

Transformative service research, service design, and social entrepreneurship: An interdisciplinary framework advancing wellbeing and social impact

Linda Alkire, Assistant Professor of Marketing
Texas State University
601 University Drive
San Marcos, Texas 7866, USA
Phone: (+1) 512-245-3245
Email: linda.alkire@txstate.edu

Christine Mooney, Barsema Professor of Social Entrepreneurship
Northern Illinois University
245M Barsema Hall
DeKalb, IL 60115, USA
Phone: (+1) 815-753-6308
Email: chmooney@niu.edu

Furkan A. Gur, Assistant Professor
Northern Illinois University
245R Barsema Hall
DeKalb, IL 60115, USA
Phone: (+1) 815-753-6232
Email: fgur@niu.edu

Sertan Kabadayi, Professor of Marketing
Gabelli School of Business
Fordham University- Lincoln Center
140 West 62nd street, Suite 446
New York, NY, 10023, USA
Phone: (+1) 212-636-7804
Email: Kabadayi@Fordham.edu

Maija Renko, Professor, Coleman Chair of Entrepreneurship
DePaul University
Driehaus College of Business
1 E Jackson Blvd
Suite 5300
Chicago, IL 60604, USA
Phone: (+1) 312-413-8237
Email: Maija.renko@depaul.edu

Josina Vink, Associate Professor
Oslo School of Architecture and Design
Maridalsveien 29
0175 Oslo, Norway
Phone: (+46) 72-733 53 92
Email: josina.vink@aho.no

Transformative service research, service design, and social entrepreneurship: An interdisciplinary framework advancing wellbeing and social impact

Purpose: The purpose of this paper is to provide an interdisciplinary framework bridging service design and social entrepreneurship with Transformative Service Research (TSR) to create greater synergetic effects to advance wellbeing and drive social impact.

Design/methodology/approach: This research provides an interdisciplinary review and synthesis of literature to establish a basis for a conceptual framework advancing human wellbeing and driving social impact.

Findings: The overarching framework created incorporates various concepts, methods and tools across the three research domains. At the core of the framework is the ultimate goal of *multilevel wellbeing* and *social impact*. The core is subsequently supported by established social entrepreneurship concepts and strategies: *prosocial motivation, hybrid identity, social bricolage, entrepreneurial thinking, community engagement, business model design, and innovative delivery*. The implementation of these concepts could benefit from the methods and tools used in service design, such as: *design probes, service blueprints, appreciative inquiry, contextual interviews, actor maps, sustainable business model canvas, and service prototyping*.

Practical implications: The paper uses the refugee crisis as an illustrative example of how the proposed framework can be put into action by service organizations.

Originality/value: By bridging literature in TSR, service design, and social entrepreneurship, this paper provides service managers with a framework to guide scalable systemic solutions for service organizations interested in advancing human wellbeing and driving social impact.

Keywords: Transformative service research, service design, social entrepreneurship, social impact, wellbeing, service organizations.

Article Classification: Conceptual paper

Transformative service research, service design, and social entrepreneurship: An interdisciplinary framework advancing wellbeing and social impact

Introduction

In today's global world, major environmental, economic, political, and social challenges are abundant and have detrimental effects to the quality of life of many people. These global challenges include poverty, climate change, food insecurity, conflict and violence, as well as education inequalities, to list a few. Globally, over 780 million people live below the poverty line, defined as less than \$1.90 USD per day (United Nations, 2019). This extreme poverty results in major food crises (e.g., 2018 Yemen's Humanitarian Crisis) and healthcare epidemics (e.g., Africa's Ebola epidemic of 2014 – 2016), leading to a systemic deterioration of our human ecosystem (Machlis *et al.*, 1997).

Aksoy and colleagues (2019) argue that the depth and scale of these global challenges cannot be solved by government action alone. They emphasize the role and value of not for profit enterprises as well as for profit organizations seeking to make a social impact. As such, service organizations are at a strategic position to drive social impact. Fundamentally, services are at the center of human interactions as we live and work within service systems, such as families, schools, enterprises, and governments. These service systems affect our interactions and experiences and are vital to the quality of our lives as well as our social wellbeing (Machlis *et al.*, 1997). While many have benefited from various service systems (e.g., education, transportation, healthcare, justice) and associated service organizations (e.g., universities, airlines, hospitals, law firms), others have been excluded or remain unserved. We witness persistent service failures caused by organizational practices such as systemic bias and unfair treatment, disrespect of human dignity

(Kabadayi *et al.*, 2019), ignorance towards and/or abuse of customer vulnerability, marketplace discrimination, and customer captivity, among others (Fisk *et al.*, 2018). This paper builds on Aksoy and colleagues (2018) argument that service organizations have a critical role to play in addressing service system failures and advancing wellbeing and social impact.

Three complementary perspectives, including transformative service research, service design, and social entrepreneurship, have attempted to understand how to create and sustain collective wellbeing and positive social impact. Within the service research field, Transformative Service Research (TSR), emphasizes the role of services as an uplifting force in the wellbeing of actors. Anderson and colleagues (2018) argue that the ability of a service to achieve TSR's illustrative wellbeing outcomes (i.e., access, literacy, decreasing disparity, health, happiness) is highly dependent on how well the service is designed. Service design, a creative, human-centered, and iterative approach to service innovation (Blomkvist *et al.*, 2010, Meroni and Sangiorgi, 2011), has direct influence on actors' individual and collective wellbeing (Vink *et al.*, 2016). As an emerging field, service design, supported by a host of methods and tools, has become more sophisticated, with its ability to address difficult and increasingly complex problems (Fisk *et al.*, 2018). Similarly, social entrepreneurship encompasses the processes, activities, and entities focused on the simultaneous creation of social and economic value (Saebi *et al.*, 2018; Short *et al.*, 2009). Concerned with how business acumen can be leveraged to address the social problems among the marginalized, social entrepreneurship has garnered increased attention within the last decade (Saebi *et al.*, 2018), in large part due to the increasingly complex global challenges confronting the world. Research on social entrepreneurship has explored a variety of topics, including the development of social innovations (Bacq and Janssen, 2011), the context in which

they are developed (Austin *et al.*, 2006), as well as the individuals pursuing social impact (Miller *et al.*, 2012).

Given their collective concern with improving human wellbeing and the complexity of that problem, there is a need for research to bridge TSR, service design, and social entrepreneurship. While TSR is essential for understanding and addressing the identified challenges in today's world, service organization management can benefit from an interdisciplinary approach (Brown *et al.*, 2010). Such an approach would involve the inclusion of intellectual resources from various academic disciplines and traditions in order to develop a "collective understanding of an issue" (Brown *et al.*, 2010, p. 6). In fact, these research areas embrace distinct, yet complementary, perspectives; each has separately contributed to our knowledge in relation to the pursuit of human wellbeing. These research fields vary in maturity and focus, having traditionally focused on different sets of outcomes, actors, and techniques, therefore evolving to recognize different terminologies and strategies. Additionally, there are limitations with each research area, including deficiencies in: design tools and conceptual mechanisms in TSR; organizational understanding and implementation processes in service design research; understanding of the service experience and co-creation of value in social entrepreneurship research. The scope and scale of the problem of improving wellbeing requires such an interdisciplinary approach to help scholars and practitioners alike maximize their social impact. By emphasizing the service side of organizing and design for wellbeing, this paper points researchers in social entrepreneurship to the centrality of service in impacting wellbeing and direct their attention to inclusion of service design and delivery in enterprise models for social impact. By introducing constructs and frameworks from social entrepreneurship and service design to TSR researchers, this paper offers tools to apply in order to better understand how services can achieve greater wellbeing and social impact.

Accordingly, this paper proposes incorporating TSR, service design, and social entrepreneurship in an interdisciplinary framework given their individual contributions to our knowledge of the pursuit of human wellbeing. The interdisciplinary framework is centered around the role of services in advancing wellbeing and social impact (TSR inspiration), by using established managerial concepts (Social Entrepreneurship) aimed at co-creating solutions through Service Design methods and tools. The aim of the framework, therefore, is to inform service researchers and organizations about the various concepts, methods and tools across these research domains that could be used to advance wellbeing and drive social impact. As such, by bridging literatures in TSR, service design, and social entrepreneurship, this paper contributes to the literature by triggering a dialogue aimed at catalyzing: (1) the development of all three disciplines by using the logic from each to address the limitations of the others, (2) scalable systemic solutions for service organizations interested in making a social impact, and (3) action based managerial and societal implications.

The paper begins with a review and comparison of the extant research on TSR, service design, and social entrepreneurship. This is followed by a framework for guiding service researchers and organizations in their efforts to advance human wellbeing and social impact. The paper continues with a discussion of the refugee crisis as a case example of how the proposed framework can be put into action by service organizations. It concludes with suggestions of opportunities for interdisciplinary research and practice.

Literature Review

Transformative Service Research

Based on the premise that services fundamentally affect human lives and wellbeing (Anderson and Ostrom, 2015), TSR was introduced as service research that seeks to improve wellbeing by

uplifting individuals, collectives, and ecosystems (Anderson *et al.*, 2013; Ostrom *et al.*, 2010). Since we as humans are embedded in and surrounded by service systems (Fisk *et al.*, 2016a), the TSR framework stresses the fundamental role of service and service systems in affecting our wellbeing (Ostrom *et al.*, 2014). It proposes that individual and societal wellbeing can be improved through the interaction between service entities (e.g., service employees, service processes or offerings, organizations or service sectors) and consumer entities (e.g., individuals, collectives, the ecosystem) by affecting the wellbeing outcomes of both (Anderson *et al.*, 2013). As such, TSR uses tools and concepts from service research to address service social issues (Gustafson *et al.*, 2015).

The distinguishing aspect of TSR from other service research is the outcomes that it investigates and emphasizes. While traditional service research often includes outcome measures, such as customer satisfaction, loyalty, and financial outcomes, TSR focuses on understanding the broader role services play in improving wellbeing related outcomes like health, literacy, access, and happiness, among others (Rosenbaum *et al.*, 2011). Furthermore, TSR encourages researchers to explore critical issues, such as social justice, equality, and service inclusion (Fisk *et al.*, 2018), through interdisciplinary research as these issues necessitate an investigation of wellbeing from many different angles rather than through a single perspective (Anderson and Ostrom, 2015).

Despite the quick success of TSR in attracting service academics and gaining traction in service journals and conferences, TSR can be enriched through further practical applications and exposure to fields beyond service research. First, most of the TSR explores individual (micro-level) wellbeing, such as consumer wellbeing (e.g., Tang *et al.*, 2016), patient wellbeing (e.g., Yao *et al.*, 2015), and employee wellbeing (Nasr *et al.*, 2015). As argued by Rosenbaum and colleagues (2011), “TSR needs to involve both individual and collective level issues and include analyses of

micro and macro outcomes of services” (p. 5). Second, existing TSR work is largely conceptual in nature. For example, service inclusion (Fisk *et al.*, 2018) and financial wellbeing (Brüger *et al.*, 2017) concepts have been developed without empirical examination. Therefore, while TSR related work to date has laid a strong conceptual foundation, there is a need for bridging the conceptual work done in TSR with more practical applications. Similarly, even though the role of service researchers and organizations in advancing wellbeing has been acknowledged (Fisk *et al.*, 2016b; Aksoy *et al.*, 2018), limited application guidelines for service organizations have been proposed. For this purpose, TSR could be enriched by perspectives that provide mechanisms and tools to achieve its outcome.

