

Booyens, I. (2022). Social Innovation for Sustainable Tourism Development. Chapter 9 in I. Booyens and P. Brouder (Eds). *Handbook of Innovation for Sustainable Tourism*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 193-209.

9. Social innovation for sustainable tourism development

Irma Booyens

<a>Introduction

This chapter explores the notion of social innovation (SI) in the context of tourism development. Social imperatives are at the core of sustainability concepts. In sustainable tourism debates, the social dimension is concerned with maximising social benefits and ameliorating the adverse social impacts of tourism (Aquino et al., 2018; Rogerson and Saarinen, 2018). SI can be understood as new or improved practices to enhance social benefit (see Booyens and Rogerson, 2016). While the idea of SI has become widely accepted, the long wave of research on innovation foregrounds technology and business organisation as drivers, and pushes socio-political and human dimensions into the background (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014; Moulaert and MacCallum, 2019). As social aspects and sustainability are becoming more important, recent literature shows that mainstream perspectives emphasising market imperatives still dominate the study of innovation in tourism (Hall and Williams, 2020; Işık et al., 2019; Pikkemaat et al., 2019).

Social inclusion is significant for sustainable tourism development (see Bakker, 2019; Rogerson, 2019; Scheyvens and Biddulph, 2018). In this context, inclusion is about broadening access to the opportunities and benefits of tourism (Matiku et al., 2021; Rogerson, 2019; Snyman and Bricker, 2019). Communities, therefore, should be central in development and decision-making processes (Aquino et al., 2018; Matiku et al., 2021; Snyman and Bricker, 2019). While this is a longstanding objective of community-based tourism, its realisation remains elusive in many cases (Matiku et al., 2021; Rogerson, 2019; Scheyvens and Biddulph, 2018). Participating meaningfully in a community - cognisant of agency and local power dynamics - learning from communities, and educating tourism actors remain significant aims in tourism development processes (see Aquino et al., 2018; Scheyvens and Biddulph 2018; Siakwah et al., 2020). Moreover, a bottom-up view of agency which incorporates a diversity of actors in fostering innovation (Booyens et al., 2018; Castro-Arce and Vanclay, 2020; Sotarauta, 2017) is a useful approach for inclusive tourism development. SI is in essence collaborative, and collective action is necessary to bring about social change and sustainability (see Castro-Arce and Vanclay 2020; Moulaert and MacCallum, 2019; van der Have and Rubalcaba 2016; Ziegler, 2017). A significant role for tourism with respect to SI is fostering structural change on a systemic level (see Booyens and Rogerson, 2016; 2017) as argued in this chapter.

This chapter views SI in tourism from a development angle, drawing on the experience of tourism innovation in Southern Africa. The arguments made are situated in the literature on sustainable development, SI and public sector innovation. Section two of this chapter looks into the connections between development and sustainability in the context of tourism. Section three unpacks SI and considers how it departs from the ‘traditional’ innovation perspective that dominates both the mainstream innovation literature and tourism innovation research. Examples of SI in Southern Africa are outlined in section four, drawing on a broad-based study of tourism innovation (see Booyens and Rogerson, 2016; 2017). Selected cases from this study are included in this chapter as illustrative examples of SI in tourism in developing country contexts. The case examples are based on purposive interviews by the author with tourism firms, government officials and non-profit organisations (NPOs). It should be noted that, while interviews were done in Cape Town (where head offices are typically located), a number of the SI examples have a wider geographical reach into the Southern African region. A discussion on key themes is offered in section five, and conclusions and recommendations for further research follow in section six.

<a> Development and Tourism Sustainability

Economic growth theories have, over the years, shifted to more human-centred approaches following growing realisations that economic growth in itself is insufficient for ensuring human development (Aghion, 2011; Telfer, 2002). From the 1980s, ‘alternative’ development paradigms departed from former neo-colonial dependency models to focus more on poverty reduction and the delivery of basic services to the poor, i.e. providing for their ‘basic needs’ (Thorbecke, 2007). The Basic Needs Approach, informed by human rights values, worked towards improving the standards of living of all people in society, particularly the poorest and most destitute (see Telfer, 2002). Boosting the informal sector and increasing the productivity of rural subsistence farmers were among the strategies propagated to redistribute growth. Increased public spending (as opposed to national saving) was required to enhance the quality and accessibility of public services such as education, healthcare, shelter, sanitation and clean water. While the 1980s saw the rise of neoliberalism, a multi-dimensional approach also emerged at the time, offering a broader view of development (Telfer, 2002). Moreover, it should be mentioned that one of the major paradigm shifts that took place between the 1980s and the 1990s was a renewed emphasis on the central role of government in development. While government is perceived to be the main obstacle to growth from a neo-classical perspective, more recent development debates perceive government as a significant player in sustainable development, especially in developing countries (Alińska et al., 2018; Anwar et al., 2020; Habiyaemye et al., 2020).

While the development of tourism as a field of study has coincided with the growth of the international tourism industry from the 1950s (Hall, 2005), Xiao and Smith (2006) observe that the prominence of economic and industry-related studies focusing on the economic benefits of tourism (evident in the 1980s) have declined in recent years. This decline has been offset by a rise in investigations into socio-cultural issues, community development and environmental concerns. Indeed, according to Sharpley (2002), in the 1990s tourism found wider recognition as an economic sector with

development potential – to maximise the benefits of tourism in host communities and advance sustainable development in destinations. An interest in tourism as a vehicle for development follows the growth of international arrivals in the Global South. Tourism is regarded as vital for economic growth – and development – in many developing countries. Sharpley (2002, p. 15) stresses that: “For many developing countries, with a limited industrial sector, few natural resources and a dependence on international aid, tourism may represent the only realistic means of earning much needed foreign exchange, creating employment and attracting overseas investment”.

