

Social Transformation through Social Innovation: The Case Study of a Moroccan Waste Recycling Cooperative

Wiam Lahmidi¹, Zineb Lahmidi², Soukaina El Boujnouni³

¹Mohammed V University, Rabat, Morocco

²Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah University, Fez, Morocco

³The higher School of Technology of Salé, Mohammed V University, Rabat, Morocco

Received: 16 Jun 2023; Received in revised form: 14 Jul 2023; Accepted: 22 Jul 2023; Available online: 30 Jul 2023

©2023 The Author(s). Published by AI Publications. This is an open access article under the CC BY license

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Abstract— Faced with the Moroccan economic, social and climatic realities, it is necessary to move towards new models, more adapted to a new dynamic of social transformation. Thus, social innovation appears as a concept linked to social economy, with the aim of meeting social needs through collective action. As such, the cooperative model is the perfect example of a field in which players can work together, collaborate and show solidarity which are essential ingredients for innovation and new solutions to social problems. At this level, the question that arises is how can social innovation contribute to social transformation? We will be focusing on the cooperative structure, as a vehicle for social innovation. With this in mind, the aim of this paper is to highlight, throughout a combination of theoretical and empirical work, the role of social actors (as part of the cooperative) in the social transformation of a given territory.

Keywords— Social innovation, Social Economy, Cooperative, Territory

I. INTRODUCTION

The current situation in the world generally and in Morocco especially has made it apparent that it is necessary to focus on new dynamics of social transformation. This underscores the growing interest of researchers in innovations that surpass the limits of technology [43], as in the case of the concept of social innovation that has been gaining momentum over the last decade [55].

Social innovation has become one of the main ways in which societies remake themselves [39] and are therefore seen as actors in major social transformations [3].

Social innovation also appears to be a concept associated with the social economy sector, emphasizing its innovative potential, which in turn seems difficult to dissociate from social transformations [41].

Social economy, as a group of collective, democratic enterprises, lies at the heart of social transformation and change. And the cooperative, as the core of social economy, is the perfect example of a structure in which players can connect, collaborate and show solidarity which

are essential ingredients for innovation, new solutions to social problems and social change.

At this level, the question that arises is how can social innovation contribute to social transformation? We will be focusing on the cooperative structure, as a vehicle for social innovation.

In order to provide some answers to this question, we begin by providing a definitional basis for social innovation, based on the main components that characterize it. Then, we discuss the notions of social transformation and social change, with reference to the various approaches to social innovation. In the second part, we examine the theoretical approaches underlining the innovative potential of the social economy, which we then subject to an empirical confrontation, based on a Moroccan initiative, the Attawafouk cooperative, which relies on waste recycling in order to highlight the social innovation that it carries as well as the social transformations and changes that it brings about.

II. SOCIAL INNOVATION AND SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION: CROSSROADS AND LINKAGES

Social innovation is a multidimensional and ambiguous concept. It is considered to be the development of new social practices which, by moving away from dominant representations and behaviors, introduce the seeds of social change [13]. Moreover, it is often associated with social transformation [35]. At this level, the question that arises is how social innovations can contribute to social transformation, especially as they most often emerge within the framework of small organizations that do not have the capacity to bring those transformations on their own [38].

For this section, we first draw on the theoretical work of [12] and [37] on the dimensions and purpose of social innovation, as well as the institutionalist approach focusing on the process of social innovation and its various components, in order to understand and clarify the concept of social innovation as much as possible (2.1).

Secondly, we look at the transformative scope of social innovation, basing ourselves on two main registers of social innovation: the Anglo-Saxon and European registers, and the different approaches derived from them (2.2).

2.1. Social innovation: A definitional approach

Various attempts to define social innovation have highlighted a number of characteristics that help to reveal the different dimensions of social innovation and provide a relatively satisfactory definition. Social innovation is therefore often defined in terms of: target, form and nature, process and purpose.

2.1.1. Targets of social innovation

Social innovation has three targets [12]:

- Individuals whose well-being is improved and assured
- Territory, which is subject to different interpretations on different scales (local, regional, national or international...) and which represents the receptacle for the impacts and changes brought about by social innovation.
- The structure carrying the social innovation.

At this level, we can mention the preferred fields of action for social innovation. Lévesque suggests three [41]:

- New values, new projects and new aspirations of collective players, for work, personal services and territory.
- Institutional innovations, new rules, systems for sharing rights and responsibilities, forms of partnership and so on.

- Organizational innovations in management, division of labor, governance, collective learning, networking and network management [1].