Service Design

Service design is a human-centered, creative, and iterative approach to service innovation (Blomkvist *et al.*, 2010; Meroni and Sangiorgi, 2011). It was first introduced into the service research field in Shostack’s (1982) pioneering work on service blueprinting – a practical tool for identifying and addressing problems in service operations. In this early work, service design was understood as a way of improving the monetary value and overall profitability of services (Shostack, 1984). However, service design quickly evolved to focus on ways of improving the customer experience, with attention to the backstage processes needed to make this happen (Bitner *et al.*, 2008).

Over the last decade, there has been a growing awareness that service design is not just applicable to the design of services, as in intangible market offerings, but can be used as a creative approach to the development of new forms of value co-creation more broadly (Kimbell, 2011). A plethora of service design methods and tools have been developed to enhance the quality of service

experiences from the customer perspective, such as service prototyping (Blomkvist and Holmlid, 2012), service walkthroughs (Blomkvist and Bode, 2012), and experience rooms (Edvardsson *et al.*, 2010). There has also been growing recognition of the need to better incorporate the context of service systems within service design efforts (Stuart, 1998). Acknowledging complex service ecosystems in service design has facilitated a shift toward balanced centrality that supports the multiplicity of needs of both service provider and customer networks (Patrício *et al.*, 2018a).

In this way, service design is increasingly viewed as “a means of harnessing latent creativity and enabling social innovation in organizations and communities to address entrenched issues and effect change for the social and public good” (Akama, 2015, p. 163). There are many examples where service design is being put into action to catalyze social change. In one example in Vancouver, Canada, InWithForward did in-depth ethnographic research to understand the lives of adults with developmental disabilities. They then partnered with a number of local non-profit organizations serving adults with developmental disabilities in a co-design process to prototype new ways of working and test out new offerings. One key result of the service design process was the development of a new community learning platform, called Kudoz, that connects adults with developmental disabilities to volunteer hosts through an online catalogue to facilitate novel learning experiences that build capabilities and social connection.

However, as service design moves into the spaces of social change, there are calls for service design to learn from established theories and principles regarding organizational and social change to better support social transformation (Sangiorgi, 2011). There remain concerns about service design’s lack of organizational understanding and inability to drive implementation (Overkamp and Holmlid, 2016; Stuart, 1998); as such, to support social change, close collaboration with other disciplines is needed (Hillgren *et al.*, 2011). In this way, combining service design with

insights from social entrepreneurship can enhance the applicability and promise of service organization for realizing social impact.

Social Entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneurship refers to any innovative activity or process intending to create social value either by creating new businesses or redirecting existing businesses (Saebi *et al.*, 2018; Zahra *et al.*, 2009). This paper builds on the understanding that SE is “the process of launching a hybrid organizational form that creates social value through market-based methods” (Miller *et al.*, 2012), where the creation of “new ventures or managing existing organizations in an innovative manner” (Zahra *et al.*, 2009, p. 519) delineates SE from other forms of prosocial or change-driven activities. The practice and policy domains of social entrepreneurship have been gaining recognition particularly in the last decade, after Mohammad Yunus won the Nobel Peace Prize for his work on microfinance in 2006. In 1976, Yunus, a pioneer in microfinance, established one of the world’s best-known social enterprises, the Grameen Bank. By allowing the poorest of the poor access to small loans, the promise of microfinance is based on the belief that disadvantaged people will be able to move upward on the social ladder through entrepreneurial pursuits (Yunus *et al.*, 2010). This example is a good illustration of why social enterprise has been gaining widespread support across economic, governmental, and social sectors. By addressing social issues, social enterprise is more communal and less profit-focused than purely commercial business, yet by attending to the financial sustainability of the operations, it is aligned with a capitalistic world view of entrepreneurial organizing.

For social enterprises, socially responsible practices are a core part of the mission and values (Certo and Miller, 2008). While the word “enterprise” typically refers to a start-up or a

small firm, the mature firms that arise from these socially responsible ventures typically continue to have furthering social good at the core of their mission. Compared to traditional organizational forms, such as for-profit service companies, or traditional non-profits in the service sector, social enterprises demonstrate unique characteristics by borrowing features from both traditional non-profit and for-profit businesses (Austin *et al.*, 2006). Social enterprises are often more aligned with markets and their needs than traditional non-profits as they not only focus on social value but also on economic value and financial sustainability through earned income. Social enterprises are characterized by a simultaneous focus on pursuing economic and social value, seeking to benefit communities that are often not considered feasible target segments for traditional enterprises due to their limited resources (Di Domenico *et al.*, 2010).

Compared to traditional, commercial companies, social impact creation is central to the very existence of social enterprises. More often than not, this social impact is created to serve one or more traditionally disadvantaged groups in society and is evident in the enterprise's mission-related impact (Dees, 1998). Faced with the failure of both markets and governments to address the needs of the vulnerable and the disadvantaged, social entrepreneurs become passionate about the needs of a particular group, or the characteristics of a particular problem, and develop solutions for such groups and problems. As a result, most activities of social entrepreneurs are directed towards offering services, products, and solutions to disadvantaged segments of the population, such as people with low income, people with disabilities, those experiencing long-term unemployment, discrimination, or homelessness, and others who are socially excluded (Seelos and Mair, 2005). Offering solutions to these major social problems with limited resources requires resourcefulness and innovativeness (Miller *et al.*, 2012).

Tensions often emerge from attending to both social and financial performance, making conflicts regarding resource allocation, organizational identity, and stakeholder accountability common (Battilana and Dorado, 2010; Conger *et al.*, 2018; Moss *et al.*, 2011; Pache and Santos, 2013). Embedded in these streams of research is an understanding that the goals of social enterprises are complex, but always social impact focused, and that serving the chosen beneficiaries can be a highly challenging process, where elements of service delivery can make or break the intended impact. Given the centrality of service in the social enterprise domain, it is clear that research in this area can benefit from the theoretical logic underlying TSR. Simultaneously, both social enterprise practitioners and researchers need tools to understand the experiences of various key actors (beneficiaries, customers, end users) to enable social impact. This is where methods and tools from service design are highly salient. Table 1 includes a comparison of TSR, service design, and social entrepreneurship research, including the similarities and differences among various dimensions.

Insert Table 1 about here

An Interdisciplinary Framework

This section outlines an interdisciplinary framework merging key concepts from the TSR, service design, and social entrepreneurship literatures to develop a holistic framework for understanding multilevel wellbeing (Ostrom *et al.*, 2010) and social impact (Saebi *et al.*, 2018) (Figure 1). At the core of the framework is the ultimate goal that needs to be achieved; referred to as *multilevel wellbeing* in TSR, including the wellbeing of individuals and collectives (Ostrom *et al.*, 2010), and

social impact in social entrepreneurship (Saebi *et al.*, 2018). Social entrepreneurship research has studied important concepts that organizations can focus on with the objective of creating social impact. Among these concepts, some are especially promising as they are well-established and essential to social entrepreneurship (Saebi *et al.*, 2018) and could expand the practical application of TSR. These concepts include: *prosocial motivation*, *hybrid identity*, *social bricolage*, *entrepreneurial thinking*, *community engagement*, *business model design*, and *innovative delivery*. Furthermore, the implementation of these concepts in service organizations would benefit from the practical methods and tools used in the service design approach. Among these methods and tools, *design probes*, *service blueprints*, *appreciative inquiry*, *contextual interviews*, *actor maps*, *sustainable business model canvas*, and *service prototyping* may prove to be especially useful for service researchers and organizations. While many service design methods may be applicable to the pursuit of multilevel wellbeing and social impact, these eight were chosen as exemplars due to their alignment with the critical concepts from social entrepreneurship. In other words, concepts from the social entrepreneurship literature can be bundled with service design methods and tools to be implemented in service organizations to achieve the broad organizational objectives of wellbeing and social impact. In the pursuit of these goals, service organizations are operating within boundary conditions (Busse *et al.*, 2017), or the elements within the environment that can enable or hinder their progress, and, hence, describe the limits of generalizability of our model (Whetten, 1989). The framework built in this paper accounts for the conditions, including socio-cultural and technological factors, that may change or limit the efficacy of our identified mechanisms to influence wellbeing and social impact (Busse *et al.*, 2017). The sections that follow delineate each of these important elements of the interdisciplinary framework that bridges disciplines.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Figure 1. Interdisciplinary framework for advancing multi-level wellbeing and social impact

Multilevel Wellbeing and Social Impact

At the core of TSR is the goal of uplifting wellbeing through service. There are traditionally two types of wellbeing, eudemonic and hedonic, encompassed within this overall goal. Eudemonic wellbeing describes and emphasizes the realization of someone's potential (Ryff and Singer, 2008). Haybron (2008) labels its content as "human flourishing", which improves the quality of life. This definition is consistent with Sen's (2005) conceptualization of quality of life as the development of human capabilities and freedom. In the context of TSR, eudemonic wellbeing is applied at the individual and collective levels, and includes outcomes like access to services, literacy, better decision making, health, decreasing health and wellbeing disparities, consumer involvement, harmony, power, respect, support, and social networks (Anderson *et al.*, 2013; Kuppelwieser and Finsterwalder, 2016). Hedonic wellbeing, on the other hand, relates to maintaining individual and collective happiness and defines wellbeing in terms of pleasure attainment and pain avoidance (Ryan and Deci, 2001).

Recently, there has been a call for expansion of the scope of TSR outcomes beyond wellbeing and for further delineation regarding the concept of wellbeing. Research suggests that focusing on *improving* wellbeing is not enough as it assumes that some level of wellbeing is already present, and that wellbeing can simply be enhanced through services (Fisk *et al.*, 2016a). However, in reality, millions of people suffer and live in poverty and extreme conditions where

they lack access to the most vital services. Therefore, it has been suggested that instead of solely focusing on “uplifting wellbeing”, there is a profound need to include the idea of “relieving suffering” in TSR’s definition and scope of work (Nasr and Fisk, 2019). Similarly, since every human is worthy of being served fairly and properly (Fisk *et al.*, 2016a), service inclusion has been proposed as another topic that needs to be addressed by TSR as a mean to achieve multilevel wellbeing (Fisk *et al.*, 2018). Service inclusion is defined as an “egalitarian system that provides customers (e.g., consumers, clients, patrons, citizens, patients, and guests) with fair access to a service, fair treatment during a service and fair opportunity to exit a service” (p. 835). With this definition, the authors position service inclusion as a global service system standard for service relationships and interactions. Investigation of how to increase service inclusion could help improve multilevel wellbeing and reduce the suffering of individuals and communities. Therefore, in addition to relieving suffering, the three pillars of service inclusion, i.e. enabling opportunity, offering choice, and fostering happiness, as identified by Fisk *et al.* (2018), broaden our understanding of multilevel wellbeing within TSR.