McCool and Bosak (2015) observe that conventional meanings of sustainable tourism rose out of two streams in the late twentieth century. The first examined the growth of tourism itself and realisations concerning the impact of mass tourism, and the second concerned the growth of international development. Both of these streams emphasise the environmental and social impacts of development, leading to the convergence of both in the notion of sustainable tourism. The notion of ‘sustainable development’ forms part of recent growth theories which emphasise the rights of future generations to meet their basic needs and encourages a long-term perspective of development, as well as the preservation of resources. Policy action for sustainable development was mobilised through Agenda 21, adopted at the Rio Earth Summit in 1992. In 1997, an Agenda 21 for tourism saw the light of day (UNWTO, 1997). The United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) stressed that the tourism industry can play a major role in the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), contributing not only to poverty reduction, but also to gender equality, public health and environmental protection (Saarinen and Rogerson, 2014). The MDGs made way for the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) with the turn of the century, and the UNWTO once again laid out tourism’s potential contributions towards these goals (see UNWTO, 2015). The 17 SDGs encapsulate the timeliest social, economic and ecological issues for achieving sustainability (Fennell and Cooper, 2020). However, leading authors (Fennell and Cooper, 2020; Hall, 2019) point to the dominant neoliberal, ‘business as usual’ discourse associated with the SDGs, and argue that extant power imbalances and unfair or inequitable global trade and financial practices offer little assurance that social inequalities can be overcome. In order to achieve change, Hall (2019, p. 1055) argues that “norms of governance structures require a substantial shift”. SI discourses emphasise the need for structural change along with enhanced governance, as outlined in the following section.

<a> On Social Innovation

A Departure from Traditional Understandings of Innovation

SI departs from traditional understandings of innovation underscored by the work of Schumpeter (1934), who held that innovation is at the core of the competitiveness and efficiency of firms and industries and fundamentally linked to entrepreneurship. The neo-Schumpeterian evolutionary perspective is embedded in the endogenous growth model that emerged in the 1980s. Endogenous growth theory regards long-term economic growth as “continual advances in technological knowledge in the form of new goods, new markets or new processes” (Aghion and Howitt, 1998, p. 11). This view constitutes

the ‘traditional’ understanding of innovation: the continuous production of new goods and processes, which drives technological change and, accordingly, economic progress.

Novelty is a core principle and knowledge an input in the endogenous process of innovation (Fagerberg, 2003). While Schumpeter’s original innovation ideas made provision for a broad conceptualisation of innovation, i.e. in its technological and non-technological forms, later neo-Schumpeterian models focused more specifically on techno-scientific innovation as a driver of growth (Fagerberg, 2003; Moulaert and MacCallum, 2019). Neo-classical economic growth theories, therefore, centre on research and development, knowledge, technology and accompanying innovation to foster the competitiveness of firms, regions, cities and nations (Baumol, 2002; Fagerberg, 2003).

The value of innovation as per the mainstream understanding is couched in commercial terms. In other words, innovation is about creating new products or services which are significantly better than alternatives; improving processes by making them more efficient and effective; enhancing productivity; and ultimately boosting profits, competitiveness and growth. While SIs should have an element of ‘newness’, i.e. a new product, practice or process, in order to be considered an innovation, the competitive drive of innovation as experienced in market settings arguably becomes superfluous in the context of SI. What is more, innovation with a neoclassical emphasis on technology and novelty is regarded as insufficient to bring about structural transformation and human development (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014; van der Have and Rubalcaba, 2016; Moulaert and MacCallum, 2019). It cannot be assumed that the benefits of technology-driven and commercially oriented innovation and economic growth will necessarily ‘trickle down’ to alleviate poverty, reduce inequalities and contribute to social wellbeing overall (Aghion, 2011; Hart et al., 2015). In view of this, a greater emphasis on humanistic perspectives is needed in the understanding of SI.

Unpacking the Concept of Social Innovation

SI has gained prominence in the political discourses of our time. That being said, the notion has a long history and has been in circulation since the late nineteenth century according to Moulaert and MacCallum (2019). It re-emerged as an intellectual interest with the growth of social movements in the 1960s and 1970s and has since served as the intellectual support for activist groups and Corporate Social Responsibility programmes in business (see Moulaert and MacCallum, 2019). Since the 2000s, SI has increasingly been adopted as a steering principle with respect to the MDGs and SDGs (Moulaert and MacCallum, 2019; Saarinen and Rogerson, 2014); inter alia, it aims to foster inclusion and social wellbeing. An ‘inclusive’ innovation agenda which aims to ensure that the disenfranchised benefit from innovation has gained policy traction in the Global South with the support of international development organisations, philanthropic foundations, corporates and governments in the Global North (see Moulaert and MacCallum, 2019; Phiri et al., 2016). Donor funders often stress inclusive innovation objectives and outcomes, and developing countries accordingly face the challenge of defining innovation policy and programmes “in a way that incorporates the poor” (Phiri et al., 2016, p.126).

SI is typically practice and/or policy driven, with understandings varying greatly across policy and practice regimes and also in academic disciplines (Moulaert and MacCallum 2019; van der Have and Rubalcaba 2016). Cajaiba-Santana (2014) stresses

that SI research largely relies on anecdotal evidence and case studies across a number of scientific fields, and lacks coherence and unifying paradigms. As a result, common definitions of and approaches to SI are not forthcoming. Most Western capitalist societies, and some in developing contexts, embrace notions of SI embedded in economic and market terms, which draws on management science, innovation economics and SI as a strategy to maximise public expenditure (Moulaert and MacCallum, 2019).