2.1.2. Form and nature of social innovation

Social innovation often takes a confusing form, as it is torn between two opposing perceptions.

The first refers to social innovation as immaterial or intangible (a new service, organization, procedure, behavior, institution... etc.), thus referring to “ways of doing things” [12]. In this sense, it is perceived as the opposite of the “product” idea, and is very closely linked to organizational innovation.

A second perspective sees social innovation as potentially material. In this case, it takes the form of production technologies, devices or products. Social innovation is defined as a new solution or response. It is therefore subject to the requirement of novelty. Rather, what makes it a social innovation is its discontinuity in relation to habitually implemented practices, which represent an out-of-the-box solution in a given context [12].

2.1.3. A process at the heart of the institutionalist approach

The process and modes of production of social innovation are another key characteristic that distinguishes it from traditional innovation. Indeed, the process lies at the heart of the institutionalist approach to social innovation developed by CRISES researchers, and is based on recurring constituents found in the majority of theoretical and empirical research. These are territory, economic model, governance and empowerment [5].

2.1.3.1. Territory

Rather than delimited borders, territory refers to organized relationships, particular groups or populations who recognize themselves in common projects [52]. It is thus seen as a dynamic process rather than a fixed substance, marked by the interaction of heterogeneous social groups that share a common sense of belonging, generating a common identity [21].

Territory is first and foremost a social entity, the fruit of a shared, collective construct [21]. This is why it cannot exist without territorialized actors [5]. There is a transversal relationship between social innovation and territory. Not only does the collective action generated by innovation contribute to the development of the territory, but it also stems from it. It's a context that not only provides the envelope for an activity or action, but also helps to build it [21]. Besançon asserts that the process of social innovation is territorialized. Indeed, this territorialization lies in the cooperation of actors from the same territory around a common project [5].

Thus, the social dimension of innovation is induced by the intensity of interactions and the scope of the mobilized social networks [49]. Proximity plays a key role in facilitating these interactions. According to Richez-Battesi and al. there are different levels of proximity that enable innovation to become embedded in the social and territorial fabric [50]. Furthermore, this territorialized process favors a plural economy [35] where hybridization of resources (market, non-market and non-monetary resources) takes precedence [50].

2.1.3.2. A hybrid Business Model

The hybridization of resources is explained by the market's inability to provide answers to local social problems. Initiatives in the non-market economy tend to compensate for the shortcomings of the market economy, acting as a "social band-aid" for the harmful consequences of the market [32].

As a result, the collective dynamics that are taking shape on the ground are instituting new inclusive and participative modes of governance, based on partnerships between private and public players [49], [50]. The process of social innovation is expressed through broad, participatory governance [5]. At this level, and according to the Quebec social innovation network (RQIS), four types of players collaborate in the world of social innovation: promoters, funders, supporting partners and takers. Promoters can be individuals or groups of people, and they put their heart and soul into creating, promoting and driving forward the innovative project. Funders are often seen as the source of financing for social innovation. Supporting partners provide knowledge and experience to support social innovators. They bring a certain credibility. Public authorities play this role. And takers contribute to the dissemination and adoption of social innovation.

Once adopted, those innovations become widespread. Takers can be users who take ownership of the innovation and put it into practice within their organization, or beneficiaries who receive the result of these social innovations "whatever form it takes" (product, service, etc.). In both cases, they participate in the innovative process, take ownership of the social innovation and benefit from it.

Thus, a social innovation must be disseminated among the actors for whom it is intended. It must then be adopted and appropriated by them at individual, microsocial (locality) and microsocial (region, nation, etc.) levels [4].

2.1.3.3. A democratic participative governance

Actors' participation is the fruit of a dual process: co-construction and co-production [54].

The first involves implementing public policies in collaboration with civil society and market players, while the second corresponds to the upstream development of public policies, both of which refer to the collaboration of civil society and market players. Hence, the idea of governance highlights how actors in networks are able to cooperate, coordinate and self-govern [24] in order to orient, guide or control certain aspects or particular dimensions of a system [14] and above all contributes to taking into account the role of actors and actor networks in the processes of developing, and not just implementing, public policies [24]. We could say that social innovation is part of an updated version of governance [5].

Also, as we saw earlier, an innovative initiative emerges from a perceived need and an institutional shortcoming. In this sense, social innovation is driven "from below" [32] as it stems from citizen initiatives [17] that aim to provide a response to a social need, while taking responsibility for it [12]. These citizen initiatives are based on the participation of social actors and the integration of groups usually excluded [12] in the social innovation process, which proves to be a source of individual empowerment.