While there has been extant research on positive and individual level wellbeing outcomes, there is a paucity of research focused on unintended and collective level outcomes (Anderson and Ostrom, 2015). TSR research has predominantly focused on the individual level while acknowledging the impact of service on the collective and community levels. In conclusion, any effort that addresses human wellbeing, and seeks lasting social impact, should focus not only on improving multilevel wellbeing, but also on reducing suffering while being inclusive.

Similar to TSR, social entrepreneurship is concerned with societal wellbeing, or the social value created for disadvantaged individuals by an organization’s actions (Martin and Osberg, 2007). More specifically, social entrepreneurship focuses on how market-based approaches can be

used to address social problems and lead to positive social change (Stephan *et al.*, 2016). This positive social change results from unique solutions that are simultaneously effective, efficient, and sustainable (Phills *et al.*, 2008). In other words, social enterprises are concerned with utilizing efficient and effective approaches in the pursuit of societal wellbeing in order to ensure both financial feasibility of the organization as well as positive social impact for society. Though financial sustainability is a key component of social enterprise, social entrepreneurship is centrally concerned with how enterprises positively impact the individual and societal wellbeing of marginalized individuals.

Social Entrepreneurship and Service Design

To help service organizations achieve multilevel wellbeing and social impact, this paper focuses on identifying relevant concepts listed in a recent review on social entrepreneurship (Saebi *et al.*, 2018) with the most potential to contribute to enriching service research and practice, including *prosocial motivation, hybrid identity, social bricolage, entrepreneurial thinking, community engagement, business model design, and innovative delivery*. These concepts are then complemented by practical service design methods and tools, including *design probes, service blueprints, appreciative inquiry, contextual interviews, actor maps, sustainable business model* and *service prototyping*. While these concepts and methods are not comprehensive, they are some of the most promising and relevant for the pursuit of the overall aim for social organizations.

Prosocial Motivation. The concept of *prosocial motivation*, or the desire to make a positive impact on other people without personal gain (Grant, 2007), developed from the need to understand why some individuals help others. Research suggests that the motivation to act for the good of others is driven by both altruistic attributes (Batson and Shaw, 1991), such as compassion

(Miller *et al.*, 2012) and empathy (Bacq and Alt, 2018), and communal mechanisms, such as a sense of social worth (Grant and Gino, 2010). Individual dispositions (Wrzesniewski *et al.*, 1997) and orientations (Vos and van der Zee, 2011) are related to the propensity to engage in prosocial behavior. Prosocial motivation is considered an inherently social attribute that encompasses a person's or organization's interactions with and perspectives about the intended beneficiaries, or the people who benefit from the social good (Grant, 2007). Prosocial motivation has been linked to many outcomes, including persistence (Grant, 2008), propensity to and perception of trust (Grant and Sumanth, 2009), individual performance and productivity (Grant, 2008; Grant and Sumanth, 2009), perspective taking, and citizenship behavior (Cardador and Wrzesniewski, 2015).

Research exploring prosocial motivation within entrepreneurship has tended to focus on social venturing (see Branzei *et al.*, 2018 for a review), given its central aim is to restore wellbeing (Wiklund *et al.*, 2018). Scholars suggest that compassion, a prosocial motivator, (Miller *et al.*, 2012) and empathy are key drivers of social entrepreneurial intentions (Bacq and Alt, 2018). In some cases, scholars have uncovered a paradoxical relationship between prosocial motives and positive social impact including prosocial motivation leading to a decrease in “socio emotional return” (McMullen and Bergman, 2017) and decreases in the probability of new venture formation (Renko, 2013). This research suggests possible negative, or unintended, consequences of prosocial motivation for social ventures.

Service design offers different ways of supporting prosocial motivation in individuals and organizations. In particular, service design is recognized as a promising approach to cultivating empathy and enhancing actors' connection to the intended beneficiaries of a service organization (New and Kimbell, 2013). There are a variety of service design methods that can be employed to elicit empathy including: observation (Leonard and Rayport, 1997) – where actors shadow others

to better understand aspects to their daily life in context; experience prototyping (Buchenau and Suri, 2000) – where actors gain a firsthand understanding of existing or future experiences by engaging with representations of that experience; design probes (Mattelmäki, 2006) – where actors self-document their personal context and perceptions through diaries or photography; and role-playing games (Kaario *et al.*, 2009) – where actors act out different experiences, including the experiences of others. These methods can help service organizations build an understanding of the experiences and context of their beneficiaries. As there are risks associated with an over-emphasis on empathy within service design, there is also recognition of the need to integrate lived experience – the direct, first-hand perception of a relevant situation, condition, or identity in an everyday context – by involving beneficiaries directly in the service design process to reduce assumptions and biased interpretations (Vink and Oertzen, 2018). Combining service design methods that support the development of empathy and integration of lived experience can help to cultivate the prosocial motivation necessary in social organizations and mitigate some of the possible unintended consequences.

Hybrid Identity. Social entrepreneurs pursue a blended value approach in that they simultaneously focus on creating social and/or environmental good, while creating financial value for the organization and its related actors. This dual approach demands the employment of a hybrid model simultaneously engaging both positive social and/or environmental impact and profit maximization (McMullen and Warnick, 2016). As a result, hybrid organizations differ from traditional commercial enterprises or social sector organizations, incorporating objectives and goals that reflect both social welfare and market efficiency (Battilana and Lee, 2014). This shared value approach is interwoven in the mission or purpose of the company, guiding all aspects of organizational decision making, including setting priorities (Grimes *et al.*, 2013).

The integration of social impact and profit maximization in the hybrid model introduces unique challenges. For example, the assimilation of diverse and possibly conflicting identities may create internal conflicts (Battilana and Dorado, 2010), as employees might be prone to identify with either the social or commercial goals (Miller *et al.*, 2012). Combining market-driven and charity-driven aspects may also present external challenges, as the hybrid structure may confuse external actors, thereby reducing organizational legitimacy and financial support (Moss *et al.*, 2018). Despite these challenges, there are some benefits to the hybrid model, including the “creative tension” that arises from competing logics (Battilana *et al.*, 2015). Additionally, new organizational forms (e.g., Benefit Corporation and B-corp certification) have emerged that more effectively reflect the hybrid nature of social enterprises (Conger *et al.*, 2018).

Service design can be a driver to support the transformation of the logics of service organizations. Such a transformation is often necessary when blending social/environmental values and financial considerations. One popular service design method that can help to unpack the implications and tensions of a hybrid identity is the service blueprint. Service blueprinting involves mapping out both the customer journey and the back-end components of a service (Shostack, 1982; 1984). This process of mapping out the current and/or future customer experience can help to identify opportunities for bringing social values to life through interactions with customers. Furthermore, the detailing of the backstage processes of a service can help organizations to understand issues around the feasibility of a particular service or approach. Involving stakeholders of a service organization in a participatory approach to service blueprinting (Bitner *et al.*, 2008) can create space for different actors, who do not necessarily agree, to come together to reveal dilemmas and make them more tangible (Hillgren *et al.*, 2011). This approach visualizes some of the competing needs and values that need to be designed for when dealing with

a hybrid identity in service organizations. By engaging with service design methods, such as the service blueprint, actors can gradually work to change the language, symbols, and practices associated with different organizational logics (Kurtmollaiev *et al.*, 2018). This process, for example, may allow a social enterprise to create an improved service experience, as the organization can develop a cohesive organizational identity while also leveraging the creative tension necessary to drive effective social innovations.

Social Bricolage. Resource management and utilization are at the center of any organization's success (Barney, 1991; Wernerfelt, 1984). Bricolage or resourcefulness is a central entrepreneurial trait as entrepreneurs almost always operate under extreme uncertainty and limited resources (Baker and Nelson, 2005). Hence, successful entrepreneurs are considered bricoleurs who excel in making do with whatever resources they have (Welter *et al.*, 2016). Social entrepreneurs especially need to be adept bricoleurs given that they are tackling large (social) issues in difficult institutional environments (Desa, 2012) with limited resources (Di Domenico *et al.*, 2010).

While somewhat similar to its use in commercial entrepreneurship, Bricolage should be contextualized in social entrepreneurship given its unique characteristics. Most importantly, while commercial entrepreneurs search for markets with opportunities and ample resources, social entrepreneurs intentionally focus on markets and communities traditionally characterized by resource limitations (Di Domenico *et al.*, 2010). Thus, the key characteristics of social bricoleurs involve making do with available resources, refusing to be limited by resource constraints, improvising and innovating for the creation and utilization of resources, as well as engaging and persuading stakeholders and other key actors of the community to secure new resources (Di Domenico *et al.*, 2010). For example, Dacin and colleagues (2010) refer to local farmers involved

in LocalFeed in Africa (a social enterprise focusing on providing high quality animal feed to increase the efficiency of their small land) as social bricoleurs as they utilize their limited knowledge and resources to create social value (e.g., leveraging idiosyncratic, local knowledge to identify new opportunities) (Zahra *et al.*, 2009). Similarly, Fairtrasa brings marginalized smallholder farmers into the global food supply chain by utilizing their local knowledge and expertise.

Recognizing the need for resourcefulness in a variety of contexts, service design offers creative ways of working with limited resources to achieve social purposes. In service design, resource limitations become creative constraints that can inspire innovative solutions. A number of service design methods are particularly honed to enable creativity and insight development amid resource limitations, such as guerilla ethnography (e.g., going out and connecting with people on the street), low fidelity prototyping (i.e. simulating function but not the aesthetics of a solution), and bodystorming (i.e. acting as though a service would exist) (Curedale, 2013). While service design is often associated with a problem-solving orientation, it can also adopt an “appreciative inquiry” approach that focuses on recognizing and leveraging the assets of an existing situation (Junginger and Sangiorgi, 2009). By mapping the existing resources, service design can support service organizations in developing contextual, strength-based approaches to realize the social impact amid resource constraints. Using an appreciative inquiry approach may increase the capacity for social bricolage, as it provides systematic tools for a social entrepreneur to identify and leverage potential resources. As social entrepreneurs become more comfortable as social bricoleurs, they may become more effective at readily identifying potential resources and building on these local resources to achieve the social mandate of their organization.

Entrepreneurial Thinking/Opportunity Mindset. An entrepreneurial, or opportunity-seeking mindset, is another critical resource leveraged by traditional entrepreneurs and social entrepreneurs alike. An entrepreneurial mindset, or “a growth-oriented perspective through which individuals promote flexibility, creativity, continuous innovation and renewal” (Ireland *et al.*, 2003, p. 968), allows individuals to engage in a flexible and self-regulating awareness and understanding under conditions of dynamism and uncertainty (Haynie *et al.*, 2010). This flexible and dynamic thinking impacts the entrepreneurial decision-making process (Shepherd *et al.*, 2015), enabling individuals to engage in strategic entrepreneurial behavior (e.g., identifying opportunities before full information is known, leveraging a flexible attitude with regards to uncertainty, and developing a comprehensive frame for entrepreneurial decision-making) (Ireland *et al.*, 2003)). Extant research reveals that entrepreneurial thinking is positively linked to creative thinking (Davis *et al.*, 2016) and entrepreneurial intentions (Pfeifer *et al.*, 2016).