Social entrepreneurship is seen as an ‘alternative’ business model widely adopted since the 1980s. Social entrepreneurship aims to address social needs unmet by the public and private sectors, e.g. poverty and unemployment and lack of education and healthcare in under-resourced communities (Aquino et al., 2018). A further perspective emphasises “collective mobilisation not only for better lives for people or communities, but more broadly for social and societal change” (Moulaert and MacCallum 2019, p.24). Cajaiba-Santana (2014, p. 44) argue that the “path of social innovation is not a social problem to be solved, but the social change it brings about”. This includes changes in attitudes, behaviour or perceptions to bring about new social configurations and relationships (Cajaiba-Santana 2014; Moulaert and MacCallum 2019). Core principles of SI according to Moulaert and MacCallum (2019, p.4) are:

- Collectively empowering people, especially those who are marginalised
- Meeting the needs neglected or exacerbated by the state/market apparatus
- Creating new forms of eco-social/institutional relations and politics.

Following on from these principles, empowerment, especially of poor communities, innovation by the public sector for the ‘public good’ and collective action for social change are discussed further in the text below. Identifiable in the literature is the developmental sanction of SI, along with an array of terms used. ‘Inclusive’ or ‘pro-poor’ innovations, inter alia, are deployed for the benefit of the poor and driven by social inclusion ideals with the aim of drawing on the knowledge of local communities and promoting inclusive grassroots processes and outcomes (Habiyaemye et al., 2020; Patnaik and Bhowmick, 2020). External agents, i.e. governments, NPOs or donor funding organisations, are characteristically involved in SI in poor communities. Examples include the energy, water and/or sanitation innovations, and also information and agricultural technologies in impoverished and/or rural areas in the Global South (Hart et al., 2020; López Jerez, 2020; Ramani, 2020). Such innovations are frequently project-based, and challenges exist with respect to scaling innovation projects towards achieving social change on a broader scale or structural level (Habiyaemye et al., 2020; Hart et al., 2020). Additionally, how innovation contributes to development and how inclusion is to be achieved on a practical level are typically not understood well by development role players (Hart et al., 2020). Notwithstanding, the inclusion of those who stand to benefit from SI and particularly persons from poor and/or marginalised communities in innovation processes is in line with inclusive and sustainable development agendas. However, such persons should not merely be regarded as ‘consumers’ or ‘beneficiaries’ of innovation, but instead as actors who engage actively in innovation processes (Hart et al., 2015; 2020). It is imperative to consider the relevance of problems addressed by innovation for the poor and whether it meets their needs adequately; how poor persons can participate meaningfully in innovation; their ability to develop or adopt new

technologies and processes; and the real impact of innovation on their wellbeing (Hart et al., 2020).

Public-sector innovation and SI ideals correspond. The public sector provides non-market services which are not (necessarily) connected to profit motives and competitiveness in market environments (see Bloch and Bugge, 2013). The role of government includes fostering innovation aimed at achieving particular social outcomes, which include: social cohesion and equality; poverty reduction; wealth distribution; job creation; environmental protection; safety and security; education and healthcare (Bloch and Bugge, 2013). However, Moulaert and MacCallum (2019) maintain that the need for social change often exists in the first place because of the actions or failures of the state. Nevertheless, involvement of the state and greater commitment on its part are essential, especially in countries with high levels of poverty, inequality, underdevelopment and poor basic service delivery where SI with developmental outcomes are sorely needed (Habiyaemye et al., 2020). Market forces cannot, or will not, solve certain problems. Köhler et al. (2019) argue that private sector actors have limited incentives to address particular social and environmental issues, and stress the central role of public policy in shaping agendas, actions and innovation policies. For instance, delivering basic services like electricity, clean water and adequate sanitation to impoverished communities with little, if any, purchasing power are not in the interests of private sector firms.

Nonetheless, perspectives emphasising either public or social entrepreneurship tend to overlook other drivers of SI which can include new institutions, new movements and collective action for social change (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014). Collective action is imperative for changing social systems and is typically driven by civil society collectives such as grassroots organisations, foundations, neighbourhood associations and cooperatives (Gregg et al., 2020; Köhler et al., 2019). For instance, collective action for community-level clean energy provision is often a response to the changing role of the welfare state and the privatisation of public services evident in certain neoliberal contexts (Gregg et al., 2020). This said, collaboration between actors, which includes government, civil society groups, international development/aid organisations, NPOs and ethical entrepreneurs or firms, is required to bring about social change at a broader, systemic level, especially with respect to fostering sustainability (see Ziegler, 2017). Indeed, Westley and Antadze (2010) contend that SI initiatives that operate in isolation rarely have a lasting or revolutionary impact on social problems. This highlights the need for innovation for inclusive development. The emphasis is on structural (and institutional) dynamics with respect to fostering transformational change (Castro-Arce and Vanclay, 2020; Habiyaemye et al., 2020; Moulaert and MacCallum, 2019; Ziegler, 2017).

Literature on the systemic characteristics of innovation, which is of particular relevance for public-sector innovation, includes the concept of networked governance, which emphasises collaboration between government departments, government agencies and external actors to foster innovation (Bloch and Bugge, 2013). Effective governance which ensures public service delivery depends entirely on innovation to both improve organisational performance and enhance public value in response to societal needs (Bland et al., 2010). Governance takes place within networks of public and non-public actors, and interactions are characterised by complexity (Ansell and Torfing, 2014). The emphasis is on collaboration, open innovation and user innovation with a focus on co-creation or co-production, while retaining a focus on ensuring good governance (Ansell

and Torfing, 2014). Co-creation and/or co-production are central to the SI ethos and final consumers or end users play an important role in public sector innovation aimed at providing public services to meet the needs of its users (Loeffler and Bovaird, 2018; Voorberg et al., 2015).

<a> Social Innovation in Tourism: Examples from Southern Africa

This research on tourism innovation in Southern Africa identified a number of SIs, these were new initiatives (at the time of interviewing) aimed primarily at providing social benefits to poor communities or focused on development overall. These initiatives included:

- Sport development and community outreach programmes
- Skills and education-focused development programmes
- Route networks to stimulate tourism development in impoverished rural areas
- Provision of medical care, education, and skills development through voluntourism operations
- Visitor centres and events focused on social issues.

