

RESEARCH ARTICLE

# “Social Innovation” and Urban Policy during Covid 19: Systematic Literature Review and Content Analysis

Burcu Hatiboğlu Kısac 1

<sup>1</sup> Asoc. Prof., Hacettepe University FEAS Department of Social Work, Ankara/Turkey  
ORCID: [0000-0002-4396-8412](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4396-8412)

E-Mail: [burcuhatiboglu@gmail.com](mailto:burcuhatiboglu@gmail.com)

Corresponding Author:  
Burcu Hatiboğlu Kısac

January 2022  
Volume:19

Issue:46

DOI: [10.26466//opus.jsr.1092792](https://doi.org/10.26466//opus.jsr.1092792)

## Abstract

*This article focuses on how social innovation activities were developed in the urban context during the Covid 19 pandemic, through systematic literature review and content analysis. The literature search was carried out between June and September 2021 on the Web of Science database. 64 articles reached from the database were filtered by applying exclusion-inclusion criteria. After examining the article abstracts, it was determined that 23 articles were closely related to the research subject. Using the NVIVO qualitative analysis program, key features of social innovation in the urban context during COVID 19 were analyzed (in terms of being value-based, social needs/problem-oriented, change-oriented). The research findings are discussed in three sub-titles, revealing the “basic values”, “prominent social problems/needs and solution proposals” and “main stakeholders” of social innovation in the context of urban policies during the pandemic. The results of the analysis have shown that the understanding of social innovation in the urban context during COVID 19 has been associated with collective values and focused on the responsibilities of local governments for the realization of social human rights. In this framework, attention is drawn to the opportunities for the implementation of participatory democracy at the level of local governments.*

**Key Words:** Social Innovation, Urban Policy, Urban Problems, Covid 19.

## Öz

*Bu makale, sistematik literatür taraması ve içerik analizi yoluyla, Covid 19 pandemisi sırasında kentsel bağlamda sosyal inovasyon faaliyetlerinin nasıl geliştirildiğine odaklanmaktadır. Literatür taraması Haziran-Eylül 2021 tarihleri arasında Web of Science veri tabanı üzerinden yapılmıştır. Veri tabanından ulaşılan 64 makale dışlama-dahil etme kriterleri uygulanarak filtrelenmiştir. Makale özetlerinin incelenmesi ile birlikte 23 makalenin konuyla yakından ilgili olduğu belirlenmiştir. NVİVO nitel analiz programı kullanılarak, COVID 19 sırasında kentsel bağlamda sosyal inovasyonun temel özellikleri analiz edilmiştir (değer temelli, sosyal ihtiyaçlar/sorun odaklı, değişim odaklı olma açısından). Araştırma bulguları, pandemi sürecindeki kent politikaları bağlamında sosyal inovasyonun “temel değerleri”, “öne çıkan toplumsal sorunlar/ihyaçlar ve çözüm önerileri” ve “Temel paydaşları”nı ortaya koyacak şekilde üç alt başlıkta tartışılmıştır. Analiz sonuçları, COVID 19 sırasında kentsel bağlamda sosyal inovasyon anlayışının kolektif değerlerle ilişkili olduğunu ve sosyal insan haklarının gerçekleştirilmesi için yerel yönetimlerin sorumluluklarına odaklandığını göstermektedir. Bu çerçevede katılımcı demokrasinin yerel yönetimler düzeyinde uygulanmasına yönelik fırsatlara dikkat çekilmektedir.*

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Sosyal İnovasyon, Kent Politikası, Kentsel Sorunlar, Covid 19.

## Citation:

Hatiboğlu Kısac, B. (2022). “Social Innovation” and urban policy during Covid 19: Systematic literature review and content analysis . *OPUS– Journal of Society Research*, 19(46), 217-227.

## Introduction

The concept of social innovation has increasingly gained significant attention in urban development especially after 2008 economic crisis. This attention has increased day by day since the UN (2015) estimates that the urban population would reach 60% of the world's population by 2030. In this context, "smart cities" in relation with the innovation concept have increasingly been emphasized in international and national urbanization policies and strategies (Calzada, 2020; UN-Habitat, 2020). Additionally, it is argued that social innovation is a dimension that should be considered especially within the poverty reduction and social inclusion policy and programs in countries with partially developed social welfare systems (Cattacin & Zimmer, 2016). In this respect, it is possible to say that the concept of social innovation has begun to be mentioned with the meltdown in welfare systems. It is also emphasized that social innovation in urban context has been differentiated from that in other fields. In this respect, social innovation in the field of urban development is to be identified as a collective strategy of rather than individual leadership. Within this context, Bransen et. al (2016) has identified five types of social innovations could be developed in the urban settings:

- Innovations in social services which consist of investing capabilities, avoiding stigmatization, and acquiring competence and self-esteem
- Innovations in regulations and rights that includes developing offers beyond fixed social rights and flexibilizing the accepted forms of governing
- Innovation in governance to building coalitions and partnership for building opinions around challenges in public services
- Innovations in modes of working and financing for combining resources from different stakeholders and
- Innovations local welfare system to encourage less standardized, more diverse, localized welfare arrangements

In this context, some researchers (Brandsen, Evers, Cattacin & Zimmer, 2016; McGuirk, Dowling, Maalsen and Baker, 2021; Ziegler, 2017) have stressed that social innovation has increasingly being addressed as a collaborative concept as an important tool for providing new and creative opportunities for local development by emphasizing social needs, quality of life, relationship within stakeholders. However, some of the others (Thompson, 2019; Mens et.al., 2021) has emphasized that social innovation becoming the favorite word of local economic development policies is related to neoliberal ideas. In this respect, they have stressed that the types of social innovations developed in the urban area have been structured in a neoliberal context and they have become passive in many cases. They have also stated that the only way to be remain active is to be conditioned by states or markets.

At this point, COVID 19 pandemic, created significant transformations in both private and public lives all around the world, especially of those living in the urban areas. Daily life practices have been restricted by COVID-19 interventions and it has ended up with anxiety and concerns, fueled by inequalities and poverty. In this situation, international organizations (UN, 2020, UN-Habitat, 2020, WHO, 2020) have been underlining that states and local governments should develop measures to prevent the spread of the pandemic with a broader and innovative perspective addressing bio-psycho-social health in a holistic manner and considering intersectional inequalities. In this context, it is seen that many social innovation studies (Tarsitano, Sinibaldib and Colao, 2021; McGuirk, Dowling, Maalsen and Baker, 2021; Cleave and Geijsman, 2020) have been started in different countries against the negative effects of the COVID 19 pandemic in the urban area. However, almost all these social innovation studies were conducted in a scattered manner as they aimed to respond quickly to the negative effects of the pandemic (McGuirk, Dowling, Maalsen and Baker, 2021). For this reason, it is important to examine the social innovation ideas applied in different countries with a scientific perspective.

This article is focused on social innovation activities developed in urban context during COVID 19 pandemic by conducting case study content analysis through the systematic literature review in an international level. In this respect, core characteristics of social innovation (value-based, social needs/problems-focused, collaborative, change-oriented) in urban context during COVID 19 has been analyzed through the selected articles on country case studies.

This paper comprises three basic sections. Following this introduction is the methodology section that gives basic information on “qualitative meta-analysis” as a research method conducted in three stages: 1) systematic literature review, 2) content analysis and 3) synthesis/reporting. The next section outlines the research findings in three subtitles: 1) Core values of social innovation in pandemic urban setting, 2) Prominent urban problems/needs and solution of social innovation in pandemic 3) Core innovators/stakeholders in collaboration under pandemic urban setting. The last section focuses on the discussion of the research findings.

### Research Method

This research aims to understand how “Social Innovation” has been contextualized within the International Urban literature related COVID 19 process that completely changed the urban area all over the world. Within this aim, research method has based on a recent approach identified as qualitative meta-analysis. “Qualitative meta-analysis” gives an opportunity for using “a systematic approach” to review, to analysis and synthesis the researches examining the same phenomenon (Timulak, 2014). Within the scope of this research, research method has conducted in three stages for gathering comprehensive understanding on "social innovation" within "urban governance" in relation with COVID 19: 1) systematic literature review, 2) content analysis and 3) synthesis/reporting.

### Systematic literature review

This stage has consisted of choosing the data bases to use, deciding the publication time periods, words, concepts, and themes to search by describing the exclusion and inclusion criteria. Web of Science database has been preferred because of allowing to reach high quality publications in terms of their impact factors at the international level. Exclusion and inclusion criteria for filtering the most related publications have also been determined as in Table 1:

**Table 1. Inclusion and exclusion criteria for filtering the most related publications**

Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All types of publications reached from WoS database</li> <li>Qualitative, quantitative or mixed research methods</li> <li>All country cases published in English</li> <li>Articles published between 2019 and 2021</li> <li>Publications with specific topics on “social innovation”, “urban/city” and “Covid 19/pandemic”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Articles not published between 2019 and 2021</li> <li>Articles not included the terms “social innovation”, “covid/pandemic” “urban/city” in their abstract</li> <li>Articles not in English</li> <li>No access to publications</li> <li>Publications on general literature review that not focus on a specific country sample</li> </ul>