Aligned with the entrepreneurial or opportunity mindset, service design offers an iterative and creative approach that supports the growth and evolution of actors’ mindsets. In particular, service design methods contribute to perspective change by helping actors tap into their senses and challenge their own assumptions (Wetter-Edman *et al.*, 2018). In doing so, service design can help to expose actors’ mental models, their assumptions about how a system works, help actors understand other possible mental models, and embody alternative mental models to support a process of ongoing adaptation (Vink *et al.*, 2019). Service design tools can act as instruments of inquiry that guide and open up actors’ perspective of particular problems and solutions (Dalsgaard, 2017). They can help to facilitate a process of reflecting on and in action and engaging in a conversation with a particular situation of interest (Schön, 1983). For example, by doing a contextual interview of a beneficiary, a social entrepreneur may challenge some of the initial

assumptions they had about a particular situation and recognize their own blind spots, enabling them to adopt a more flexible mindset with regards to possible solutions and entrepreneurial options.

Community Engagement. Service ecosystems is a growing area in service management research (e.g., Barile *et al.*, 2016; Jonas *et al.*, 2018), but more research is needed to understand the community structure of service ecosystems. Accordingly, another key area where social entrepreneurship can provide insights for the service organization involves community engagement in the pursuit of creating social value. Communities are “a complex web of relationships between a set of individuals who share values, norms, meanings, history, and identity” separated by “their culture, groups, and places” (Shepherd and Patzelt, 2011, p. 139).

Social entrepreneurship is a key approach for building, rebuilding, improving, and growing social communities (Thompson and Alvy, 2000). Moreover, social communities in an ecosystem are central to a social enterprise’s success as the community can often serve as a key means to secure necessary resources (Di Domenico *et al.*, 2010). In fact, community participation is considered to be key for successful social enterprises (Zahra *et al.*, 2009). Accordingly, social enterprises create mechanisms through which the entire community is engaged in identifying often neglected social issues in their own community as well as co-creating and implementing solutions to these problems (Santos, 2012).

The importance of community engagement is exemplified by a non-governmental social enterprise called Gram Vikas, focusing on tackling major social issues in rural India and Africa. Gram Vikas trains villagers in India on various simple infrastructure mechanisms for sanitation. Villagers, in turn, commit to sanitation by providing the necessary labor as well as providing necessary funds for the maintenance and long-term sustainability of this sanitation system. In

doing so, the entire community is engaged in creating, implementing, and assuring the sustainability of a solution for a major problem of their community (Santos, 2012).

Moreover, social entrepreneurship research suggests a wide use of partnerships and collaborations with for-profit corporations (Di Domenico *et al.*, 2009), governments, and other institutions (Sud *et al.*, 2009). For instance, Ansari and colleagues (2012) develop a more socially embedded and community-focused approach to the base-of-the pyramid (BOP), one that is co-created within the community with the support of various actors who eventually affect and shape communities. Thus, community-orientation and mobilization can be considered as further evidence for the social entrepreneurs' role as bricoleurs.

Service design can be employed as an approach to building engagement among community actors. First, service design involves methods for supporting the identification of diverse actors and their relations within a service ecosystem. This can be done through the creation of an actor network map that visually represents the network of actors associated with a service (Patrício *et al.*, 2018). Furthermore, at the heart of service design is the participatory approach of co-design that involves partnering with diverse actors within the design process (Steen *et al.*, 2011). Co-design can involve a one-time co-creation workshop with actors or collective creativity across the whole design process (Sanders and Stappers, 2008). Involving community actors through co-design has documented benefits including enhancing the benefit of beneficiaries and increasing the novelty of developed concepts (Trischler *et al.*, 2018). Service design research also suggests a number of benefits from co-design related to wellbeing for end beneficiaries, including enhanced satisfaction and empowerment, and for service organizations, including greater levels of creativity among staff and better relationships (Steen *et al.*, 2011; Vink *et al.*, 2016).

Business Model Design. Business models are a central construct to understanding *how* organizations, such as social enterprises and service organizations, can add value to society by creating significant and sustainable change. The example of the Grameen Bank and microfinance, mentioned earlier, shows how a new business model (microlending) can profoundly impact the poor microentrepreneurs' lives. By offering loans to the previously "unbankable poor", microlending was organized differently from traditional banking with its focus on women borrowers, borrowing to groups instead of individuals, and making loans that were a fraction of the size of traditional bank loans (Yunus *et al.*, 2010). As such, the Grameen Bank and other microfinance organizations illustrate the definition of a business model as "the content, structure, and governance of transactions designed so as to create value through the exploitation of business opportunities" (Amit and Zott, 2001, p. 511), and, increasingly, through the exploitation of opportunities to create social value (Martí, 2018; Seelos and Mair, 2005). More generally, the business model is a "system that is made up of components, linkages between the components, and dynamics" (Afuah and Tucci, 2000, p. 4), where the end result is the creation of value for the customer (Chesbrough and Rosenbloom, 2002).

Not surprisingly, therefore, business models have become an important topic of study for both entrepreneurship and service design scholars, who are generally interested in value creation as an outcome of business operations (Demil *et al.*, 2015; Stickdorn *et al.*, 2018; Prendeville and Bocken, 2017). Service design can leverage different approaches to visualizing business models that integrate environmental and social impacts within the business model canvas, such as the sustainable business model (e.g., Upward and Jones, 2016). Such alternative approaches can be used in a service design process to work through a service organization's business model while incorporating multilevel wellbeing as a key goal.

In social entrepreneurship, firms straddle the space between government and private sector to find new ways to create societal wealth (e.g., Martí, 2018; MacMillan and Thompson, 2013). In this process, the buy-in from key actors, such as customers and beneficiaries, is essential (MacMillan and Thompson, 2013), and business models take key actors into account by referring to the customer value proposition (e.g., Chesbrough and Rosenbloom, 2002) or by including customers and beneficiaries as actors in the firm's value creation system (e.g., Amit and Zott, 2001).

Business model design offers a link between service design, TSR, and social entrepreneurship, in that it brings to light the common, underlying assumption in each area: customers and beneficiaries are not passive recipients, and are more than consumers of firms' products and services (Martí, 2018; Seelos and Mair, 2005; Fisk *et al.*, 2018, Patrício *et al.*, 2018). Instead, they are increasingly involved in the generation and delivery of the value—be it social or financial—that is co-created with them (Prahalad and Ramaswamy, 2004). In microfinance, for example, the microentrepreneurs' actions and insight of local markets are essential for their ability to use the funds they are provided with to further the success and long-term sustainability of their enterprises, leading to poverty reduction. While entrepreneurship research has often focused on the emergence and cognitive origins of new business models (e.g., Martins *et al.*, 2015), having the customer as a central anchor for these models aligns with the main tenet of the design literature (Kelley, Littman, and Peters, 2001; Zott and Amit, 2015). Students of both service design and social entrepreneurship often use the same visual tools, such as the business model canvas, to understand the interconnections in the model that creates value for the customer and/or social value (e.g., Osterwalder and Pigneur, 2010).

Social enterprises employ a variety of business models to deliver social value, including: engaging in open hiring - directly employing, or training for employment, those coming from disadvantages backgrounds, such as the homeless or the formerly incarcerated (Bloom and Chatterji, 2009); facilitating market access to products or services for those coming from disadvantaged backgrounds (Mair and Marti, 2009); providing access to products or services otherwise unavailable to disadvantaged groups (Yunus *et al.*, 2010) and adopting a donation model, such as the buy-one-give-one model popularized by Tom's Shoes (Binkley, 2010) to support social impact. For example, fair trade organizations aim to provide living wages to farmers in developing nations, while also facilitating the distribution of their products to markets in the Western world. These are just some examples of the commonly used social enterprise business models, and numerous others exist and are being developed in the field (Renko and Freeman, forthcoming). Exploration of sustainable business models can help enhance social responsibility while maintaining or improving financial stability. The process of business modeling provides a platform to engage with the appropriate beneficiaries and other stakeholders to collectively consider how they may be integrated into the business model. By quickly sketching out different iterations of business models, social entrepreneurs can evaluate alternatives and more quickly develop innovative and effective business models to achieve social good.

Innovative Delivery. Developing novel solutions for social problems and delivering them in innovative ways is at the heart of social entrepreneurship and is a key differentiator of social enterprises from traditional non-profits as their innovativeness helps them create sustainable businesses in the long-term (Peredo and McLean, 2006; Santos, 2012). Accordingly, while there are many definitions of social entrepreneurship, with great diversity among them, innovative

solutions or innovative delivery of these solutions have been a shared feature for the majority of these definitions (Dacin *et al.*, 2010; Saebi *et al.*, 2018; Zahra *et al.*, 2009).

An example of an innovative solution to a social problem is Biolite (a socially focused outdoor and off-grid energy company) which developed an innovative device that utilizes thermoelectric technology to make wood-burning stoves cleaner and safer in addition to the extra capabilities, such as a charger for cell phones or other accessories (Muralidharan *et al.*, 2015). The key here is that the innovation in social entrepreneurship is not only about the creation of innovative solutions for social problems, but also is about the innovative delivery of these solutions (Belinda and Chu, 2013). Working with microfinance institutions, for example, Kiva (a San Francisco based non-profit focusing on creating financing opportunities for underserved communities) created a new pipeline of funding for people who are marginalized. Through their online platform, Kiva provides individuals the opportunity to lend money, as little as \$25, directly to poor entrepreneurs. This innovative delivery method provides these entrepreneurs improved and more direct access to capital.

To support the development of innovative solutions, service design offers a host of approaches that service researchers and organizations can employ. One of the most important approaches in service design to support iteration around innovative solutions is service prototyping (Blomkvist and Holmlid, 2010). Service prototypes create a representation of a future state to understand how an existing situation can be transformed into a new one (Blomkvist, 2012). One way of prototyping involves doing service walkthroughs where actors move through the different touchpoints of a service, often using roleplay to better understand the general experience holistically and make changes (Blomkvist *et al.*, 2012). By representing the design of a service before the final solution exists and testing it out to appreciate the experience of the beneficiary,

prototyping can help to support the process of solution development and refinement (Buchenau and Suri, 2000). Prototyping also allows social entrepreneurs to experiment with multiple potential solutions to better understand what is most effective within a given context before making significant investments.

Boundary Conditions

This paper outlines a number of ideas on how to combine social enterprise and service design elements in pursuit of the wellbeing goals of TSR. However, not all of these ideas will work equally well in every service context; boundary conditions are also important considerations when exploring human wellbeing. This section elaborates on some key boundary conditions of the presented theoretical ideas (Whetten, 1989), addressing the issue of generalizability of the model across contexts (Busse *et al.*, 2017). For the framework outlined above, the role of socio-cultural and technological environments can be paramount as they may constrain service organizations from enacting the social enterprise and service design components of the framework.