Thus, social innovation can be understood as "a support system designed to bring about lasting change in individuals, to develop them in such a way that they regain power over the course of their own lives" [12].

2.1.3.4. Empowerment

From this perspective, empowerment refers to the (re)appropriation of power by individuals, organizations and communities [45], and to changing public policies based on social movements [5]. It has an undeniable territorial dimension, because the social movements behind it are, above all, territorialized [34].

Empowerment is also a learning process aimed at enhancing the value of individuals and developing their autonomy, knowledge and skills, so that they can meet their own needs [12].

2.1.4. A social purpose

Social innovation refers to initiatives that aim to respond to problems and needs that the state has gradually abandoned, through the implementation of projects set up or financed by major players in market capitalism [5]. Thus, it emerges in response to the failure of state and market mechanisms to meet certain social needs with a view to improving the quality of life of an individual or a group of individuals [7] or enhancing their well-being [10].

This innovation is centered on a social purpose, since its aim is far from being economic, and its bearers are generally not motivated by the prospect of maximizing

their profits, since in the majority of cases their activity is non-profit or generates little profit (However, the aim of some social innovations is also commercial development). Consequently, the term “social” associated with innovation is used in the normative sense of aiming for the common good.

In conclusion, and by bringing together the characteristics mentioned above, we put forward a synthetic definition of social innovation, which refers to any new approach, practice, intervention or product developed to improve a situation or solve a social or socio-economic problem, and which has found takers in the market, institutions, organizations or communities [7]. It takes shape in a collective process marked by solidarity-based practices that form a strong territorial anchoring and, concomitantly, a broad, participative governance, resulting in a plural economic model [5].

2.2. Social innovation and the heart of social transformation

In this section, we look at the different approaches to social innovation, and the transformative impact of each of them in two main ways: Anglo-Saxon and European.

The Anglo-Saxon conception (2.2.1) refers to the institutional approach and entrepreneurial dimension of social innovation, driven by social entrepreneurs. Whereas the European concept (2.2.2) is based on the entrepreneurial dimension of social innovation, supported by the concept of the social enterprise (developed by the EMES network) and the institutionalist approach mentioned above.

2.2.1. An Anglo-Saxon conception: Institutional approach and social Entrepreneurship

The institutional approach sees social innovation as an instrument for modernizing and rationalizing public and social policies, and focuses on the capacity of social innovation to modernize and even transform public policies, making them more efficient and effective. A public policy is understood as an institutional framework that structures social practices at the same time as these practices participate in its production [29]. This dual action requires innovation, which is seen as a key lever for the evolution and improvement of our social and economic model. In this sense, social innovations are called upon to compensate for the imperfections of conventional public action [5].

They apply the rules of new public management, which aims to achieve greater effectiveness and efficiency by transposing private-sector management methods to the public sector [2] and introducing market mechanisms into the state apparatus (e.g. competition between public

administrative services as a means of internal regulation and encouraging greater productivity) [47].

The social entrepreneur approach brings together work that develops a more entrepreneurial vision of social innovation. Indeed, the notion of social entrepreneurship emerged in the United States on the initiative of the Harvard Business School in 1993. Nevertheless, it is possible to identify two schools of social entrepreneurship, both American: the market revenue school and the social innovation school [5].

On the first hand, the market revenue school defines “social enterprise” as a form of organization that solves the funding problems of NPO's (non-profit organizations) by developing revenue-generating economic activities that benefit the organizations' social mission. This initial concept has since been broadened to include any organization, profit-making or not, that carries out a market-based economic activity for the benefit of a social purpose [50]. Non-profitability is not a condition of social enterprise according to the American vision, which emphasizes above all philanthropic motivations and market opportunities (i.e. the possibility of profit-making organizations positioning themselves). Social innovation here as a response to a social need puts the spotlight on the entrepreneur, who may be one or more individuals seeking, primarily, to make available the financial resources required for innovation [5].

On the other hand, social innovation, according to the social innovation school, is dependent on a single individual (entrepreneur) and emphasizes his or her characteristics and the purpose of his or her action [49]. Thus, the social entrepreneur is someone who uses his or her entrepreneurial qualities to solve a large-scale social and/or environmental problem. Whatever the field in which they are involved, social entrepreneurs set the scale of their impact on society as their main criterion for success. They are therefore motivated by a social purpose, which presupposes changes that create social value [50].