The literature search has been performed through Web of Science database between June and September 2021. After 64 articles reached from the database were filtered by applying the exclusion and inclusion criteria (2 of the article not accessed; 4 in Italian and 3 in Chinese could not be included), abstracts of 55 articles identified have carefully been screened for choosing most related articles about the topic. For example, 6 articles were not included in the analysis because of not providing appropriate information for content analysis although they have allowed a general understanding of social innovation within urban policies and governance during the COVID 19 process from an international perspective. 26 articles in which terms of "city" and "urban" has been only referred for only marking the research area but not referred to urban governance or policies/services in their title, abstract or full text are excluded. At least, 23 articles identified as relevant (Table 2) were inserted into the database for analyzing via NVIVO qualitative analysis program.

**Table 2. Articles identified for content analysis**

Publications	Journal name	Nbr.
Cleave J. and Geijsman J. (2020)	Digital Library Perspectives	1
McGuirk, P., Dowling, R., Maalsen S. and Baker, T. (2021)	Geographical Research	1
Voda, M., Murgu, A., Sarpe, C. A., Graves, S. M. and Avram, C. (2021)	International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health	3
Chen, Y., Su, X. and Zhou, Q. (2021)		
Jeong, E., Hagose, M., Jung, H., Ki, M. and Flahault, A. (2020)		
Mehmood, A. and Imran, M. (2021)	European Planning Studies	1
Zukin, S. (2020)	Theory and Society	1
Maynardes, D. and Fariniuk, T. (2020)	Brazilian Journal of Public Administration	1
Le, T.T., Ngo, H. Q. and Aureliano-Silva, L. (2020)	International Journal of Emerging Markets	1
Hou, X., Ma, Q. and Wang, X. (2021)	Discrete Dynamics in Nature and Society	1
Hidayat S., Halid J., Dirgantara, T., Kusuma, M. A.; Utomo, H.; Sudjud, R. W.; Rejeki, S. I.; Mahradi, S.; Raharno, S.; Rukanta, D. & Tjahjono, H. (2020)	Journal of Engineering and Technological Science	1
Imai, H. and Ji, Y. (2021)	Asian Studies	1
Sharif, A., Khavarian-Garmsir, A.R. and Kummitha, R.K.R. (2021)		3
Calzada, I. (2021).	Sustainability	
Samkange, F., Ramkissoon, H., Chipumuro, J., Wanyama, H. and Chawla, G. (2021)		
Tarsitano, E., Sinibaldib, P. and Colao, V. (2021).	International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology	1
Maestosi, C. P., Andreucci, M. B. and Civiero, P. (2021).	Energies	1
Porotto, A. and Ledent, G. (2021).	Buildings	1
Buffel, T., Yarker S., Phillipson C., Lang L., Lewis C., Doran P. and Gof, M. (2021).	Urban Studies	2
Zukin S. (2021).		
Painter, D.T., Shutters,,S. T. and Wentz,,E. (2021).	Urban Science	1
Diganta D. and Zhang, J. J. (2021)	Urban Geography	1
Hestad, D., Tabara, J. D. and Thornton, T. F. (2021).	Cities	1
<b>Total number of the publications analyzed</b>		<b>23</b>

### Content analysis of the literature

Once 23 articles chosen as suitable for reaching the research aim were uploaded to the research database of NVIVO. Most of the articles were country specific urban case studies. Once, the remaining 23 articles from the screenings were classified as single cases with country name in the database. In this context, the cases of countries included in the content analysis are as follows: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, China (2), Italy (2), Indonesia, Japan, New Zealand, Romania, Singapore, South Africa, South Korea, Spain (2),

United Kingdom (2), United States of America (3), Vietnamese.

Then, all cases were analyzed according to capture general understanding on how “social innovation” has been contextualized within the international urban literature related Covid 19-process. In order to understand in depth how social innovation is handled in the context of urban problems/needs within the COVID 19 process, the four sub-questions were identified in relation with the literature on core characteristics of social innovation (value-based, social needs/problems-focused, change-oriented). These sub-questions are:

1. What are the core values that the innovation idea based on?
2. What are the prominent urban social problems/needs to which the idea of innovation is identified?
3. Who are the core innovators/stakeholders?
4. What is the change-oriented solutions produced by the idea of innovation?