A salient condition for whether service organizations can feasibly pursue wellbeing goals, in the first place, is presented by their socio-cultural environment: the beliefs, customs, practices, and behaviors of a society in which the organization operates (Thornton *et al.*, 2011). As an example, while access to education is widely acknowledged as a valuable wellbeing goal, *the socio-cultural* context of a service organization may limit the extent to which education can be provided to certain demographic groups, such as women. Relatedly, socio-cultural norms, including the social networks and cultural beliefs of the key stakeholders, such as founders, employees, and beneficiaries (Thornton *et al.*, 2011), likely influence the creation and development of service organizations. Beliefs around individualism, power distance, masculinity and uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede, 1983) influence entrepreneurial activity, such that these

differences may influence elements important in social enterprising, including prosocial motivation (e.g., views on volunteerism), the entrepreneurial mindset (e.g., valuing a growth mindset), and community engagement (e.g., views around the role of community in solving social problems). Furthermore, some service design methods and tools are reflective of particular socio-cultural contexts and may not be aligned with others. Human interaction, for example, is reflective of its cultural context, and cultural norms (e.g., gender roles and responsibilities) may limit the extent to which service design methods from a Western culture (e.g., experience prototyping and role-playing games) can be effectively applied in the context of certain developing nations.

Similarly, technological elements, including the skills, methods, systems, and equipment within the business environment are likely to influence a service organization's capacity to create social impact and multilevel wellbeing. The creativity that drives social bricolage, business model development and innovative delivery, for example, may be enhanced or hindered by key elements in the technological environment, such as the skill level of the workforce, technological advances in equipment, and everyday availability of technological solutions for consumers. While many of the service design elements in the interdisciplinary framework do not require sophisticated technology to be used, their adoption can certainly be aided by the advancements in technological tools and physical materials (e.g., digital tools for prototyping). Furthermore, ongoing technological change has a direct influence on the evolving context of individuals and service organizations, often dramatically altering interactions. For example, business models that bring together beneficiaries from the developing world and resource providers from more developed countries (e.g., crowdfunded microfinance) have been made possible because of the ubiquitous availability of internet around the globe.

Applications of an Interdisciplinary Framework

To illustrate the possible integration of these components from the interdisciplinary framework, below we highlight ~~two~~ an illustrative case that demonstrates how such a framework could be applied to support service organizations in their pursuit of multilevel wellbeing and social impact within a particular context.

A Case Study: The Refugee Crisis

Globally, more than 25 million refugees lack adequate access to basic services like healthcare and education (UNHCR, 2019). Adopting a TSR lens, Nasr and Fisk (2019) suggest that services play a paramount role in reducing the suffering of refugees. Similarly, Aksoy and colleagues (2019), emphasize the role of for-profit service organizations in addressing these global challenges. A social entrepreneurship approach to the refugee issues would emphasize both the social impact of such interventions (e.g., how to successfully integrate refugees and provide adequate access) as well as the sustainability of the solutions. The framework developed in this paper suggests various social entrepreneurship concepts that could be adopted by service organizations to support the wellbeing of refugees and their communities.

Prosocial motivation, for example, needs to be present across the service organization to support this social pursuit. Efforts to enhance prosocial motivation can be supported by engaging organizational actors in using service design methods, such as observation, experience prototyping, and role-playing games, that aim at creating empathy. More specifically, co-design with refugees could help employees to have a better understanding of the refugees' daily experiences and may subsequently lead to prosocial motivation across the organization. Another concept from social entrepreneurship that service organizations can adopt is building a community

orientation and engagement in their efforts to help refugees. Service organizations can utilize an actor network map, developed within a participatory service design process, that visually represents all the different actors (e.g., community members, NGOs, government agencies) that share the same goal of helping refugees, to identify potential partners and collaborators.

Similarly, developing a hybrid identity focused simultaneously on social and economic value could facilitate more financially sustainable service organizations as they could leverage a broader array of funding opportunities in order to create maximum impact for addressing this major problem. Specifically, in addition to relying exclusively on donations, organizations focusing on addressing this social problem could also benefit from revenues generated based on selling products or services crafted by refugees or by pursuing a one-for-one business model similar to Tom's Shoes, in which they donate an item desperately needed by refugees when they sell their product or service at a premium price to other customers.

If an organization was to sell products or services crafted specifically by refugees with barriers to employment, the service blueprint could help to map out the key backstage processes of refugees and other intermediaries as well as the journey of the customers. By mapping out the backstage steps of refugees, the organization could build their understanding of the conditions and opportunities for supporting dignified work and ongoing skill development. Furthermore, by mapping the customer experience, the organization can better understand how best to communicate their social mission to the customers and increase demand. This blueprinting process could help organizations grapple with the implications of developing a hybrid identity that both serves the intended beneficiaries and the organizational staff.

Given the complexity of the problem, service organizations would immensely benefit from adopting an opportunity mindset to dig deep into the underlying root causes of the refugee crisis

in different contexts. For example, a root cause assessment could be facilitated by the commonly used approach of the five whys – where actors repeatedly question the underlying reasons for why something exists (Stickdorn and Schneider, 2011). In the context of the refugee crisis, this may lead to realizations about the interconnectedness of the refugee crisis with issues of war or climate change. Through this knowledge, an organization might decide to strategically contribute to reducing migration pressure by adopting a purchasing policy that restricts doing business with companies that make or sell weapons for war and find ways to reduce their carbon emissions or eliminate waste. While these issues are not always immediately connected to the refugee crisis, service design methods can help to analyze and unpack complex and interconnected issues to inform an organization’s strategy more broadly and ensure alignment with its social mission.

As highlighted by this illustrative example, adopting an interdisciplinary framework can have important implications for service research. As previously noted, there is a need for more empirical TSR research involving the individual and collective level issues, including the outcomes of services provided. As suggested by this proposed framework, TSR researchers might consider constructs from service design and social entrepreneurship, to help inform wellbeing among a wider breadth of individuals, including beneficiaries. Furthermore, these established constructs could inform empirical testing and implementation of the conceptual frameworks developed by TSR. Similarly, service design and social entrepreneurship researchers may find the framework useful in conceptualizing wellbeing at multiple levels, including for communities and nations. For service design researchers, this framework can help expand the discipline’s theoretical foundations, including its knowledge of organizational and social change. Given the limited understanding of service delivery, co-creation and service experience in social entrepreneurship

research, the proposed framework provides a strong conceptual basis from TSR and essential tools from service design to inform scholars about the service context and its role in social impact and wellbeing. Bridging process elements of design and social impact constructs with TSR outcome metrics, such as financial wellbeing (Brüngen *et al.*, 2017) and service inclusion (Fisk *et al.*, 2018), provides a more holistic view of service research outcomes and potential for practical application. We, therefore, encourage researchers to apply an interdisciplinary approach, such as the one proposed here, when exploring and examining wellbeing.

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper is to build an interdisciplinary framework that draws from Transformative Service Research (TSR), service design, and social entrepreneurship literatures to create greater synergetic effects for advancing wellbeing and driving social impact. This framework combines the underlying goals of TSR with social enterprise concepts and exemplary service design methods relevant for operationalizing these goals. We also outline critical boundary conditions within the environment that may influence the application of this framework in different contexts. To contextualize the framework, the paper continues with an illustrative example of its application related to the refugee crisis, as well as suggestions for future applications within the research fields. As such, this framework contributes to all three research traditions, including helping TSR become more practical and testable, enabling service design to become more socially oriented and theoretically grounded, and infusing social entrepreneurship with a service mindset. In doing so, this paper contributes to TSR by advancing the discussion on how to operationalize the pursuit of multilevel wellbeing and social impact.

Furthermore, this paper builds a foundation for ongoing interdisciplinary dialogue around the shared goals of multilevel wellbeing and social impact. There is a need for a continued conversation across disciplinary boundaries so that service research can be informed and enhanced by other established research and traditions. Service scholars are encouraged to continue engaging with other disciplines, including social innovation (e.g., Aksoy *et al.*, 2019), humanistic management (e.g., Kabadayi *et al.*, 2019), social marketing (e.g., Russell-Bennett *et al.*, 2019), Corporate Social Responsibility (e.g., Losada-Otálora and Alkire, 2019), public policy, and sociology, to address and solve the global challenges in an efficient and effective way. In addition, researchers should consider the value of collaboration across research and practice. The majority of the global problems are being addressed by NGOs and social enterprises that are working hard to help millions of people around the world. Unfortunately, researchers and academics are far from having a similar impact. As such, academics are urged to partner with organizations to pursue social impact through research and practice.

References:

- Afuah, A. and Tucci, C.L. (2000), *Internet Business Models and Strategies: Text and Cases*, McGraw-Hill Higher Education: New York.
- Akama, Y. (2015), “Continuous re-configuring of invisible social structures”, In Bruni, E. A., Parolin, L. L., and Schubert, C. (Eds.), *Designing Technology, Work, Organizations and Vice Versa* pp. 163-183, Vernon Press.
- Aksoy, L., Alkire, L, Choi, S., Kim, P., and Zhang, L. (2019), “Social Innovation in Service: A Conceptual Framework and Research Agenda”, *Journal of Service Management*.
- Amit R., and Zott C. (2001), “Value creation in e-business”, *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 22 No.6/7, pp. 493–520.
- Anderson, S., Nasr, L., and Rayburn, S. (2018), “Transformative service research and service design: synergistic effects in healthcare”, *The Service Industries Journal*, Vol. 38 No. 1-2, pp. 99-113.

- Anderson, L., and Ostrom, L. (2015), "Transformative service research: advancing our knowledge about service and wellbeing", Vol. 18 No.3, pp. 243-249.
- Anderson, L., Ostrom, A. L., Corus, C., Fisk, R. P., Gallan, A. S., Giraldo, M., Mende, M., Mulder, M., Rayburn, S. W., Rosenbaum, M. S., Shirahada, K., and Williams, J. D. (2013), "Transformative service research: An agenda for the future", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 66 No. 8, pp.1203-1210.
- Andreassen, T. W., Kristensson, P., Lervik-Olsen, L., Parasuraman, A., McColl-Kennedy, J. R., Edvardsson, B. and Colurcio, M. (2016), "Linking service design to value creation and service research", *Journal of Service Management*, Vol. 27 No.1, pp. 21-29.
- Ansari, S., Munir, K., and Gregg, T. (2012), "Impact at the "Bottom of the Pyramid": The role of social capital in capability development and community empowerment", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 49 No. 4, pp. 813–842.
- Austin, J., Stevenson, H., and Wei-Skillern, J. (2006), "Social and Commercial Entrepreneurship: Same, Different, or Both? *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, Vol. 47 No.3, pp. 370–384.
- Bacq, S., and Alt, E. (2018), "Feeling capable and valued: a prosocial perspective on the link between empathy and social entrepreneurial intentions", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 33, pp. 333-351.
- Bacq, S., and Janssen, F. (2011), "The multiple faces of social entrepreneurship: A review of definitional issues based on geographical and thematic criteria", *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, Vol. 23 No. 5-6, pp. 373-403.
- Baker, T., and Nelson, R. (2005), "Creating Something from Nothing: Resource Construction through Entrepreneurial Bricolage", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 50, pp. 329–366.
- Barile, S., Lusch, R., Reynoso, J., Saviano, M., and Spohrer, J. (2016), "Systems, networks, and ecosystems in service research", *Journal of Service Management*, Vol. 27 No. 4, pp. 652-674.
- Barney, J. (1991), "Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 99-120.
- Battilana, J. and Dorado, S. (2010), "Building sustainable hybrid organizations: The case of commercial microfinance organizations", *Academy of Management Journal*. Vol. 53, pp. 1419-1441.
- Battilana, J. and Lee, M. (2014), "Advancing research on hybrid organizing: Insights from the study of social enterprises", *Academy of Management Annals*, Vol. 8, pp. 397-442.