2.2.2. The European conception: Social enterprise and the institutionalist approach

On the one hand, the concept of social enterprise is linked to the Italian social cooperatives and the work of EMES in analyzing social enterprises. Unlike the American approach of social innovation, which focuses on social purpose and entrepreneurial characteristics, the European approach emphasizes the collective, non-profit process within social enterprises. Non-profit in this sense is seen as a limited redistribution that avoids profit-maximizing behavior [19]. Social innovation is therefore a bottom-up process (emanating from the community), collective (involving a diversity of players), based on democratic

principles and born of a desire to meet the needs of a community. This concept of social innovation is consistent with that of the social economy [18].

On the other hand, the institutionalist approach developed at CRISES (in Quebec) then at IFRESI (in France), emphasizes the collective process that emerges in territories to meet unsatisfied social needs in a dynamic of social transformation. Two dimensions will be highlighted. The first refers to the local context in which social innovation develops, while the second focuses on new actions, practices and initiatives that help transform society.

Social innovation is thus defined as a territorialized, bottom-up, non-governmental, participatory and inclusive system that accounts for initiatives taken to meet social expectations [6] and holds a transformative and territorialized potential [5].

2.2.3. The transformative scope of Anglo-Saxon and European conceptions

Having reviewed the Anglo-Saxon and European approaches to social innovation, we now turn to the concepts of social transformation and social change. The social entrepreneurship approach emphasizes the notion of social change rather than social transformation.

At this level, social change is perceived as a series of changes that can be observed and verified over the medium term, and that can be localized geographically and socially. In other words, social change is a collective phenomenon, involving a plurality of actors, which affects living conditions or lifestyles. It also represents an observable change in social organization over a specific period of time. Thus, social change refers to an evolution in the purpose of economic projects, from the pursuit of profits to the satisfaction of needs or the resolution of the problems of the most underprivileged [5] and occurs in continuity, unlike social transformation, which designates a mutation marking discontinuity and designating large-scale dissemination [41].

Moreover, social transformation is a notion emphasized by the institutionalist approach of European origin. This social transformation is at the heart of initiatives in the solidarity economy [42], which can be defined as all economic activities governed by the will to act democratically, where social relationships based on solidarity take precedence over individual interest or material profit; it thus contributes to the democratization of the economy based on citizen commitment [23]. It breaks with the dominant organizational forms and emphasizes the transformative impact of social innovation on its framework of action, and its ability to promote forms of coordination and cooperation other than market relations,

or even to participate in a process of reintegrating the economy into a democratic political project [5].

In this context, social transformation refers to what we might call institutional change, which concerns the ideas, values, regulations and cognitive orientations that influence organizational behavior. In other words, it refers to changes in habits of thinking (representations) and doing (practices) [22].

III. SOCIAL INNOVATION, SOCIAL ECONOMY AND SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS: CONVERGING CONCEPTS

Social economy refers to a group of collective, democratic enterprises that are often seen as fertile ground for social innovation, which is at the heart of the adoption of new approaches, new products and new services.

It is clear, then, that social economy and social innovation refer to two realities with close links, and it would be interesting to highlight the sources and factors that make social economy an innovative sector par excellence (3.1).

Social economy is also fertile ground for social innovation and can lead to social change and transformation. This will be established through the case study of the Attawafouk; a waste recycling cooperative (3.2).

3.1. Social Economy: A socially innovative sector

Social economy refers to that part of the economy which explicitly recognizes the social dimension of economy [11]. This social dimension is made explicit by the legal status of cooperatives, mutuals and associations [20], by the values of service to members and the community [18], by the rules linking economic activity and an association of people [56], and by the hybridization of the various economic principles of the market, redistribution and reciprocity [23] and [15].

Indeed, social economy is based on several elements: legal status, diversity of players, a set of rules and values, activities with a dual purpose (social and economic) to meet social needs and the aspirations of members of organizations or communities [39]. And it is these very elements that make social economy a privileged field for experimentation and a matrix from which social innovation can emerge [9].

Furthermore, social economy makes it possible to solve or prevent social problems that neither the government nor the market are able to satisfy. Social innovation as a "new way of doing things" emanates from the activities implemented that are often neglected by the market or the state [9].

Social economy is thus considered innovative because it occupies the spaces left vacant by the public economy and the market economy [35] and because it gives certain relatively dominated or excluded players access to entrepreneurial power, enabling them to carry out business projects they would not have been able to carry out individually [9]. As a result, social economy tends to change social relationships, overturn social norms and rethink institutions, particularly when these are unable to respond to new demands [37].

Also, social economy's novel operating rules are largely responsible for its innovative capacity. Indeed, individuals mobilize collectively to meet a common need. This mobilization generates new social ties and solidarity between members. It is the richness of these ties and the scope of the social networks that have been set up that lay the foundations for participative and democratic governance, in which the contribution of members and the sharing of information are paramount.