The innovations identified were driven by the motivations of entrepreneurs to be ethical or ‘do the right thing’, or by government entities or NPOs which consider such activities to be part of their core mandate. Illustrative case examples of SI associated with tourism, based on the author’s interviews, follow below.

The *Montebello Design Centre* is a craft and visitor centre in Cape Town involved in SI through programmes for skills development in arts and crafts as part of its mandate. The centre has an outreach/development arm supported by donor funding which supports craft product development and entrepreneurship on an ongoing basis – inter alia in the Eastern Cape, a rural, impoverished province of South Africa – with the aim of selling craft products at Montebello’s shop. The centre is not directly involved in training, but it cooperates with the Craft and Design Institute (CDI, an NPO in Cape Town) which provides training. The centre is also involved in other educational programmes for adults and children alike. One of their projects (a new one at the time of interviewing) was a creativity lab combining arts and science, which helped school children to develop creative thinking, innovation and problem-solving skills. The centre collaborated on this project with UK- and Ireland-based universities.

The *Cape Town Holocaust Centre* receives local and international visitors, but its focus is on educating school children and the general public on social issues like discrimination, human rights and social justice. This centre, along with the South African Holocaust and Genocide Foundation, has expanded its activities and mandate significantly since the inclusion of the Holocaust as a topic in the National Curriculum for secondary education. The centre is involved in a wide array of activities with an educational focus and also has an extensive programme of public events. These activities include travelling/ temporary exhibitions, talks and workshops for learners and teachers, symposiums and contributing to or supporting plays on relevant topics. The scheme has

also expanded to Durban and Johannesburg, with the newly built Johannesburg centre housing a permanent exhibition on the genocide in Rwanda.

Infecting the City is a public arts festival held annually in Cape Town. This festival is the first of its kind in South Africa. This is a home-grown event which is modelled on societal needs, even though they do draw on similar festivals overseas. The creators have performing arts backgrounds and a strong academic approach to the festival. This enables them to use the arts to speak to city issues and community problems in Cape Town. The main aim of the festival is not to draw tourists in large numbers, but rather to promote and popularise performing and visual arts in South Africa and to use the arts as a platform for social commentary. The festival also acts as a platform for innovation in the arts.

Open Africa is a network of self-drive routes throughout South Africa, Lesotho, Swaziland, Mozambique, Namibia and Zambia. It operates as an NPO and uses 'tourism as an economic platform to create and sustain jobs for rural communities in Africa'. At the time of interviewing, Open Africa had 63 routes in the network, with 2,400 participating businesses employing around 27,000 persons. It focuses on drawing a range of existing tourism establishments into the route initiatives: there are 5-star hotels and homestays on the same route. An Open Africa team develops the route and provides training. It then hands the initiative over to a community to be managed by a route forum, usually consisting of local business owners; these work closely with local municipalities and tourism associations, with funding from corporate firms as part of their social responsibility initiatives and from provincial and national departments, the National Lotto, and the World Bank. Open Africa thus has an innovative model to facilitate SI.

African Impact, an NPO, is an African-based voluntourism operator. At the time of interviewing, it supported about 80 projects and operated about 40, with approximately 2,300 volunteers per annum. The projects are concerned with community upliftment (including education) and providing medical care in impoverished communities, as well as conservation. In terms of its innovation outlook, African Impact is continually looking for new opportunities and expanding existing activities at projects.

The *City of Cape Town*, through an innovative programme, actively promotes the take-up of responsible tourism business practice, which includes social and environmental dimensions by tourism firms in the Cape Town city-region. This is illustrative of a regulatory initiative bringing various stakeholders together on a systemic level. The project followed the adoption of the *Responsible Tourism Policy and Action Plan* by the City and incorporated participants who were part of the former *Cleaner Production Project* of the provincial government. Systemic relationships between public and private role players and inter-organisational collaboration within the Cape Town city-region to promote responsible tourism were identified through this research. While, arguably, more needs to be done to ensure a broad-based uptake of responsible tourism in Cape Town, much has been achieved as a result of the efforts of the local council with the support of the provincial government. Cape Town has won several responsible tourism awards and Cape Town Tourism has since come on board as a partner to encourage the wider roll-out of such practices.

The promotion of *Fair Trade wine* in the Western Cape by industry bodies and private firms is an example of structural innovation in the private sector (also see Baird et alia in this volume, see Chapter 8). South Africa is one of the largest producers of Fair

Trade wine internationally. Innovation in this regard is driven by compliance with Fair Trade principles, including paying fair prices and establishing direct trading partnerships with producers. In South Africa, Fair Trade consists of a certification system for sustainability, fair labour practices and poverty alleviation. Social and environmental sustainability (particularly with respect to the preservation of the indigenous *Fynbos* flora) are encouraged. Several initiatives are associated with the Fair Trade drive, i.e. the *Biodiversity and Wine* initiative (a partnership between the World Wildlife Fund, the local wine industry and conservation bodies) and the *Integrity and Sustainability* certification of the Wine and Spirit Board.

It should be highlighted that most of the examples of SI identified in this research have an underlying structural character. Structural innovation is identified as a collaborative form of innovation focused on ensuring wider benefits and affecting structural change (environmental and/or social) in a given community or destination (see Booyens and Rogerson, 2016). Structural innovations are implemented by individual firms, NPOs or public entities, but in all cases firms or organisations indicated that they collaborated with others in order to do so. Structural innovations, as observed in this research, extend beyond the benefit of a single firm or organisation to benefit a group of firms, a sector, a community or a destination. The aim of such innovation is to effect structural change. While this corresponds with the SI literature, which underscores the need for social change (see Moulaert and MacCallum, 2019), structural innovation has environmental and social outcomes which are significant from a sustainable tourism perspective.