- Battilana, J., Sengul, M., Pache, A.-C., and Model, J. (2015), Harnessing productive tensions in hybrid organizations: the case of work integration social enterprises. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58 (6), 1658–1685.
- Batson, C.D. and Shaw, L.L. (1991), “Evidence for altruism: Toward a pluralism of prosocial motives”, *Psychological Inquiry*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 107-122.
- Belinda, L., and Chu, V. (2013), “Social enterprise versus social entrepreneurship: An examination of the ‘why’ and ‘how’ in pursuing social change”, *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 31 No. 7, pp. 764–784.
- Bhuiyan, M.F. and Ivlevs, A. (2019), “Micro-entrepreneurship and subjective well-being: Evidence from rural Bangladesh”, *Journal of Business Venturing*, in press.
- Binkley, C. (2010), “Charity Gives Shoe Brand Extra Shine.” *Wall Street Journal*, April 1, 2010, sec. Life and Style
<http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052702304252704575155903198032336>
- Bitner, M. J. (1990), “Evaluating service encounters: The effects of physical surroundings and employee responses”, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 54 No. 2, pp.69–82.
- Bitner, M. J. (1992), “Servicescapes: The impact of physical surroundings on customers and employees”, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 52 No. 2, pp. 57-71.
- Bitner, M. J., Ostrom, A. L., and Morgan F. N. (2008), “Service blueprinting: A technique for service innovation”, *California Management Review*, Vol.50 No. 3, pp.66-94.
- Blocker, C.P. and Barrios, A. (2015), “The transformative value of a service experience”, *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 265-283.
- Blomkvist, J., and Bode, A. (2012), “Using service walkthroughs to co-create whole service experiences”, *In Proceedings of the International Service Innovation Design Conference*, 3.
- Blomkvist, J. and Holmlid, S., (2012), September. Exemplars in service design. In Conference Proceedings ServDes. 2009; DeThinking Service; ReThinking Design; Oslo Norway 24-26 November 2009 (No. 059, pp. 19-30). Linköping University Electronic Press.
- Blomkvist, J., Holmlid, S. and Segelström, F. (2010), “Service design research: Yesterday, today and tomorrow”, In Stickdorn, M., and Schneider, J. (Eds.), *This Is Service Design Thinking*, Amsterdam, the Netherlands: BIS Publishers, pp. 308-315.
- Bloom, P. N., and Chatterji, A. K. (2009), “Scaling Social Entrepreneurial Impact”, *California Management Review*, Vol. 51 No. 3, pp. 114–33.

- Branzei, O., Parker, S. C., Moroz, P. W. and Gamble, E. (2018), “Going pro-social: Extending the individual-venture nexus to the collective level”, *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 33, pp. 551-566
- Brown, V.A., Deane, P.M., Harris, J.A. and Russell, J.Y. (2010), *Towards a just and sustainable future. Tackling wicked problems: Through the transdisciplinary imagination*, Taylor & Francis, pp. 3-15.
- Buchenau, M. and Suri, J.F. (2000), “Experience prototyping”, In *Proceedings of the 3rd Conference on Designing Interactive Systems: Processes, Practices, Methods, and Techniques* (pp. 424-433). ACM.
- Busse, C., Kach, A. P., and Wagner, S. M. (2017), “Boundary conditions: What they are, how to explore them, why we need them, and when to consider them”, *Organizational Research Methods*, Vol. 20 No. 4, pp. 574-609.
- Cardador, M. and Wrzesniewski, A. (2015), “Better to Give and to Compete? Prosocial and Competitive Motives as Interactive Predictors of Citizenship Behavior”, *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 155 No. 3, pp. 255 - 273.
- Certo, S. T., and Miller, T. (2008), “Social entrepreneurship: Key issues and concepts”, *Business Horizons*, Vol. 51 No. 4, pp. 267–271.
- Chesbrough H. and Rosenbloom RS. (2002), “The role of the business model in capturing value from innovation: evidence from Xerox Corporation's technology spin-off companies”, *Industrial and Corporate Change*, Vol. 11, pp. 529–555.
- Chiapello, E. and Fairclough, N. (2002), “Understanding the new management ideology: a transdisciplinary contribution from critical discourse analysis and new sociology of capitalism”, *Discourse & Society*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp.185-208.
- Clatworthy, S. (2011), “Service innovation through touch-points: Development of an innovation toolkit for the first stages of new service development”, *International Journal of Design*, Vol 5 No. 2, pp. 15-28.
- Conger, M., McMullen, J. S., Jr. Bergman, B. J., and York, J. G. (2018), “Category membership, identity control, and the reevaluation of prosocial opportunities”, *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 33, pp. 179-206.
- Curedale, R. (2013), *Service Design: 250 Essential Methods*. Design Community College, California.
- Dacin, P. A., Dacin, M. T., and Matear, M. (2010), “Social Entrepreneurship: Why We Don’t Need a New Theory and How We Move Forward from Here”, *Academy of Management Perspectives*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 37–57.

- Dalsgaard, P. (2017), "Instruments of inquiry: Understanding the nature and role of tools in design." *International Journal of Design*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 21-33.
- Davis, M. H., Hall, J. A., and Mayer, P. S. (2016), Developing a new measure of entrepreneurial mindset: Reliability, validity, and implications for practitioners", *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, Vol. 68 No.1, pp. 21.
- Dees, J. G. (1998), "The meaning of social entrepreneurship. Kauffman Foundation and Stanford University, 1–5."
- Demil, B., Lecocq, X., Ricart, J. E., and Zott, C. (2015), "Introduction to the SEJ special issue on business models: business models within the domain of strategic entrepreneurship", *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 1-11.
- Desa, G. (2012), "Resource Mobilization in International Social Entrepreneurship: Bricolage as a Mechanism of Institutional Transformation", *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, Vol. 36 No. 4, pp. 727–751.
- Di Domenico, M. L., Haugh, H., and Tracey, P. (2010), "Social bricolage: Theorizing social value creation in social enterprises", *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, Vol. 34 No.4, pp. 681–703.
- Di Domenico, M., Tracey, P., and Haugh, H. (2009), "The dialectic of social exchange: Theorizing corporate—social enterprise collaboration", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 30 No.8, pp. 887-907.
- Dietrich, T., Trischler, J., Schuster, L., and Rundle-Thiele, S. (2017), "Co-designing services with vulnerable consumers", *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, Vol. 27 No. 3, pp. 663-688.
- Dorst, K. (2011), "The core of 'design thinking' and its application". *Design Studies*, Vol. 32, No. 6, pp. 521-532.
- Edvardsson, B., Enquist, B., and Johnston, R. (2010), "Design dimensions of experience rooms for service test drives: case studies in several service contexts", *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, Vol. 20 No. 4, pp. 312-327.
- Emerson, J. (2003), "The blended value proposition: Integrating social and financial returns", *California Management Review*, Vol. 45, pp. 35-52.
- Fisk, R., Anderson L., Bowen D., Gruber T., Ostrom A., Patrício L., Reynoso J., and Sebastiani R. (2016a), "Billions of impoverished people deserve to be better served: A call to action for the service research community", *Journal of Service Management*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 43-55.
- Fisk, R., Dean, A., Alkire (née Nasr) L., Joubert, A., Previte, J., Robertson, N., Rosenbaum, M. (2018), "Design for service inclusion: creating inclusive service systems by 2050", *Journal of Service Management*, Vol. 29 No. 5, pp. 834-858.

- Fisk, R., Nasr, L., Gallan, A., Rayburn, S., Ng, S., Sanjit, R. and Sebastiani, R. (2016b), “Doing well by doing good: transformative service organizations”, *25th Annual Frontiers in Service Conference*, June, Bergen.
- Global Goals (2018). <https://www.globalgoals.org/>, Accessed on October 10, 2018.
- Grant, A. M.; Berry, J. W. (2011), “The necessity of others is the mother of invention: Intrinsic and prosocial motivations, perspective taking, and creativity”, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 54, pp. 73-97.
- Grant, A.M., and Gino, F. (2010), “A little thanks goes a long way: Explaining why gratitude expressions motivate prosocial behavior”, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 98, pp. 946-955.
- Grant, A. M. (2007), “Relational Job Design and the Motivation to Makes a Prosocial Difference”, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 32, pp. 393-418.
- Grant, A. M. (2008), “Does Intrinsic Motivation Fuel the Prosocial Fire? Motivational Synergy in Predicting Persistence, Performance, and Productivity”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, pp. Vol. 93 No. 1, pp. 48-59.
- Grant, A. M. and Sumanth, J. J., (2009), “Mission Possible? The Performance of Prosocially Motivated Employees Depends on Manager Trustworthiness”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 94 No.4, p.927.
- Grimes, M. G., McMullen, J. S., Vogus, T. J., and Miller, T. L. (2013), “Studying the origins of social entrepreneurship: Compassion and the role of embedded agency”, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 38, pp. 460-463.
- Gustafsson, A., Aksoy, L., Brady, M.K., McColl-Kennedy, J.R., Sirianni, N.J., Witell, L. and Wuenderlich, N.V. (2015), “Conducting service research that matters,” *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 29 No. 6/7, pp. 425-429.
- Gustafsson, A., Högström, C., Radnor, Z., Friman, M., Heinonen, K., Jaakkola, E. and Mele, C. (2016), “Developing service research—paving the way to transdisciplinary research”, *Journal of Service Management*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 9-20.
- Haybron, D. M. (2008), Happiness, the self and human flourishing, *Utilitas*, Vol.20 No.1, pp. 21-49.
- Hillgren, P. A., Seravalli, A., and Emilson, A. (2011), “Prototyping and infrastructuring in design for social innovation”, *CoDesign*, Vol. 7 No. 3/4, pp. 169-183.