Another important element that constitutes one of the strengths of social economy is its territorial anchoring. This territorial anchoring operates on two levels. The first is proximity [48],[25] expressed in different ways: spatial, organizational and institutional. The second is the construction of a sense of belonging through interpersonal processes and knowledge of the physical space that surrounds us.

Moreover, as social economy develops through the triptych of government, market and civil society, the relative autonomy of each of these spheres must be respected. As Laville [36] points out, social economy structures hybridize various economic forms: market, state and reciprocal. This capacity is based on the alliance of players from different backgrounds, united around a project that itself mobilizes [38].

In short, the ability of social economy to produce social innovation boils down to its capacity to build bridges between private and public, economic and social, to hybridize resources of various kinds (market: proceeds from the sale of goods and services, non-market: donations, non-monetary: volunteering), to bring together a plurality of players around a common project, make it effectively a breeding ground for the development of social innovations. In this sense, social economy organizations are condemned to innovate [7], [38].

3.2. Dynamics and transformations implied by a social innovation: the case study of the Attawafouk cooperative

The aim of this section is to offer an empirical comparison of the theoretical approaches mentioned above, in order to

reveal in practice, the transformations and changes brought about by social innovation.

To do this, we have based ourselves on the process of social innovation developed by the institutionalist approach, to emphasize the different changes brought about in each constituent element. The Attawafouk cooperative, located in Oum Aazza cercle Ain Aouda, prefecture of Skhirate Temara, is a case in point. Its activity is based on waste recycling and integration through economic activity.

3.2.1. General Context

In Morocco, waste sorting and recovery business is particularly informal, relying mainly on waste pickers or itinerant. The former wait for garbage trucks to be emptied before sorting, equipped with forks and bags to collect recyclable waste. The latter, scours town with a cart, collecting recyclable waste from garbage cans and skips before the collection trucks arrive, usually during the night.

This scenario is repeated in all Morocco's rubbish dumps, where the hands of sorters (men, women and children) are intermingled, and where working conditions are disorganized, full of risk, and a blatant reflection of a state of misery and exclusion.

The Aakrach landfill was one of these, and had a number of environmental drawbacks: proliferation of vermin, deterioration of the air and landscape through the scattering of waste by the wind or its piling up and damage to the earth.

At the end of 2007, saturation of the Akrach site (where around 150 sorters and their families worked and lived) led to its closure. The closure involved transferring the site to a new landfill at Oum Azza.

3.2.2. Identifying a social need

According to the Godin Institute, social innovation is contextualized in terms of the need it aims to meet and the social aspiration that motivates its emergence.

The Attawafouk cooperative (which means agreement in Arabic) is the product of an awareness of an unsatisfactory situation and an aspiration for a better life.

A variety of factors contributed to its impetus: the closure of the Akrach site, the dangers and hazards associated with the sorters' activities, the desire to integrate an organized and formal framework.

Cooperative as a legal status is the framework best suited to the context and the needs of cooperators, combining democracy, social purpose and collective effort.

3.2.3. A multi-criteria transformation process

In approaching the process of social innovation, we place ourselves in a perspective centered on the collective, the plurality and hybridization of resources, territorial anchoring, participative and democratic governance and the empowerment of individuals.

3.2.3.1. A collective action

The definition of a cooperative emphasizes its collective dimension, as it refers to a group of people who come together to provide the product or service they need to their exclusive satisfaction.

The Attawafouk cooperative was set up on January 3, 2010, and began operations at the end of July 2011, initially with 27 members, which grew to 150 in 2015. The aim of the cooperative is to sort waste, add value to the sorted products, wash, grind and press them, and improve the social conditions of the sorters by increasing production.

This cooperative is at the heart of a delegated management contract with Segedema (a subsidiary of the French Pizzorno Group), which in June 2011 opened the Oum Azza mechanized waste sorting center, which receives waste from the cities of Rabat, Salé and Témara and employs former informal sorters from the Akrach landfill.

In addition, and with the aim of facilitating the professional integration and structuring the activities of the sorters, the Pizzorno Group has entered into a partnership with the NGO Care Maroc, which has provided them with training to familiarize them with the organization of work and the operation of the machines. The Group supports the cooperative by providing all the material and logistical conditions necessary for its operation.

3.2.3.2. A wide range of resources

At this level, it is worth pointing out that the cooperative involves multiple local players in a co-production process that results in the hybridization of market, non-market and nonmonetary resources.