<a>Discussion

The nexus between social entrepreneurship, SI and sustainable tourism is a strong emerging theme in the tourism literature (Aquino et al., 2018; de Lange and Dodds, 2017; Hall and Williams, 2020; Mosedale and Voll, 2017). The discussion in this section highlights social entrepreneurship and structural innovation to enhance sustainability in tourism and the need for networking to enhance tourism innovation.

Social Entrepreneurship and Innovation in Tourism

The Southern African research shows that social entrepreneurs implement SI in tourism contexts because of utilitarian motives with ethical underpinnings (see Booyens and Rogerson, 2017). Social enterprises are able to address issues that affect marginalised groups and local communities, particularly those disadvantaged and/or under-developed (Aquino et al., 2018; de Lange and Dodds, 2017; Malek and Costa, 2015). Social entrepreneurs styled as ‘socially conscious’, ‘ethical’ and/or ‘responsible’ drive innovation with social outcomes in tourism (Booyens and Rogerson, 2016; 2017; de Lange and Dodds, 2017). Social entrepreneurs–enterprises and NPOs alike–accordingly adopt SI as a ‘business model’ or ‘core mandate’ to address social needs or enhance social benefits (Alegre and Berbegal-Mirabent, 2016; de Lange and Dodds, 2017). However, there are concerns that social enterprises have little agency to affect social change on a broader scale. Tourism social enterprises tend to be micro businesses or organisations, often with a limited understanding of how these can contribute to

sustainable tourism development and governance on a larger scale (Aquino et al., 2018; Quandt et al., 2017). These limitations underscore the need for structural innovation, as discussed below.

Structural Innovation in Tourism

While institutional actors play a central role in tourism innovation, this is often lacking in the tourism context (Booyens et al., 2018; Carson and Carson, 2017). The notion of structural innovation, as introduced in the previous section, involves collective action by public, private and NPO actors towards enhancing social change on a broader scale. Structural innovation, as contextualised here, relates to architectural innovations (see Henderson and Clark, 1990; Hjalager, 2002). Architectural innovations “...change overall structures, and establish new rules” (Hjalager, 2002, p.467). However, it is argued that architectural innovations are focused on firm activities for their own purposes, whereas structural innovations extend beyond firm or organisational boundaries. This perspective corresponds with what is defined as institutional innovations, which “...go beyond the individual enterprise, representing collaborative and regulatory structures in small or larger communities. Institutional innovations transect public and private sectors, and set out new rules of the game” (Hjalager, 2002, p. 466). The Southern African research, however, conceptualises such innovations as ‘structural’ rather than ‘institutional’, borrowing from the notion of structural functionalism in sociological theory which is also applied in economics (see Garner, 2019). The term ‘institutional’ innovation is ambiguous and not the best fit with respect to the Southern African observations. This research draws attention to innovations which are not driven by institutions per se, but rather more informally in a collaborative manner by a group of entrepreneurs or network partners consisting of a variety of actors – characteristic of innovation in developmental settings (see Booyens et al., 2018). It is argued that structural innovation leads to a wider spread of benefits that are more inclusive and mutually beneficial. This corresponds with functionalist thought, which regards society as a complex system and focuses on structures that shape society (Garner, 2019).

Structural innovations are important from a policy perspective, since governments are expected to play a role in addressing growing social and environmental impacts of tourism at various scales (see Hall and Williams, 2020). Collective actions are needed to promote sustainable tourism and governance is the basis of collaboration (Guia, 2018; Malek and Costa, 2015). However, the tourism industry, characteristically, is highly fragmented and collaboration within the industry, and between the private sector, public sector and communities is either absent or at best constrained (Fennel and Cooper, 2020; Solnet et al., 2014). Governments, accordingly, have a role in stimulating stakeholder collaboration and governance for sustainable and inclusive tourism (Bakker, 2019; Hall and Williams, 2020; Nyanjom et al., 2018; Siakwah et al., 2020). More specifically, public policy can support the collective creation of new social practices through innovation networks (Farmaki, 2015; van der Have and Rubalcaba, 2016).

Networking behaviour and governance enable structural innovation and change. However, tourism studies investigating innovation networking by tourism entities on a regional or destination level found little evidence of it overall, beyond limited micro-level networking, i.e. small clusters, often in peripheral or rural areas (Booyens et al., 2018; de

Lange and Dodds, 2017; Quandt et al., 2017). The promotion of networking in the tourism sector should be directed at strengthening relationships between key partners or stakeholder groups for the continuous improvement of the social outcomes of tourism (Guia, 2018). This aligns with public management approaches aimed at bringing stakeholders together, sharing knowledge and fostering collaboration and co-production to improve planning, policy formation, social outcomes and governance (see Hall and Williams, 2020; Howlett et al., 2020). Even though the notion of governance networks is not new, it has assumed greater importance in recent years with respect to SI, sustainable development and tourism (see Castro-Arce and Vanclay, 2020; Espiner et al. 2017; Solnet et al., 2014).

<a> Concluding Remarks and Further Research

SI is a relatively young, albeit growing field of inquiry in tourism (see Hall and Williams, 2020). Empirical work on SI in tourism, like SI research in other settings, typically relies on case study research regarding the deployment of technologies and/or new products, processes and approaches in tourism settings (see Castro-Spila et al., 2018; Polese et al., 2018; Presenza et al., 2021; Quandt et al., 2017). While tourism scholarship readily draws on social entrepreneurship notions and approaches with respect to SI, the ‘public good’ dimension remains under-developed and under-explored in tourism (see Hall and Williams, 2020; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2020).