- Hofstede, G. (1983). "National cultures in four dimensions: A resource-based theory of cultural differences among nations", *International Studies of Management and Organizations*, Vol. 13 No.1/2, pp. 46-74.
- Holt, D. and Littlewood, D. (2015), "Identifying, mapping and monitoring the impact of hybrid firms." *California Management Review*, Vol. 57 No. 3, pp. 107-125.
- Hurley, E., Trischler, J., and Dietrich, T. (2018), "Exploring the application of co-design to transformative service research", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 32 No. 6, pp. 715-727.
- Ireland, D.R., Hitt, M.A., and Sirmon, D.G. (2003), "A Model of Strategic Entrepreneurship: The Construct and its Dimensions", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 29, pp. 963-1069.
- Jaakkola, E., and Alexander, M. (2014), "The role of customer engagement behavior in value co-creation: a service system perspective", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 247-261.
- Jack, S. L., and Anderson, A. R. (2002), "The effects of embeddedness on the entrepreneurial process", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 17 No. 5, pp. 467-487.
- Jonas, J. M., Boha, J., Sörhammar, D., and Moeslein, K. M. (2018), "Stakeholder engagement in intra-and inter-organizational innovation: Exploring antecedents of engagement in service ecosystems", *Journal of Service Management*. Vol. 29 No. 3, pp. 399-421.
- Junginger, S. (2015), "Organizational design legacies and service design", *The Design Journal*, Vol. 18 No. 2, pp. 209-226.
- Junginger, S., and Sangiorgi, D. (2009), "Service design and organisational change. Bridging the gap between rigour and relevance, In International Association of Societies of Design Research (pp. 4339-4348). Korean Society of Design Science, Korea.
- Kaario, P., Vaajakallio, K., Lehtinen, V., Kantola, V., and Kuikkaniemi, K. (2009), "Someone else's shoes-using role-playing games in user-centered service design", Paper presented at the First Service Design and Service Innovation Conference, Oslo, Norway.
- Karpen, I. O., Gemser, G., and Calabretta, G. (2017), "A multilevel consideration of service design conditions: Towards a portfolio of organizational capabilities, interactive practices and individual abilities", *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 384-407.
- Kelley, T., Littman, J., and Peters, T. (2001), *The Art of Innovation: Lessons in creativity from IDEO, America's leading design firm*. New York: Currency.
- Kimbell, L. (2011), "Designing for service as one way of designing services", *International Journal of Design*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 41-52.

- Kroeger, A. and Weber, C. (2015), "Developing a conceptual framework for comparing social value creation." *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 4015 No 1, pp. 43-70.
- Kuppelwieser, V G. and Finsterwalder, J. (2016), "Transformative Service Research and Service Dominant Logic: Quo Vadits?", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 28, pp. 91-98.
- Kurtmollaiev, S., Fjuk, A., Pedersen, P. E., Clatworthy, S., & Kvale, K. (2018). "Organizational transformation through service design: The institutional logics perspective." *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 59-74.
- Leonard, D., and Rayport, J. F. (1997), "Spark innovation through empathic design", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 75, pp. 102-115.
- Losada-Otálora, M. and Alkire, L. (2019), "A transformative approach to corporate social responsibility: an antidote to corporate hypocrisy", *The Service Industries Journal*, DOI: 10.1080/02642069.2019.1655000
- Machlis, G.E., Force, J.E. and Burch Jr, W.R. (1997), "The human ecosystem part I: the human ecosystem as an organizing concept in ecosystem management", *Society & Natural Resources*, Vol.10 No.4, pp.347-367.
- MacMillan, I. C., and Thompson, J. D. (2013), *The Social Entrepreneur's Playbook: Pressure Test Your Start-Up Idea*. Wharton Digital Press.
- Mair, J., and Marti, I. (2009), "Entrepreneurship in and around Institutional Voids: A Case Study from Bangladesh." *Journal of Business Venturing, Special Issue Ethics and Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 24 No. 5, pp. 419–35.
- Martí, I. (2018), "Transformational business models, grand challenges, and social impact", *Journal of Business Ethics*, pp. 1-12.
- Martin, R.L. and Osberg, S. (2007), "Social entrepreneurship: The case for definition." *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Vol. 5 No 2, pp. 28-39.
- Martins, L. L., Rindova, V. P., and Greenbaum, B. E. (2015), "Unlocking the hidden value of concepts: a cognitive approach to business model innovation", *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 99-117.
- Mattelmäki, T. (2006), *Design Probes* (PhD thesis), Aalto University, Helsinki, Finland.
- McMullen, J.S. (2018), "Organizational hybrids as biological hybrids: Insights for research on the relationship between social enterprise and the entrepreneurial ecosystem", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 33, pp. 575-590.

- McMullen, J. S. and Bergman, B. J. Jr., (2017), “Social Entrepreneurship and the Development Paradox of Prosocial Motivation: A Cautionary Tale”, *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 243-271.
- McMullen, J.S. and Bergman, B.J. (2018), “The promise and problems of price subsidization in social entrepreneurship”, *Business Horizons*, Vol. 61, pp. 609-621.
- McMullen, J.S. and Warnick, B.J., (2016), “Should I require every new venture to be a hybrid organization? Exploring the limits of a world of blended value”, *Journal of Management Studies.*, Vol. 53 No. 4, pp. 630, 663.
- McPhee, W. (2014), “A new sustainability model: engaging the entire firm”, *Journal of Business Strategy*, Vol. 35 No. 2, pp. 4-12.
- Mende, M. and van Doorn, J. (2015), “Coproduction of transformative services as a pathway to improved consumer well-being findings from a longitudinal study on financial counseling”, *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 351-368.
- Meroni, A., and Sangiorgi, D. (2011), *Design for Services (Design for Social Responsibility)*, Gower Publishing Ltd, Surrey.
- Haynie, J.M., Shepherd, D., Mosakowski, E. and Earley, P.C. (2010), “A situated metacognitive model of the entrepreneurial mindset”, *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp.217-229.
- Miller, T. L., Grimes, M. G., McMullen, J. S., and Vogus, T. J. (2012), “Venturing for others with heart and head: How compassion encourages social entrepreneurship”, *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp. 616–641.
- Moss, T. W, Short, J. C, Payne, G. T., and Lumpkin, G. T. (2011), “Dual identities in social ventures: An exploratory study”, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol 35, pp. 805-830.
- Moss, T.W., Renko, M., Block, E., and Meyskens, M. (2018), “Funding the story of hybrid ventures: crowdfunder lending preferences and linguistic hybridity”, *Journal of Business Ventures*, Vol. 33 No.5, pp.643-659.
- Mulder, M.R., Rapp, J.M., Hamby, A. and Weaver, T. (2015), “Consumer transformation through volunteer service experiences”, *The Service Industries Journal*, Vol. 35 No. 15/16, pp. 865-882.
- Muralidharan, V., Sussan, T. E., Limaye, S., Koehler, K., Williams, D., Rule, A. M., and Biswal, S. (2015), “Field testing of alternative cookstove performance in a rural setting of western India”, *International Journal of Environmental Research And Public Health*, Vol. 12 No.2, pp. 1773-1787.

- Nasr, L. and Fisk, R. (2019), “The global refugee crisis: how can transformative service researchers help?”, *The Service Industries Journal*, Vol. 39, No 9/10, pp. 684-700.
- Nasr, L., Burton, J., and Gruber, T. (2015), “When good news is bad news: The negative impact of positive customer feedback on front-line employee wellbeing”, *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 29 No. 6/7, pp. 599–612.
- New, S., and Kimbell, L. (2013), “Chimps, designers, consultants and empathy: A “theory of mind” for service design”, In *Proceedings of Cambridge Academic Design Management Conference* (pp. 139-152).
- Nga, J. K. H., and Shamuganathan, G. (2010), “The influence of personality traits and demographic factors on social entrepreneurship start up intentions”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 95 No. 2, pp. 259-282.
- Osterwalder, A., and Pigneur, Y. (2010), *Business Model Generation: A Handbook For Visionaries, Game Changers, And Challengers*. John Wiley and Sons.
- Ostrom, A.L., Bitner, M.J., Brown, S.W., Burkhard, K.A., Goul, M., Smith-Daniels, V., Demirkan, H. and Rabinovich, E., (2010), “Moving forward and making a difference: research priorities for the science of service”, *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 13 No.1, pp.4-36.
- Ostrom, A. L., Parasuraman, A., Bowen, D. E., Patricio, L., and Voss, C. A. (2015), “Service research priorities in a rapidly changing context”, *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 18 No. 2, pp. 127-159.
- Overkamp, T., and Holmlid, S. (2016), “Views on implementation and how they could be used in service design”, *Proceedings of ServDes, the Fifth Service Design and Innovation Conference*, Linköping: Linköping University Electronic Press, pp. 205-214.
- Pache, A. and Santos, F. (2013), “Inside the hybrid organisation: Selective coupling as a response to competing institutional logics”, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 56, pp. 972-1001.
- Patrício, L., de Pinho, N. F., Teixeira, J. G., and Fisk, R. P. (2018a), “Service design for value networks: enabling value cocreation interactions in healthcare”, *Service Science*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 76-97.
- Patrício, L., Fisk, R.P. and Falcão e Cunha, J. (2008), “Designing multi-interface service experiences: the service experience blueprint”, *Journal of Service Research*, 10(4), pp. 318-334.
- Patrício, L., Fisk, R.P., Falcão e Cunha, J. and Constantine, L. (2011), “Multilevel service design: from customer value constellation to service experience blueprinting”, *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 180-200.

- Patrício, L., Gustafsson, A. and Fisk, R. (2018b), “Upframing service design and innovation for research impact”, *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 3-16.
- Peredo, A. M., and McLean, M. (2006), “Social entrepreneurship: A critical review of the concept”, *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 41 No. 1, pp. 56–65.
- Pfeifer, S., Šarlija, N., and Zekić Sušac, M. (2016), “Shaping the Entrepreneurial Mindset: Entrepreneurial Intentions of Business Students in Croatia”, *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 54 No. 1, pp. 102-117.
- Phillips, W., Lee, H., Ghobadian, A., O’Regan, N., and James, P. (2015), “Social innovation and social entrepreneurship: A systematic review”, *Group & Organization Management*, Vol. 40, pp. 428-461.^[17]
- Phills, J. A., Deiglmeier, K., and Miller, D. T. (2008), “Rediscovering social innovation”, *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Vol. 6, pp. 34-43.
- Porter, M.E. and Kramer, M.R. (2011), “Creating shared value.” *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 89 No.1/2, pp. 62-77.
- Prahalad C.K. and Ramaswamy V. (2004), *The Future of Competition: Co-creating Unique Value with Customers*. Harvard Business School Press: Boston, MA.
- Prendeville, S., and Bocken, N. (2017), “Sustainable business models through service design”, *Procedia Manufacturing*, Vol. 8, pp. 292-299.
- Renko M. and Freeman, M. (2018), Entrepreneurship by and for Disadvantaged Populations: Global Evidence. Forthcoming in: *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Social Responsibility: Psychological and Organizational Perspectives*, edited by A. McWilliams, D.E. Rupp, D. Siegel, G. Stahl, and D. Waldman. Oxford University Press.
- Renko, M. (2013), “Early challenges of nascent social entrepreneurs”, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 37 No. 5, pp. 1045-1069.
- Rittel, H.W. and Webber, M.M. (1973), “Dilemmas in a general theory of planning”, *Policy Sciences*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp.155-169.
- Rosenbaum, M. S., Corus, C., Ostrom, A. L., Anderson, L., Fisk, R. P., Gallan, A. S., and Williams, J. D. (2011), “Conceptualization and aspirations of transformative service research”, *Journal of Research for Consumers*, Vol. 19, pp. 1–6.
- Russell-Bennett, R., Fisk, R., Rosenbaum, M. and Zainuddin, N. (2019), "Commentary: transformative service research and social marketing – converging pathways to social change", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSM-10-2018-0304>