- Market resources are derived from the sale and recycling of sorted products.
- Non-market resources refer to government contributions, which in this case consist of facilities and aid administered by the municipality and Wilaya of Rabat and Kénitra.
- Non-monetary resources based on personalized reciprocity through training and coaching activities aimed at strengthening know-how and improving sorters' professionalism.

3.2.3.3. Territory roots

This initiative is seen as a territorial social innovation through:

- *Coordination between local players and building a shared vision:* the Attawafouk cooperative has not only mobilized the actors most familiar with this environment and best placed to launch innovative and adapted initiatives (the sorters), it has also sought to stimulate other stakeholders by creating a meeting place for heterogeneous actors including private organizations, local authorities, NGOs...
- *Use of local human and natural resources:* The local environment is involved on two levels. On the one hand, waste is supplied and deposited on the basis of a sorting process that takes place on the Oum Azza site. Admittedly, this waste does not emanate directly from this same area, as the sorting center receives waste from various towns, notably Rabat, Salé and Témara, but it is nonetheless a resource that is attached to it because it is destined for it. What's more, the human resources working on this site share a common history and are dependent on a logic of proximity that enables them to forge solid bonds of solidarity.
- *Responding to the needs of a socially responsible territory:* The Oum Azza cooperative contributes to the development of the territory in which it operates and to the preservation of the environment, which is apparent just by looking at the splendid, soothing greenery and landscapes of this commune located 30km from Rabat and 5km from Akrach.

3.2.3.4. Participatory and democratic governance

Respecting and applying cooperative values and principles means that governance is participative and democratic. The principle of "one person = one vote" encourages participation in strategic decisions and the election of leaders. In the case of the Attawafouk cooperative, all sorters are equal, with the same starting salary. This emphasizes democratic, egalitarian governance and the primacy of the individual over capital.

In addition, a monthly meeting is organized to select the customer whose offer is the most attractive, and each of them has a voice that enables them to be heard and to participate in the project. The response is produced collectively, giving a central role to the cooperators, who together have gained access to markets that previously seemed inaccessible.

3.2.3.5. Empowerment

The Attawafouk cooperative's innovative initiative enables sorters to gain power in the face of a society that has excluded them. This gain takes place on different levels: economic, social and psychological.

Indeed, "mikhali" is the derogatory term in Moroccan dialect by which they were known due to their association

with Akrach, which has always been perceived as a nest of criminals and thugs.

Today, these recuperators are gaining respect and ridding themselves of the stigma they once suffered. The proof is that they have been able to integrate professionally, earn an honest living and bring about a positive change, since the Attawafouk cooperative in Oum Azza is a pioneering initiative in terms of waste sorting in a country with over 200 unauthorized dumps.

They have also regained their dignity and self-confidence, as they are now able to give free rein to their ambitions and have a vision of the future, something they previously lacked.

Moreover, the recognition and formalization of the sorters' professional status has enabled them to benefit from a number of advantages, including medical cover, a bank account and the right to take out a mortgage at a relatively low rate.

IV. CONCLUSION

It can be said that the Attawafouk cooperative in Oum Azza represents a pioneering innovation in waste sorting and recycling in a country with some 200 uncontrolled dumps. Consequently, social economy seems to be a fertile ground for social innovation and social transformation and change, for two main reasons.

On the one hand, social economy is based on a hybridization of resources and is in constant contact with other economic sectors, in particular the private and public sectors, which enrich the exchange and participate in a learning process. This can be part of a vision of improvement and efficiency for both the supporting institution and its various stakeholders. This is what we call social change.

On the second hand, it relies on a coalition of social players. Particularly actors belonging to the same territorial entity. This highlights their ability to co-construct public policies, and to co-produce and implement them.

This increases the attractiveness of the territory, solidifies social ties, promotes new forms of cooperation, and establishes new institutional forms leading to new work organizations. All key ingredients for institutional change and social transformation.

REFERENCES

[1] Alter, N. (2002). Théorie du don et sociologie du monde du travail. *Revue du MAUSS*, 20(2), 263-285.