The COVID-19 pandemic provides an opportunity to rethink the impacts and benefits of tourism in the context of crises, while bringing greater attention to social aspects, human flourishing and local communities (Brouder, 2020; Cheer, 2020; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2020). This chapter argues for finding new and improved ways to enhance social benefits and inclusion, which is part and parcel of promoting sustainability in tourism. In order to achieve this, a focus on structural dimensions is pertinent. Accordingly, there is a need for greater collaboration to foster inclusive tourism to enhance social outcomes and sharing of the benefits (Brouder 2020; Scheyvens and Biddulph, 2018; Snyman and Bricker, 2019).

This chapter advocates for policy intervention to promote SI in the context of sustainability at a time when the social and environmental impacts of tourism are ever-growing concerns (Hall and Williams, 2020; van der Have and Rubalcaba, 2016). This said, a greater understanding is needed of the limitations of government, market and private entities in promoting SI for sustainability (Cajaiba-Santana 2014). Recommendations for further research in the area of tourism SI are as follows:

- How to promote active modes of inclusion, beyond simple mechanisms of public participation and towards the co-creation of public services (Hart et al., 2020; Loeffler and Bovaird, 2018), i.e. between users, public sector officials and other role players in tourism development.
- The role of agency in social systems, and that of second- and third-sector actors in tourism to promote SI (see Cajaiba-Santana 2014; van der Have and Rubalcaba, 2016).

- Policy and planning for innovation networking, regional development and the governance of sustainable tourism (Booyens et al., 2018; Eichelberger et al., 2020; Farmaki, 2015; Siakwah et al., 2020).
- Non-linear innovation, multi-layered processes, social dimensions and local community participation (see Espiner et al., 2017; Köhler et al., 2019).
- The rights and wellbeing of local, indigenous communities and their meaningful participation in innovation processes, with an emphasis on co-creation (see Bichler et al., 2020; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2020; Snyman and Bricker, 2019; Voorberg et al., 2015).
- Human development along with tourism labour and workforce issues which have largely been neglected in the sustainable tourism discourses (see Baum et al., 2016; Bianchi and de Man, 2021; Booyens, 2020; Ioannides et al., 2021; Solnet et al., 2014). There is a need for tourism policy and innovation to support human resource and skills development, and foster decent work in the sector.

<a>References

Aghion, P. (2011), 'Industrial policy, entrepreneurship and growth', in D.B. Audretsch, O. Falck, S. Heblich and A. Lederer (eds), *Handbook of Research on Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 45-54.

Aghion, P. and P. Howitt (1998), *Endogenous Growth Theory*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Alegre, I. and J. Berbegal-Mirabent (2016), 'Social innovation success factors: hospitality and tourism social enterprises', *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, **28**(6), 1155-1176.

Alińska, A., B.Z. Filipiak and A. Kosztowniak (2018), 'The importance of the public sector in sustainable development in Poland', *Sustainability*, **10**(9), 3278.

Ansell, C. and J. Torfing (eds.) (2014), *Public Innovation through Collaboration and Design*, Abingdon: Routledge.

Anwar, M., M.S. Khattak, J. Popp and D.F. and D Máté (2020), 'The nexus of government incentives and sustainable development goals: is the management of resources the solution to non-profit organisations?', *Technological and Economic Development of Economy*, **26**(6), 1284-1310.

Aquino, R.S., M. Lück and H.A. Schänzel (2018), 'A conceptual framework of tourism social entrepreneurship for sustainable community development', *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, **37**, 23-32.

Bakker, M. (2019), 'A conceptual framework for identifying the binding constraints to tourism-driven inclusive growth', *Tourism Planning & Development* **16**(5), 575–590.

Baum, T., C. Cheung, H. Kong, A. Kralj, S. Mooney, H.N.T Thanh, S. Ramachandran, M. Dropulić Ružić and M.L. Siow (2016), 'Sustainability and the tourism and hospitality workforce: a thematic analysis', *Sustainability*, **8** (8), 809-829.

- Baumol, W.J. (2002), *The Free-market Innovation Machine: Analysing the Growth Miracle*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bianchi, R.V. and F. de Man (2021), 'Tourism, inclusive growth and decent work: a political economy critique', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, **29**, 353-371.
- Bichler, B.F., A. Kallmuenzer and M. Peters (2020), 'Entrepreneurial ecosystems in hospitality: The relevance of entrepreneurs' quality of life', *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, **44**, 152-161.
- Bland, T., B. Bruk, D. Kim and K.T. Lee (2010), 'Enhancing Public Sector Innovation: Examining the Network-Innovation Relationship', *The Innovation Journal: the Public Sector Innovation Journal*, **15** (3), article 3.
- Bloch, C. and M.M. Bugge (2013), 'Public sector innovation — from theory to measurement', *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, **27**, 133-145.
- Booyens, I. (2020), 'Education and skills in tourism: Implications for youth employment in South Africa', *Development Southern Africa*, **37**(5), 825-839.
- Booyens, I., T.G.B and K.H. Ramoroka (2018), 'Local innovation networking dynamics: evidence from South Africa', *The European Journal of Development Research*, **30**, 749-767.
- Booyens, I. and C.M. Rogerson (2016), 'Responsible tourism and innovation: insights from the Western Cape Province, South Africa', *Tourism: an Interdisciplinary Journal*, **64**(4), 385 – 396.
- Booyens, I. and C.M. Rogerson (2017), 'Managing tourism firms in South Africa for competitiveness: an innovation perspective', *Tourism Review International*, **21**, 49-61.
- Brouder, P. (2020), 'Reset redux: possible evolutionary pathways towards the transformation of tourism in a COVID-19 world', *Tourism Geographies*, **22**(3), 484-490.
- Cajaiba-Santana, G. (2014), 'SI: Moving the field forward. A conceptual framework', *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, **82**, 42-51.
- Carson, D.A. and D.B. Carson (2017), 'Path dependence in remote area tourism development: why institutional legacies matter', in P. Brouder, S.A. Clavé, A. Gill and D. Ioannides (eds.), *Tourism Destination Evolution*, Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 103-122.
- Castro-Arce, K. and F. Vanclay (2020), 'Transformative social innovation for sustainable rural development: An analytical framework to assist community-based initiatives', *Journal of Rural Studies*, **74**, 45-54.
- Castro-Spila, J., R. Torres, C. Lorenzo and A. Santa (2018), 'Social innovation and sustainable tourism lab: an explorative model', *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning*, **8**(3), 274-290.
- Cheer, J.M. (2020), 'Human flourishing, tourism transformation and COVID-19: a conceptual touchstone', *Tourism Geographies*, **22** (3), 514-524.
- De Lange, D. and R. Dodds (2017), 'Increasing sustainable tourism through social entrepreneurship', *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, **29** (7), 1977-2002
- Eichelberger, S., M. Peters and B. Pikkemaat and C.S. Chan (2020), 'Entrepreneurial ecosystems in smart cities for tourism development: From stakeholder perceptions to regional tourism policy implications', *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, **45**, 319-329.