In order to answer these sub-questions, deductive category application approach (Timulak, 2014) was used in the first phase of the content analysis by using four categories: 1) core values, 2) urban social problems/needs, 3) core innovators/stakeholders in collaboration, 4) change-oriented solutions. In second phase, inductive approach was used to analyze in all categories separately. Under each category, the contextual position of social innovation in the urban context during the pandemic process has been tried to be understood by using line-by-line coding. Then, themes under each category were reached.

### Synthesis/reporting

For synthesizing the data, whenever information related to characteristics of social innovation (value-based, social needs/problems-focused, change-oriented solutions) was found, it has been recorded in a separate coding under the core characteristics in NVIVO program. As the next article has been analyzed, it has checked whether the coding information (related to each

characteristic) could be combined with an existing code. This process was continued until all articles in the database were analyzed. It has helped to identify and extract codes from existing literature and classifying them to developing overarching themes and sub-themes. This approach has also provided insights on how sub-themes and themes are interconnected and useful for information about social innovation in the pandemic urban settings, which has reported in the following section.

**Findings**

Content analysis results show that social innovation studies developed within the scope of city management and policy under pandemic conditions are handled with direct reference to sustainable development goals. In this respect, the sustainable development goals framework has a decisive position in terms of developing social innovation solutions for urban problems. In 12 of the analyzed articles, it has been emphasized that "Sustainable Development Goals" should be implemented directly in the context of urban policy under pandemic conditions. Additionally, in 6 articles has indirectly referred to "sustainable development" and "sustainability" in "social innovation" studies within pandemic urban. In this respect, a "sustainable", "recovery-oriented", "resilient" and "green" city has pointed to the main political orientation in which core values and activities of social innovation to solve prominent social problems in pandemic process have been constructed.

The research findings are discussed under four sub-titles to understand that the social innovation activities in pandemic urban conditions have been constructed on which core values, what kind of social problems/need focused and how solutions constructed in collaboration.

**Core values of social innovation in pandemic urban setting**

Within the framework of the content analysis on core values that stand out in social innovation in terms of urban policies during Covid-19 process, 4

core values in policy level, 10 dependent values in local and 20 dependent values in daily life levels has been categorized (Table 3). The dependent values are interconnected with each other and has close connection with the realization of core values.

In this respect, Interconnectedness & Reciprocity as one of the core values of urban social innovation during COVID 19 have seen institutional "solidarity", "responsibility" and "transparency" in local governance as the basis. Dependent values that require the development of this process at the level of daily life are described as "collective action" and "solidarity" spirit, "participative", "voluntary" spirit, and openness to change.

*Table 3. Core values for social innovation in urban settings during Covid 19*

SUSTAINABLE – RECOVERY ORIENTED – RESILIENT-GREEN		
Strong relation with Sustainable Development Goals (Directly in 12 articles and partially in 6 articles)		
Core values in policy level	Dependent values in local level	Dependent values in daily life level
Interconnectedness & Reciprocity	Solidarity	Collective action
	Social responsibility	Participation
	Transparency	Voluntary spirit
		Solidarity spirit
		Openness to change
Inclusiveness (Equality & justice)	Empowerment	Democratic participation culture
	Digital rights	Belonging
	Cohesion	Accessibility
		Tolerance
Transformativity	Openness	Critical thinking
	Adaptability	Multiple use of spaces
	Multiple benefits	Advocacy & Activism
Ecological Priority	Environmentality	Diversity awareness
		Advocacy & Activism
	Ecological urban services	Monitoring
		Belonging

Inclusiveness has been one of the other core values defined for social innovation in pandemic urban policy context; that has close connection with the understanding of equal and just city. The realization of this core value has identified as a required multi-level local governance for empowering of vulnerable, implementing of digital rights for all and adopting cohesion policies. In this context, the dependent values expected to develop at the level of daily life have also been mentioned. Especially democratic participation culture, tolerance and belonging

have defined as the main dependent values for realization of inclusiveness in urban daily life under pandemic conditions. In addition to these, accessibility has also handled in close relationship with inclusiveness.

Transformativity has emerged as another important core value emphasized at the level of urban policies during the covid process. This core value has focused on the importance of openness to change toward more democratic urban governance in which the adaptability and the multiplicity of urban services for immediate recovery could be possible in the face of deepening inequalities under pandemic conditions. For this, at the level of everyday urban life, capacity of critical thinking on multi-use value of spaces, monitoring of the urban policy and services and developing advocacy and activism have been highlighted as the important aspects.