- [2] Amar, A., & Berthier, L. (2007). Le nouveau management public: avantages et limites. *Gestion et management publics*, 5, 1-14.
- [3] Bellemare, G., & Briand, L. (2004). *Définition structurationaliste des innovations et transformations sociales* (No. 414). CRISES.
- [4] Beltrao, C., & Pasa, C. (2019). Social Innovation Initiatives Expansion.
- [5] Besançon, E. (2013) L'innovation sociale en pratiques solidaires : processus, résultat, impacts et changements. In: *L'innovation sociale: Principes et fondements d'un concept*. Paris: L'Harmattan; p. 49-82 (Chap.3).
- [6] Bouchard, M. J., & Hudon, M. (2005). Le logement coopératif et associatif comme innovation sociale émanant de la société civile. *Revue Interventions économiques. Papers in Political Economy*, (32).
- [7] Bouchard, M.J., and Université du Québec à Montréal (2006) L'innovation sociale en économie sociale. *Canada Research Chair in Social Economy*, Université de Montréal.
- [8] Bouchard, M.J. (2008). *La coopérative de travailleurs actionnaire, une innovation sociale qui peut contribuer au développement local* (Doctoral dissertation, Université du Québec en Outaouais).
- [9] Bouchard, M., & Lévesque, B. (2010). *Économie sociale et innovation: l'approche de la régulation, au coeur de la construction québécoise de l'économie sociale*. CRISES, Centre de recherche sur les innovations sociales.
- [10] Bouchard, M. J., Evers, A., & Fraisse, L. (2015). Concevoir l'innovation sociale dans une perspective de transformation. *Sociologies pratiques*, 9-14.
- [11] Bruyn, S.T.H. (1977) *The social economy: People transforming modern business*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [12] Cloutier, J., What is social innovation? *Crises*. (2003). p. 1-46.
- [13] Chevallier, J. (2005). Politiques publiques et changement social. *Revue française d'administration publique*, (3), 383-390.
- [14] Damant, D., Bélanger, J., & Paquet, J. (2000). Analyse du processus d'empowerment dans des trajectoires de femmes victimes de violence conjugale à travers le système judiciaire. *Criminologie*, 33(1), 73-95.
- [15] D'Amours, M. (2012). Les initiatives solidaires. La réciprocité face au marché et à l'État. *Canadian journal of nonprofit and social economy research*, 3(1), 92.
- [16] D'Amours, M., Fontan, J. M., Huot, G., and Rouzier, R. (2006) *L'économie sociale au Québec: cadre théorique, histoire, réalités et défis*. Éditions Saint Martin.
- [17] Dandurand, L. (2005). Réflexion autour du concept d'innovation sociale, approche historique et comparative. *Revue française d'administration publique*, (3), 377-382.
- [18] Defourny, J. (1994). Apports et limites de trois approches courantes des associations. *Coopératives et développement*, 26(1).
- [19] Defourny, J. (2004). L'émergence du concept d'entreprise sociale. *Reflets et perspectives de la vie économique*, (3), 9-23.