Espiner, S., C. Orchiston and J. Higham (2017), '@Resilience and sustainability: a complementary relationship? Towards a practical conceptual model for the sustainability–resilience nexus in tourism', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, **25**(10), 1385-1400.

Fagerberg, J. (2003), 'Schumpeter and the revival of evolutionary economics: an appraisal of the literature', *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, **13**, 125-159.

Farmaki, A. (2015), 'Regional network governance and sustainable tourism', *Tourism Geographies*, **17**(3), 385-407.

Fennell, D.A. and C. Cooper (2020), *Sustainable Tourism: Principles, Contexts and Practices*, Clevedon: Channel View.

Garner, R. (2019), 'Structural Functional Theory', *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*, Wiley Online Library. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781405165518.wbeoss289.pub2> (Accessed: 8 May 2021).

Gregg, J.S., S. Nyborg, M. Hansen, V.J. Schwanitz, A. Wierling, J.P. Zeiss, S., Delvauz, V. Saenz, L. Polo-Alvarez, C. Candelise, W. Gilcrease, O. Arrobbio, A. Sciuollo and D. Padovan (2020), 'Collective action and SI in the energy sector: A mobilization model perspective', *Energies*, **13**(3), 651.

Guia, J. (2018), 'Managing Uncertainties in the Governance of Sustainable Tourism Networks', in D.J. Liburd and D.D. Edwards (eds.), *Collaboration for Sustainable Tourism Development*, Oxford: Goodfellow Publishers, pp. 55 – 76.

Habiyaremye, A., G. Kruss and I. Booyens (2020), 'Innovation for inclusive rural transformation: the role of the state', *Innovation and Development*, **10** (2), 155-168.

Hall, C.M. (2005), 'The Future of Tourism Research', in B.W. Ritchie, P. Burns and C. Palmer (eds.), *Tourism Research Methods: Integrating Theory with Practice*, Wallingford: CABI Publishing, pp. 221-229.

Hall, C.M. (2019), 'Constructing sustainable tourism development: The 2030 agenda and the managerial ecology of sustainable tourism', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, **27**(7), 1044-1060.

Hall, C.M. and A.M. Williams (2020), *Tourism and Innovation*, Second Edition, Abingdon: Routledge.

Hart, T.G.B, K.H. Ramoroka, P.T. Jacobs and B. Letty (2015), 'Revealing the social face of innovation', *South African Journal of Science*, **111**(9/10), 109-114.

Hart, T.G.B., I. Booyens and S. Sinyolo (2020), 'Innovation for Development in South Africa: Experiences with Basic Service Technologies in Distressed Municipalities', *Forum for Development Studies*, **47**(1), 23-47.

Henderson, R.M. and K.B. Clark (1990), 'Architectural innovation: the reconfiguration of the existing product technologies and the failure of established firms', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **35**(1), 9-30.

Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2020), 'Socialising tourism for social and ecological justice after COVID-19', *Tourism Geographies*, **22** (3), 610-623.

Hjalager, A.M. (2002), 'Repairing innovation defectiveness in tourism', *Tourism Management*, **23**, 465-474.

Howlett, M., M. Ramesh and A. Perl (2020), *Studying public policy: Principles and Processes*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ioannides, D., S. Gyimóthy and L. James (2021), 'From liminal labor to decent work: A human-centered perspective on sustainable tourism employment', *Sustainability*, **13**(2), 851.

Işık, C., E.G. Küçükaltan, S. Taş, E. Akoğul, A. Uyrun, T. Hajjiyeva, B. Turan, A.H., Dirbo and E. Bayraktaroğlu (2019), 'Tourism and innovation: A literature review', *Journal of Ekonomi*, **1** (2), 98-154.

Köhler, J., F.W. Geels, F. Kern, J. Markard, E. Onsongo, A. Wieczorek, F. Alkemade, F. Avelino, A. Bergek, F. Boons, L. Fünfschilling, D. Hess, G. Holtz, S. Hyysalo, K. Jenkins, P. Kivimaa, M. Martiskainen, A. McMeekin, M.S. Mühlemeier, B. Nykvist, B. Pel, R. Raven, H. Rohracher, H., Sandén, J. Schot, B. Sovacool, B. Turnheim, D. Welch and P. Wells (2019), 'An agenda for sustainability transitions research: State of the art and future directions', *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, **31**, 1-32.

Loeffler E. and T. Bovaird, (2018), 'From Participation to Co-production: Widening and Deepening the Contributions of Citizens to Public Services and Outcomes', in E. Ongaro and S. van Thiel (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Public Administration and Management in Europe*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 403-423.

López Jerez, M. (2020), 'The rural transformation of the two rice bowls of Vietnam: the making of a new Asian miracle economy?', *Innovation and Development*, **10**(2), 169-186.

Malek, A. and C. Costa (2015), 'Integrating communities into tourism planning through social innovation', *Tourism Planning & Development*, **12**(3), 281-299.