Ecological priority has been considered as the newest core value of social innovation in urban setting especially after COVID 19, in close connection with the "sustainable development goals". In this respect, developing environmentality in urban life and governance via ecological urban services has been highlighted as the local level values. The prominence of this local values has been dependent on the increasing awareness on ecological diversity after the relationship between green spaces and belonging becoming more visible in pandemic conditions. From this point of view, values in daily life level on ecological priority have also been defined depending on the capacities of the citizens to monitor and advocate for more green urban areas.

Consistent with the results of the analysis regarding the social problems/needs deepened by the pandemic conditions- discussed in detail in the next section-, the understanding of social innovation has increasingly related with more and more collective values and focusing on local government responsibilities for realizing social human rights.

### Prominent urban problems/needs and solutions of social innovation in pandemic

As a result of the content analysis, it is seen that social innovation activities in urban settings have focused on immediate effects of the pandemic but also addressed longstanding social inequalities. In Table 4, social problems/needs and the vulnerable groups defined in social innovation studies carried out within the framework of these problems have been defined under 6 problem categories.

*Table 4. Social problems and needs on which social innovation activities focused in urban settings during COVID 19*

Problem categorization	Social problems/needs most frequently highlighted	Vulnerable groups
Health problems	Unequal distribution of health supplies	Urban poor Elderly
	Restricted food supply	Homeless, refugees, displaced people (like Roma people)
	Need for medical devices and services	
	Low public health awareness	
Inclusiveness problem	Unmet needs of vulnerable	Elderly
	Inaccessibility of urban services	Refugee, Roma people
	Integration problems and conflicts	Young people
	Unheard voices	Women
	Stereotypes and inequalities	LGBTI+
Space/place related problems	Decreased safe spaces/places	Homeless, refugee, displaced people (like Roma people), Urban poor (children, young, elderly, women, LGBTI+)
	Conflict of interest over land use	
	Housing shortage/increasing prices	
	Increasing deprived urban areas	
Isolation problems	Restrictions of public transportation	
	Abundance of green spaces	
	Feeling of loneliness	Elderly people
Digitalization problems in urban governance	Depression	Young people
	Negative effects of causalities	
	Technocratic and undemocratic planning culture	People living in urban areas of municipalities with unequal resources
	Fragmental local governance and territorial management	Poor
	E-democracy algorithmic threats-Representative problems	Elderly
	Digital inequalities-Digital illiteracy	Women Children

All the problem categories have close relations with the health problems and inclusiveness problems categories. While the first category includes unequal distribution of health supplies (masks, disinfectants etc.), restricted food supply, need for medical devices and services, low public health awareness, the second category consists of unmet needs of the vulnerable because of the inaccessible urban services, stereotypes, and inequalities. That's why, social innovation activities have focused is the space/place related

problems increasing because of the pandemic conditions. This categorical problem definitions have referred to the needs of creating more safe and green spaces/places and more safe public transport services mostly for deprived urban areas and needs for local urban policies to resolve conflicts over land use and housing shortage. The most vulnerable groups have identified in relation to these problems are listed as follows: Homeless people, refugees, displaced people (like Roma people) and the LGBTI+, children, young people and women living in urban poor.

Thus, the most of the innovative solutions to health and inclusiveness problems related to COVID 19 has been about creating, mapping or monitoring multifunctional, ecological, safe urban spaces, public transport system and other urban services including or participatory policy development for reorganizing the public space rules, tax reduce, control of prices of home and collective housing production.

This innovative space creation and mapping activities has been expanded to open online sources spaces for coworking, job creating, knowledge and skills sharing, organizing, and networking in pandemic times. In this kind of open sources space creation, inclusiveness perspective seems to have improved with the trans-boundary collaboration of local union, city councils and non-governmental organizations. Studies carried out in this framework also enable the development of innovative ideas and institutional and social transformation via facilitating social interaction between citizens civil society and the local government. Examples of such innovative studies are:

- Developing online educational and cultural activities for promoting effective lifelong learning and distance learning
- Organizing public discussions
- Disseminating good practice on e-governance
- Developing useful application to raise digital knowledge and skills especially for the vulnerable and groups
- Creating virtual models of safe gaming for children and young people

- Raising awareness via social media campaign for activism and lobbying of social rights

Open sources online spaces have also identified as innovative solutions for the negative effects of isolation during COVID 19 which are categorized under isolation problems. In addition, isolation problems have also been related with the psychosocial and physical health problems which needs to be identified as government responsibility. In this respect, opportunities have emerged for the development of digital professional support systems for all in cooperation between local governments, hospitals, and universities, along with solution proposals, lobbying and advocacy activities of civil society and citizens. At this point, it is seen that innovative professional services have been developed with the financial and technical support of local governments. These professional services can be summarized as follows:

- Call centres for tele consultations and tele medicine with professional psychological support and health materials & medical equipment delivery support,
- Virtual visits of infected patients,
- Local digital centres to capture confirmed cases and to inform about vaccines,
- Municipal financial and food aid for vulnerable,
- Municipal tax assistance to local economy to strengthen small and medium enterprise
- Living treatment centres / Self-help online networks of
- Mutual care,
- Pop up food banks,
- Hardship funds via crowdfunding,
- Organized food distribution to vulnerable,
- Organized vacant housing.

While the emergence of pandemic process in which the use of technology gained importance in terms of urban policy and management revealed the necessity of inclusive participation in governance, governance problems has become more visible or diversified with technological determinism. These problems, which are categorized as digitalization problems in urban governance, has becoming more visible with the emphasis of the need for democratic planning in

general with the pandemic, by civil society and civil networks. However, the status of having digital competence and infrastructure is not shared equally by municipalities, problems arising from digital inequalities seem to have increased due to the dominance of fragmental local governance and territorial management understanding and the inability to carry out e-democracy processes effectively and competently. These problems include the representative problem that emerged as a result of non-inclusive and non-participatory governance understanding. This situation has been further reinforced by the abundance of data on social life during and post pandemic and the problem of digital illiteracy, which prevents the use of mapping systems that will provide data on this issue by the citizens.

### Core innovators/stakeholders in collaboration under pandemic urban setting

Content analysis of the articles selected has shown that the core innovators/stakeholders under pandemic urban setting has multiplicity characteristics and new types of collaborations to solve the urban problems has usually been developed under the leadership of municipal and state institutions. These collaborations have been generally defined as “cross-institutional” or “cross-sectional” municipality-led collaborations, unlike traditional innovation activities. They rely on financial, political, technical, and promotional support from municipalities and government institutions. Additionally, roles of the stakeholders have been diversified (Table 5).

**Table 5. Stakeholders for social innovation in urban settings during Covid 19**

Stakeholders	Roles of the stakeholders
Institutional entrepreneurs from government agencies	Political, financial, technical, and promotional support
<b>Local government</b>	
City leaders (politicians, city councils, collaborative networks)	Dissemination, monitoring, and mobilization support
City agents-community leaders, agents at household level, city volunteers-civic groups	
<b>NGOs, youth agencies, civil society</b>	
Local police	Practice and place support
Local Institutions (such as libraries, health centers etc.)	
Health workers in public and private health institutions	Knowledge, technical and practice support
<b>Universities/academicians/research institutes</b>	
National Tech groups/health companies/industry professionals/architects, and private institutions	Technical, knowledge and promotional support
EU organizations	
<b>International companies</b>	
Philanthropies	Financial support
Citizens & Civic groups	Shared economy partnership

It is also seen that municipalities generally support the sustainability of innovation activities based on shared economy partnerships developed by the citizens and civil organizations via mobilizing civil society, create crowdfunding system across the borders, institutional boundaries, and generations. In this respect, it is also seen that municipalities, local governments institutions and companies have also found a place for developing cross-border collaborations with international institutions and companies. It seems possible to say that this situation can be reflected in the awareness of sustainable development goals at the local level.

### Conclusion

The results of the content analysis on scientific publications, accepted as high quality in terms of international recognition and scientific rankings through WoS database, has shown that the rise of the social innovation activities in urban context can be addressed as a result of the new conditions created by the pandemic in social relations together with the institutional changes that came to the agenda with the neoliberal urban governance policies in the pre-pandemic. In addition to this, social innovation studies developed as a solution to the urban problems

together with the pandemic in various countries (Ziegler, 2017; McGuirk, Dowling, Maalsen and Baker, 2021) have mostly focused on "collectivist and transformative values" including interconnectedness, inclusiveness, transformativity and ecological priority. These collective and transformative values have opened up a space for constructing of values relating with the participatory democracy both in local governments and everyday life level (Abid & Muhammad, 2021). In this framework, it seems possible to develop mechanisms emphasizing and advocating the responsibility of local governments via the active participation of the citizens in the handling of social problems and solution proposals. As a matter of fact, the results of the analysis have indicated that the possibilities of cross border collaborations for social innovation have been developed through diversified roles of the stakeholders, but mostly under state or local government-led responsibility.