- [20] Desroche, H. (1992). Communication et coopération ou le projet coopératif commutativement revisité. *Communication et organisation. Revue scientifique francophone en Communication organisationnelle*, (2).
- [21] Di Méo, G. (2006) Les territoires de l'action. *Bulletin de la Société géographique de Liège*. P. 7-17.
- [22] Edgell, S., & Townshend, J. (1993). Marx and Veblen on human nature, history, and capitalism: vive la différence!. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 27(3), 721-739.
- [23] Eme, B., & Laville, J. L. (2006). Économie solidaire. *Dictionnaire de l'autre économie*, 303-312.
- [24] Enjolras, B. (2010). Gouvernance verticale, gouvernance horizontale et économie sociale et solidaire: le cas des services à la personne. *Géographie Économie Société*, 12(1), 15-30.
- [25] Favreau, L. (2008). *Entreprises collectives: Les enjeux sociopolitiques et territoriaux de la coopération et de l'économie sociale*. PUQ.
- [26] Ferreira, N. (2008). Social innovation and economic development in Latin America. In: Laperche, B(dir) L'innovation pour le développement: Enjeux globaux et opportunités locales. P. 233-247. Paris, Karthala
- [27] Fontan, J. M. (2008). Développement territorial et innovation sociale: l'apport polanyien. *Revue Interventions économiques*.
- [28] Fontan, J. M. (2011). Territorial development and social innovation. In: Bellemare, G., Klein, J.-L., Innovation sociale et territoire. Convergences théoriques et pratiques. Presses de l'Université du Québec. P. 17-42.
- [29] Grenier 1, C., & Guitton-Philippe 2, S. (2010). Politiques publiques et innovation: proposition d'un modèle d'agir de l'innovation dans le champ sanitaire et social. *Revue management et avenir*, (5), 194-209.
- [30] Guyon, T., Chochoy, N., & Besançon, E. (2013). L'innovation sociale: Principes et fondements d'un concept. *L'innovation sociale*, 1-160.
- [31] Harrisson, D., Vincent, V., and Rollin, J. (2008). Social innovation and efficient arrangements. *Hermès*, 2008. P. 55-60.
- [32] Hillier, J., Moulaert, F., & Nussbaumer, J. (2004). Three essays on the role of social innovation in territorial development. *Géographie, économie, société*. P. 129-152.
- [33] Hollingsworth, J. R. (2000). Doing institutional analysis: implications for the study of innovations. *Review of international political economy*. p. 595-644.
- [34] Jouve, B. Editorial. (2006). Empowerment: between myth and reality, hope and disenchantment. *Geography, Economy, Society*. P. 5-15.
- [35] Klein, J. L., & Harrisson, D. (Eds.). (2006). *L'innovation sociale: émergence et effets sur la transformation des sociétés*.
- [36] Laville, J. L. (1994). Économie et société: pour un retour à une problématique fondatrice de la sociologie.
- [37] Lévesque, B., and Vaillancourt, Y. (1998). Les services de proximité au Québec: de l'expérimentation à l'institutionnalisation. *Laboratoire de recherche sur les pratiques et les politiques sociales, Dép. de travail social, Université du Québec à Montréal*.
- [38] Lévesque, B. (2002). Le modèle québécois: Un horizon théorique pour la recherche, une porte d'entrée pour un projet de société? *Revue Interventions économiques. Papers in Political Economy*.
- [39] Lévesque, B., & Lajeunesse-Crevier, F. (2005). *Innovations et transformations sociales dans le développement économique et le développement social: approches théoriques et politiques publiques* (No. 507). Québec: CRISES.
- [40] Lévesque, B. (2006). Le potentiel d'innovation sociale de l'économie sociale: quelques éléments de problématique. *Économie et solidarités*. P. 13-48.
- [41] Lévesque, B. (2007). *Une gouvernance partagée et un partenariat institutionnalisé pour la prise en charge des services d'intérêt général*. CRISES.
- [42] Lévesque, B. (2008). Contribution de la nouvelle sociologie économique à l'analyse des territoires sous l'angle de l'économie plurielle. *Sciences du territoire: perspectives québécoises*, 205-232.
- [43] Lopes, D. P. T., dos Santos Vieira, N., Barbosa, A. C. Q., & Parente, C. (2017). Management innovation and social innovation: convergences and divergences. *Academia Revista Latinoamericana de Administración*, 30(4), 474-489.
- [44] Maisonnasse, J., Petrella, F., & Richez-Battesti, N. (2019). Préserver le sens dans les organisations de l'économie sociale et solidaire: quels outils de gestion?. *RIMHE: Revue Interdisciplinaire Management, Homme (s) & Entreprise*, (1), 3-29.
- [45] Ninacs, W.A. (2002). Types and processes of empowerment in community economic development initiatives in Quebec. Thesis, Université Laval Québec.
- [46] Nussbaumer, J., Moulaert, F., Klein, J. L., & Harrisson, D. (2007). L'innovation sociale au coeur des débats publics et scientifiques.
- [47] Pesqueux, Y. (2010). Genèse de la responsabilité sociale de l'entreprise.
- [48] Proulx, P.P. (2002). Le modèle québécois: origines, définition, fondements et adaptation au nouveau contexte économique et social. *Revue Interventions économiques. Papers in Political Economy*.
- [49] Richez-Battesti, N. (2008). Innovations sociales et dynamiques territoriales. Une approche par la proximité: (L'expérience des banques coopératives). *Marchés et organisation*, (2), 36-51.
- [50] Richez-Battesti, N., Petrella, F., and Vallade, D. (2012). L'innovation sociale, une notion aux usages pluriels: Quels enjeux et défis pour l'analyse? *Innovations*. P. 15-36.

- [51] Sabel, C. (1996). Ireland, local partnerships and social innovation. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (OECD)
- [52] Sack, R.D. (1986). Human territoriality: its theory and history (Vol. 7). CUP Archive.
- [53] Torre, A. (2015). Territorial development theory. *Geography, economy, society*. P. 273-288.
- [54] Vaillancourt, Y., & LeClerc, P. (2013). The co-construction of public policy: The contribution of the social economy. *Innovation and the social economy: The Québec experience*, 127-157.
- [55] Van Der Have, R.P. and Rubalcaba, L. (2016), "Social innovation research: an emerging area of innovation studies?", *Research Policy*, Vol. 45 No. 9, pp. 1923-1935
- [56] Vienney, C. (1980). *Socio-économie des organisations coopératives*. Coopérative d'information et d'édition mutualiste.