Matiku, S.M., J. Zuwarimwe and J. Tshipala (2021), 'Sustainable tourism planning and management for sustainable livelihoods', *Development Southern Africa*, **38**(4), 524-538,

McCool, S.F and K. Bosak (2015), *Reframing Sustainable Tourism*, Cham: Springer.

Mosedale, J. and F. Voll (2017), 'Social Innovations in Tourism: Social practices contributing to social development', in P.J. Sheldon and R. Daniele (eds.), *Social Entrepreneurship and Tourism: Philosophy and Practice*, Cham: Springer, pp. 101-115.

Moulaert, F. and D. MacCallum (2019), *Advanced introduction to SI*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Nyanjom, J., K. Boxall and J. Slaven (2018), 'Towards inclusive tourism? Stakeholder collaboration in the development of accessible tourism', *Tourism Geographies*, **20**(4), 675-697.

Patnaik, J. and B. Bhowmick (2020), 'Promise of inclusive innovation: A Re-look into the opportunities at the grassroots', *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **259**, 121124.

Phiri, M.Z., N. Molotja, H. Makelane., T. Kupamupindi and C. Ndinda (2016), 'Inclusive innovation and inequality in South Africa: a case for transformative social policy', *Innovation and Development*, **6**(1), 123-139.

Pikkemaat, B., M. Peters and B.F. Bichler (2019), 'Innovation research in tourism: Research streams and actions for the future', *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, **41**, 184-196.

Polese, F., A. Botti, M. Grimaldi, A. Monda and M. Vesce (2018), 'Social innovation in smart tourism ecosystems: How technology and institutions shape sustainable value co-creation', *Sustainability*, **10**(1), 140.

Presenza, A., U. Panniello and A. Messeni Petruzzelli (2021), 'Tourism multi-sided platforms and the social innovation trajectory: The case of Airbnb', *Creativity and Innovation Management*, **30**, 47–62.

Quandt, C., A. Ferraresi, C. Kudlawicz, J. Martins and A. Machado (2017), 'Social innovation practices in the regional tourism industry: Case study of a cooperative in Brazil', *Social Enterprise Journal*, **13**(1), 78-94.

Ramani, S.V. (2020), 'On consortium driven sanitation interventions to end open defecation: insights from an Indian village study', *Innovation and Development*, **10**(2), 245-261.

Rogerson, C.M. (2019), 'In Search of Inclusive Tourism in South Africa: Some Lessons', in J.M. Rogerson and G.E. Visser (eds.), *New Directions in South African Tourism Geographies*, Cham: Springer, pp. 147-165.

Rogerson, C.M. and J. Saarinen (2018), 'Tourism for poverty alleviation: Issues and debates in the global South', in C. Cooper, S. Volo, B. Gartner and N. Scott (eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Tourism Management: Applications of Theories and Concepts to Tourism*, London: Sage, pp.22-47.

Saarinen, J. and C.M. Rogerson (2014), 'Tourism and the millennium development goals: Perspectives beyond 2015', *Tourism Geographies*, **16**(1), 23-30.

Scheyvens, R. and R. Biddulph (2018), 'Inclusive tourism development', *Tourism Geographies*, **20**(4), 589-609.

Schumpeter, J. (1934), *The Theory of Economic Development*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sharpley, R. (2002), 'Tourism: A Vehicle for Development?', in R. Sharpley and D.J. Telfer (eds.), *Tourism and Development: Concepts and Issues*, Clevedon: Channel View, pp. 11-34.

Siakwah, P., R. Musavengane and L. Leonard (2020), 'Tourism governance and attainment of the Sustainable Development Goals in Africa', *Tourism Planning & Development*, **17**(4), 355-383.

Snyman, S. and K.S. Bricker (2019), 'Living on the edge: Benefit-sharing from protected area tourism', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, **27**(6), 705-719.

Solnet, D., D. Nickson, R.N. Robinson, A. Kralj and T. Baum (2014), 'Discourse about workforce development in tourism—An analysis of public policy, planning, and implementation in Australia and Scotland: Hot air or making a difference?', *Tourism Analysis*, **19**(5), 609-623.

Sotarauta, M. (2017), 'An actor-centric bottom-up view of institutions: combinatorial knowledge dynamics through the eyes of institutional entrepreneurs and institutional navigators', *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, **35**(4), 584-599.

Telfer, D.J. (2002), 'The Evolution of Tourism and Development Theory', in R. Sharpley and D.J. Telfer (eds.), *Tourism and Development: Concepts and Issues*, Clevedon: Channel View, pp. 35-78.

Thorbecke E. (2007), 'The Evolution of the Development Doctrine, 1950–2005', in G. Mavrotas and A. Shorrocks (eds.), *Advancing Development: Core Themes in Global Economics*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp 3-36.

UNWTO (United Nations World Tourism Organisation) (1997), *Agenda 21 for the Travel and Tourism Industry*, Madrid: UNWTO.

UNWTO (2015), 'Tourism and the Sustainable Development Goals'. Available at: <https://www.e-unwto.org/doi/pdf/10.18111/9789284417254> (Accessed: 23 September 2020).

Van der Have, R.P. and L. Rubalcaba (2016), 'SI research: An emerging area of innovation studies?', *Research Policy*, **45**(9), 1923-1935.

Voorberg, W.H., V.J. Bekkers and L.G. Tummers (2015), 'A systematic review of co-creation and co-production: Embarking on the SI journey', *Public Management Review*, **17** (9), 1333-1357.

Westley, F. and N. Antadze (2010), 'Making a difference: strategies for scaling SI for greater impact', *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, **15**(2), 3-21.

Xiao, H. and S.J.L. Smith (2006), 'The making of tourism research: insights from a social sciences journal', *Annals of Tourism Research*, **33**(2), 490-507.

Ziegler, R. (2017), 'Social innovation as a collaborative concept', *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, **30**(4), 388-405.