However, the pandemic has imposed solutions based on digitalization in terms of local governments and collaborative activities that reveals some risks in terms of the development of participatory democracy in urban context (Hestad, Tabara & Thornton, 2021). At this point, content analysis results have drawn attention to the e-democracy and representation problems (Calzada, 2021) that arise due to fragmental local governance understanding with lack of digital infrastructure, unequal financial and digital capacity or digital illiteracy in both local governance and the daily life level (Zukin, 2021).

At this point, it is seen that a critical perspective on social innovation developed with the pandemic in the urban context has not been developed much. However, content analysis results have shown the contradictory dimensions of social innovation in this context. For example, it is clear that there is a need for studies that reveal the experiences of disadvantaged groups in the dimensions of inclusiveness, freedoms and barriers, especially at the point of being included in the collaborations. Thus, the obstacles could be revealed to the sustainability of the solutions produced by social innovation in urban context during and post the pandemic process.

At last, it should be noted that this research analyzed the social innovation studies implemented in the early stages of the pandemic in urban context through a specific database. This points the limitation of this study despite its importance in terms of capturing the general perception on social innovation in pandemic urban context that determines the international literature.

## References

- Abid, M. & Muhammad, I. (2021) Digital social innovation and civic participation: Toward responsible and inclusive transport planning. *European Planning Studies*, 29, 1870-1885.
- Brandesen, T., Evers, A., Cattacin, S. & Zimmer, A. (2016). Chapter 25: The Good, the Bad and the Ugly in Social Innovation Bransen et. Al. (Eds.). in *Social Innovations in the Urban Context: Nonprofit and Civil Society Studies* (p.303-310). Springer, Cham.
- Buffel, T., Yarker, S., Phillipson, C., Lang, L., Lewis, C., Doran, P. & Gof, M. (2021). Locked down by inequality: Older people and the COVID-19 pandemic. Special issue article: Urban Public Health Emergencies and The Covid-19 Pandemic. *Urban Studies*, 00, 1-18.
- Calzada, I. (2020). Replicating smart cities: The city-to-city learning programme in the replicate EC-H2020-SCC Project. *Smart Cities*, 3, 978-1003.
- Calzada, I. (2021). The right to have digital rights in smart cities. *Sustainability*, 13, 11438.
- Cattacin, S. & Zimmer, A. (2016). Chapter 2: Urban governance and social innovations in social innovations Bransen et. Al. (Eds.). in *Social Innovations in the Urban Context: Nonprofit and Civil Society Studies* (p.21-44). Springer, Cham.
- Chen, Y., Su, X. & Zhou, Q. (2021). Study on the spatiotemporal evolution and influencing factors of urban resilience in the Yellow River Basin. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18, 10231.
- Cleave, J. & Geijsman, J. (2020). LibraryCraft – how the COVID-19 pandemic led to the growth of the WA libraries public Minecraft server. *Digital Library Perspectives*, 36, 377-388.
- Diganta, D. & Zhang, J. J. (2021). Pandemic in a smart city: Singapore's COVID-19 management