- Ryan, R.M. and Deci, E.L. (2001), "On Happiness and Human Potentials: A Review of Research on Hedonic and Eudaimonic Wellbeing," *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 52 No.1, 141-166.
- Ryff, C.D. and Singer, B.H. (2008), "Know thyself and become what you are: A eudaimonic approach to psychological wellbeing", *Journal of Happiness Studies*, Vol. 9 No.1, pp.13-39.
- Saebi, T., Foss, N. J., and Linder, S. (2018), "Social Entrepreneurship Research: Past Achievements and Future Promises", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 1–26.
- Sanders, E. and Stappers, P. (2008), "Co-creation and the new landscapes of design". *CoDesign*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 5-18.
- Sangiorgi, D. (2011), "Transformative services and transformation design", *International Journal of Design*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 29-40.
- Santos, F. M. (2012), "A Positive Theory of Social Entrepreneurship", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 111 No. 3, pp. 335–351.
- Schön, D. (1983), *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. Basic Books Inc., London.
- Seelos, C., and Mair, J. (2005), "Social Entrepreneurship: Creating New Business Models to Serve the Poor." *Business Horizons*, Vol. 48 No. 3, pp. 241–46.
- Sen, A. (2005), "Human rights and capabilities", *Journal of Human Development*, Vol.6 No.2, pp.151-166.
- Shepherd, D. A., and Patzelt, H. (2011), The New Field of Sustainable Entrepreneurship: Studying Entrepreneurial Action Linking "What Is to Be Sustained" With "What Is to Be Developed." *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, Vol. 35 No. 1, pp. 137–163.
- Shepherd, D.A., Williams, T.A., and Patzelt, H. (2015), "Thinking about entrepreneurial decision making: Review and research agenda", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 41, pp. 11-46.
- Short, J.C., Moss, T.W., Lumpkin. G.T. (2009), "Research in social entrepreneurship: past contributions and future opportunities", *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, Vol. 2, pp. 161-194.
- Shostack, G. L. (1982), "How to design a service", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol.16 No.1, pp. 49–63.
- Shostack, G. L. (1984), "Designing services that deliver", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 62 No.1, pp. 133–139.

- Steen, M., Manschot, M., and De Koning, K. (2011), “Benefits of co-design in service design projects”, *International Journal of Design*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 53-60.
- Stephan, U., Patterson, M., Kelly, C., and Mair, J. (2016), “Organizations driving positive social change: A review and an integrative framework of change processes”, *Journal of Management*, Vol. 42 No. 5, pp. 1250-1281.
- Stickdorn, M., Hormess, E. M., Lawrence, A., and Schneider, J. (2018), *This Is Service Design Methods: A Companion to This Is Service Design Doing*, First Ed. O'Reilly Media.
- Stickdorn, M. and Schneider, J., eds. (2011), *This Is Service Design Thinking*. Amsterdam: BIS Publishers.
- Stuart, I. (1998), “The influence of organizational culture and internal politics on new service design and introduction”, *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, Vol. 9 No. 5, pp.469-485.
- Sud, M., VanSandt, C. V., and Baugous, A. M. (2009), “Social entrepreneurship: The role of institutions”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 85 No. 1, pp. 201-216.
- Tang, C., Guo, L., and Gopinath, M. (2016), “A social-cognitive model of consumer wellbeing: A longitudinal exploration of the role of the service organization”, *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 19 No. 3, pp. 307–321.
- Teixeira, J.G., Patrício, L., Huang, K. H., Fisk, R. P., Nóbrega, L., and Constantine, L. (2017), “The MINDS method: integrating management and interaction design perspectives for service design”, *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 240-258.
- Thompson, J. A., and Alvy, G. (2000), “Social Entrepreneurship-a new look at the people and the potential”, *Management Decision*, Vol. 38 No. 5, pp. 328–338.
- Thornton, P.H., Ribeiro-Soriano, D., and Urbano, D. (2011). “Socio-cultural factors and entrepreneurial activity: An overview”, *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 105-118.
- Trischler, J., Pervan, S. J., Kelly, S. J., and Scott, D. R. (2018), “The value of codesign: The effect of customer involvement in service design teams”, *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 21, No.1, pp. 75-100.
- United Nations (2019), *Goal 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere* <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/poverty/> (Accessed on May 12, 2019)
- UNHCR (2019), *Figure at a glance*. Retrieved from <http://www.unhcr.org/en-us/figures-at-a-glance.html> (Accessed on May 12, 2019)

- Upward, A., and Jones, P. (2016), "An ontology for strongly sustainable business models: Defining an enterprise framework compatible with natural and social science", *Organization & Environment*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 97-123.
- Vink, J., Edvardsson, B., Wetter-Edman, K., and Tronvoll, B. (2019), "Reshaping mental models – Enabling innovation through service design", *Journal of Service Management*, Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. 75-104.
- Vink, J. and Oertzen, A.-S. (2018), "Mitigating the risks of co-creation by integrating empathy and lived experience in service design", In *Proceedings of ServDes2018 Conference* (pp. 471-483).
- Vink, J., Wetter-Edman, K., Edvardsson, B. and Tronvoll, B. (2016), "Understanding the influence of the co-design process on wellbeing", in *Proceedings from ServDes2016 Conference* (pp. 390-402).
- Vos, M. and van der Zee, K. (2011), "Prosocial behavior in diverse workgroups: How relational identity orientation shapes cooperation and helping", *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 363-379.
- Welter, C., Mauer, R., and Robert, W. (2016), "Bridging Behavioral Models and Theoretical Concepts: Effectuation and Bricolage in the Opportunity Creation Framework", *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, Vol. 10, pp. 5–20.
- Wernerfelt, B. (1984), "A resource-based view of the firm", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 171-180.
- Wetter-Edman, K., Vink, J., and Blomkvist, J. (2018), "Staging aesthetic disruption through design methods for service innovation", *Design Studies*, Vol. 55, pp. 5-26.
- Whetten, D. A. (1989), "What constitutes a theoretical contribution?", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 14 No. 4, pp. 490-495.
- Wiklund, J., Graham, C., Foo, M.D., Bradley, S.W., Shir, N., Nikolaev, B. (2018), Entrepreneurship and wellbeing, *Journal of Business Venturing* (Special Issue Call for Papers) <https://www.journals.elsevier.com/journal-of-business-venturing/call-for-papers/entrepreneurship-wellbeing>
- Wrzesniewski, A., McCauley, C. Rozin, P. and Schwartz, B. (1997), "Jobs, Careers, and Callings: People's Relations to Their Work", *Journal of Research in Personality*, Vol. 31, pp. 21–33.
- Yao, T., Zheng, Q., and Fan, X. (2015), "The impact of online social support on patients' quality of life and the moderating role of social exclusion", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 369–383.

- Yunus, M., Moingeon, B., and Lehmann-Ortega, L. (2010), “Building Social Business Models: Lessons from the Grameen Experience.” *Long Range Planning, Business Models*, Vol. 43 No. 2, pp. 308–325.
- Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D. O., and Shulman, J. M. (2009), “A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges”, *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 24 No. 5, pp. 519–532.
- Zott C, and Amit, R. (2015), Business model innovation: towards a process perspective. In Oxford *Handbook of Creativity, Innovation, and Entrepreneurship: Multilevel Linkages*, Shalley C, Hitt M, Zhou J (eds). Oxford University Press: New York. pp. 395-405

Table 1: Comparison of TSR, service design research, and social entrepreneurship research

	Transformative Service Research	Service Design Research	Social Entrepreneurship Research
Focus	Services Service systems (Rosenbaum <i>et al.</i> , 2011)	Service innovation (Blomkvist <i>et al.</i> , 2010) Customer experience (Patrício <i>et al.</i> , 2008)	Social entrepreneurship (Saebi <i>et al.</i> , 2018) Social issues (Mair <i>et al.</i> , 2012) Social innovation (Phillips <i>et al.</i> , 2015)
Unit of analysis	Service interactions Service encounters (Anderson <i>et al.</i> , 2013)	Service design methods (Bitner <i>et al.</i> , 2008) Design capabilities (Karpen <i>et al.</i> , 2017)	Social enterprise (McMullen, 2018) Social entrepreneur (Miller <i>et al.</i> , 2012)
Primary Outcomes	Eudemonic and hedonic well-being (Anderson <i>et al.</i> , 2013) Transformative value (Blocker and Barrios, 2015) Relieving suffering (Nasr and Fisk, 2019) Service inclusion (Fisk <i>et al.</i> , 2018) Multilevel well-being (Fisk <i>et al.</i> , 2018)	New service development (Clatworthy, 2011) Enhanced customer experience (Zomerdijsk and Voss, 2010) Efficient backstage and frontstage operations (Shostack, 1984) Creative problem solving (Teixeira <i>et al.</i> , 2017) Novel forms of value co-creation (Meroni and Sangiorgi, 2011)	Blended value (Emerson, 2003; Porter and Kramer, 2011) Creation of social value (Kroeger and Weber, 2015) Social impact (Holt and Littlewood, 2015) Well-being (Bhuiyan and Ivlevs, 2019)
Target Beneficiaries	Individuals Collectives Ecosystems (Anderson <i>et al.</i> , 2013)	Organizations Customers Service designers and/or managers (Junginger, 2015; Patrício <i>et al.</i> , 2018a)	Marginalized, disadvantaged and vulnerable population (Mair <i>et al.</i> , 2012)
Research Accomplishments	Call for focusing on measures beyond profit and customer satisfaction. (Rosenbaum <i>et al.</i> , 2011) Identified as a service research priority (Ostrom <i>et al.</i> , 2015)	Established practical methods and tools used by service organizations to reach aspired outcomes (Bitner <i>et al.</i> , 2008) Co-design approaches with stakeholders (Trischler <i>et al.</i> , 2018)	Established concepts that organizations can focus on with the objective of creating social impact (Saebi <i>et al.</i> , 2018)
Research Opportunities	Great potential for practice and impact Growing opportunities for empirical work Meso and Macro level empirical research capabilities Increasing need for managerial applications and guidelines	Expand understanding of social change in service organizations Opportunities to examine implementation process Potential to expand theoretical framing in service design	Potential to expand knowledge of social entrepreneurship within the service ecosystem. Illumination of how social ventures enhance and deliver social impact. Opportunities to explore social innovation and impact within a service framework Explore stakeholders' roles and experience in the service context
Research objective:			

Interdisciplinary framework centered around the role of services in advancing wellbeing and social impact (TSR inspiration), by using established managerial concepts (Social entrepreneurship) aimed at co-creating solutions through service design methods and tools.

Research contribution:

- TSR becomes more practical and testable
- Service design research expands theoretical foundations and managerial relevance
- Social entrepreneurship broadens theoretical framing and incorporates tools to inform service experience

Figure 1:

