterprise Incubation Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Honorary Advisor</td>
<td>Hong Kong Youth Ballet Limited</td>
<td>HK Social Enterprise Incubation Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Honorary Treasurer</td>
<td>Monte Jade Association H.K</td>
<td>CUHK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Director / Trainer</td>
<td>ASEAN Economic Co-Operation Foundation</td>
<td>HKCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Director</td>
<td>CUHK Social Innovation Centre</td>
<td>HK Baptist University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Director</td>
<td>CUHK Architecture Alumni Association</td>
<td>HK Baptist University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Task Force Member</td>
<td>Fullness Social Enterprises Society Ltd</td>
<td>HK Baptist University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Task Force Member</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship Working Ministry Ltd</td>
<td>HK Baptist University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Advisor</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship Workshop Ministry Ltd.</td>
<td>CUHK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Advisor</td>
<td>SIE Fund</td>
<td>CUHK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Vice-Chairman</td>
<td>SIE Fund</td>
<td>The HK Polytechnic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Non-executive Director</td>
<td>Wofoo Social Enterprises</td>
<td>The HK Polytechnic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Committee Member</td>
<td>Tangwah Group College</td>
<td>The HK Polytechnic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Executive Committee Member</td>
<td>Hong Kong Housing Society</td>
<td>The HK Polytechnic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hong Kong Cyberport Management Co. Ltd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hong Kong Council of Social Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Hub Hong Kong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I – UNITS OF ANALYSIS

1. Ecosystem
2. Lack of Policy Support
3. Policy Recommendations
4. Networks
5. University Collaboration
6. HEI/Private Sector Collaboration
7. Business Support/Training
8. Cross-sector Collaboration
9. Power-distance
10. Co-creation
11. HEI/NGO Partnerships
12. International NGOs
13. Research Impact (REF)
14. Spin-outs
15. Capacity-building
16. Overcoming Replication
17. Competition
18. Generational Shift
19. Hybridity
20. Social Problems
21. Government
22. Teaching Social Innovation
23. Embedded Learning
24. Agenda Setting
25. Social Value Procurement
26. Knowledge Transfer
27. Policy Inertia
28. Higher Education Barriers
29. Community Engagement
30. Academic Entrepreneurship
31. Global Learning
32. Global Comparisons
33. Innovation Barriers
34. Applied Research
35. Social Enterprise Legal Form
36. Definition
37. Inequality
38. Awareness of Social Innovation
39. Student Activism
40. Social Impact Measurement
41. Corporate Engagement
42. Finance and Investment
43. Social Investment
44. Value Alignment
45. Social Entrepreneur Agency
46. Traditional Research Structures
47. Research Funding
48. Social Innovation Funding
49. Tenure System
50. Curriculum Rigidity
51. Strategic Direction
52. Social Impact Bonds

APPENDIX J – HEI SOCIAL INNOVATION RESEARCH CENTRES/INSTITUTES GLOBALLY

The below list outlines some of the more prominent research centres/ institutes globally focused on social innovation and related topics. The list is not intended to be exhaustive and merely provides a snapshot of some of the institutions that are now actively building social innovation into their research base. Alto, P. (2012), Impact Investing: Will Hype Stall its Emergence as an Asset Class? Social Space, 40-47.

2. Skoll Centre for Social Entrepreneurship (University of Oxford, UK)
3. Centre for Social Innovation (University of Cambridge, UK) https://www.jbs.cam.ac.uk/faculty-research/centres/social-innovation/
5. Yunus Centre for Social Business and Health (Glasgow Caledonian University, UK) https://www.gcu.ac.uk/yunuscentre/
6. Centre for Evidence and Social Innovation (Queen's University Belfast, UK) https://www.qub.ac.uk/research-centres/cesi/
7. Center for Social Innovation (Stanford University, USA) https://www.gsb.stanford.edu/faculty-research/centers-initiatives/csi/
8. Sol Price Center for Social Innovation (University of Southern California, USA) https://socialinnovation.usc.edu/
11. Institute for Corporate Social Innovation (Rutgers Business School, USA) https://www.business.rutgers.edu/ricsi
12. Institute for Social Innovation (Fielding Graduate University, USA) https://www.fielding.edu/our-programs/institute-for-social-innovation/
13. Social Enterprise Institute (Northeastern University, USA) https://www.northeastern.edu/sei/
15. Social Innovation Institute (MacEwan University, Canada) https://www.macewan.ca/wcm/socialinnovation/learning-institute
18. Social Innovation Research Institute (Swinburne University, Australia)
46 of the 52 responses were gathered before 31 January 2019; however, the survey duration was extended until 31 May 2019 to ensure that further relevant stakeholders could be engaged.

39 projects were disclosed in the survey, but two of these were duplicates, resulting in 37 projects overall.

The modules were identified through the survey data, online materials available publicly through the university websites, and based upon additional feedback provided by academics in Hong Kong. Where modules were not seen to be explicitly focused on an area/element of social innovation (even if some of the module's focus may have touched upon this), they were excluded from the list.
The British Council is the UK’s international organisation for cultural relations and educational opportunities.

www.britishcouncil.hk/en