- through technology & society. *Urban Geography*, 42, 408-416.
- Hestad, D., Tabara, J. D. & Thornton, T. F. (2021). The role of sustainability-oriented hybrid organisations in the development of transformative capacities: The case of Barcelona. *Cities*, 119, 1-13.
- Hidayat, S., Halid, J., Dirgantara, T., Kusuma, M. A., Utomo, H., Widiyanto S. R., Rejeki, I. S., Mihradi, S., Raharno, S., Rukanta, D. & Tjahjono, H. (2020). Lessons learned from rapid development of CPAP Ventilator Vent-I during Covid-19 pandemic in Indonesia. *Journal of Engineering and Technological Science*, 52, 765-778.
- Hou, X., Ma, Q. & Wang, X. (2021). Spatial differentiation and elements influencing urban resilience in the middle reaches of the Yangtze River under the COVID-19 pandemic. *Discrete Dynamics in Nature and Society*, 2021(1), 1-18.
- Imai, H. & Ji, Y. (2021). Social capital, innovation, and local resilience: Tokyo neighbourhood in times of crisis. *Asian Studies IX (XXV)*, 1, 283–313.
- Jeong, E., Hagose, M., Jung H., Ki, M. & Flahault, A. (2020). Understanding South Korea’s response to the COVID-19 outbreak: A real-time analysis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health Case Report*, 17, 9571.
- Le, T. T., Ngo, H. Q. & Aureliano-Silva, L. (2020). Contribution of corporate social responsibility on SMEs’ performance in an emerging market – the mediating roles of brand trust and brand loyalty. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOEM-12-2020-1516>.
- Maestosi, C. P., Andreucci, M. B. & Civiero, P. (2021). Sustainable urban areas for 2030 in a post-COVID-19 scenario: Focus on innovative research and funding frameworks to boost transition towards 100 positive energy districts and 100 climate-neutral cities. *Energies*, 14, 216.
- Maynardes, D. & Fariniuk, T. (2020). Smart cities and the pandemic: digital technologies on the urban management of Brazilian cities. *Brazilian Journal of Public Administration*, 54, 860-873.
- Mehmood, A. & Imran, M. (2021). Digital social innovation and civic participation: Toward responsible and inclusive transport planning. *European Planning Studies*, 29(10), 1870-1885
- McGuirk, P., Dowling, R., Maalsen S. & Baker, T. (2021). Urban governance innovation and COVID-19. *Geographical Research*, 59, 188–195.
- Painter, D., T., Shuttters, S. T. & Wentz, E. (2021). Innovations and economic output scale with social interactions in the workforce. *Urban Science*, 5, 21.
- Porotto, A. & Ledent, G. (2021). Crisis and transition: Forms of collective housing in Brussels. *Buildings*, 11, 162.
- Samkange, F., Ramkissoo, H., Chipumuro, J., Wanyama, H. & Chawla, G. (2021). Innovative and sustainable food production and food consumption entrepreneurship: A conceptual recipe for delivering development success in South Africa. *Sustainability*, 13, 11049.
- Sharif, A., Khavarian-Garmsir, A.R. & Kummitha, R.K.R. (2021). Contributions of smart city solutions and technologies to resilience against the COVID-19 pandemic: A literature review. *Sustainability*, 13, 8018.
- Tarsitano, E., Sinibaldib, P. & Colao, V. (2021). Green days in the Park: A case study on Landsenses Ecology. *International Journal Of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*, 28, 632-643.
- Thompson, M. (2019). Playing with The rules of the game: Social innovation for urban transformation. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 43, 1168-1192.
- Timulak, L. (2014). Qualitative meta-analysis. Flick, U (Ed.). in *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis* (p.481-495). SAGE Publications.
- UN (2015). *World Population Prospects: The 2015 Revision, Key Findings and Advance* (Working Paper No. ESA/P/WP.241) Department of Economic and Social Affairs. [https://population.un.org/wpp/Publications/Files/Key\\_Findings\\_WPP\\_2015.pdf](https://population.un.org/wpp/Publications/Files/Key_Findings_WPP_2015.pdf).
- UN (2020). *Policy Brief: COVID-19 in an Urban World*. United Nations. [https://unsdg.un.org/sites/default/files/2020-07/sg\\_policy\\_brief\\_covid\\_urban\\_world.pdf](https://unsdg.un.org/sites/default/files/2020-07/sg_policy_brief_covid_urban_world.pdf).

- UN-Habitat (2020). *UN-Habitat Guidance on COVID-19 and Public Space* (Covid Response 1). UN-Habitat.  
[https://unhabitat.org/sites/default/files/2020/06/un-habitat\\_guidance\\_on\\_covid-19\\_and\\_public\\_space.pdf](https://unhabitat.org/sites/default/files/2020/06/un-habitat_guidance_on_covid-19_and_public_space.pdf).
- WHO (2020). *Strengthening Preparedness for COVID-19 in Cities and Urban Settings Interim Guidance for Local Authorities* (WHO/2019-nCoV/Urban\_preparedness/2020.1). World Health Organization.  
[https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/331896/WHO-2019-nCoV-Urban\\_preparedness-2020.1-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/331896/WHO-2019-nCoV-Urban_preparedness-2020.1-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y).
- Voda, M., Murgu, A., Sarpe, C. A., Graves, S. M. & Avram, C. (2021). The Tigani community adaptability to changes in rural Romania and the COVID-19 Impact. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18, 10622.
- Ziegler, R. (2017). Social innovation as a collaborative concept. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 30, 388-405.
- Zukin, S. (2020). Seeing like a city: How tech became urban. *Theory and Society*, 49, 941-964.
- Zukin, S. (2021). Planetary silicon valley: Deconstructing New York's innovation complex. *Urban Studies*, 58, 3-35.