

**Nasho Ah-Pine Elda, PhD, Dr Associate Professor
ESC Clermont BS/CleRMA (Université Clermont Auvergne), France**

Teaching on responsible innovation: engaged scholarship and social innovation serving environmental protection

Our humanity is confronted with many complex challenges such as socio-economic and health crises, the fight against global warming and social and epistemic injustices, and even deep institutional crises. Many are the uncertainties concerning the management of these crises. However, life is characterized by movement and innovation initiatives to address these crises are abundant (the invention of the anti-covid vaccine in only a few months, the use of digital technology in many fields, the implementation of various actions within companies and public policies to identify new ways to address the climate emergency, etc.).

However, notwithstanding the *prima facie* positive effects of these innovations, more and more researchers are being critical about the injunction that innovation is necessarily synonymous with societal progress (Coyle, 2017; Kuppelwieser et al., 2019; Brulé & Munier, 2021, Coad et al., 2021). Some other propositions even go one step further by suggesting the very opposite of innovation, namely "désinnovation" to find sustainable solutions to the climate emergency and its pernicious effects on humans and the planet (Bonnet et al., 2021). Despite these controversies, it is not always easy to distinguish between on one hand, non-responsible innovations that would even worsen the above-mentioned crises, and on the other hand, responsible innovations (RI) that would be on the contrary positive for humans and the planet.

There are many definitions of RI. For the EU a RI is "the transition to a new situation - and an expansion of opportunities - to meet the requirements and honor more responsibilities towards other human beings, the environment, the planet and future generations than was previously the case" (Kormelink, 2019, p. 11). This vision of RI remains unclear and is subject to many different interpretations. The substantive question therefore still remains: how to innovate responsibly?

We intend to answer this question in the context of a pedagogical reflection and experience, in which we mobilize, within an interdisciplinary context (political science and management), a teaching based on engaged scholarship and social innovation (SI) to serve environmental protection. Considering the magnitude of the climate emergency we are experiencing, the course is based on a strong conception of SI, endowed with a significant emancipatory and transformative potential in association with an enterprise that must be inclusive, operating in a multi-dimensional and multi-actor framework, mobilizing new responses to new needs, and working towards a sustainable transformation of the society by bringing to life veritable development models (Bélanger, 2007; Richez-Battesti, 2011; Besançon, 2015; Moulaert, 2016; Avelino et al., 2019). This responsible innovation posture incarnated in this strong SI approach establishes a strong connection between innovation and social transformation.

Moreover, this teaching is inspired by the philosophy of engaged scholarship, as reconceptualized by Andrew Van de Ven (2007; 2020) insofar as: 1/ the teaching is co-

constructed with relevant stakeholders (students in this case) according to Van de Ven's proposals; 2/ we have conceived our own societal responsibility as a teacher-scholar. More precisely, it is a pedagogical innovation implemented since September 2020, in the framework of a 27-hour course taught to about 120 students in Master 1 at ESC Clermont Business School. This interdisciplinary course is entitled "Business in an innovative and international context faced with the geopolitics of the environment". Its objective is to support and encourage students to proactively project themselves into a world that is uncertain and complex, so that they can think about positive and sustainable solutions regarding the many environmental and socio-economic challenges.

From a methodological point of view, this is an exploratory research based on the content analysis of 70 SI projects that have been defended by students since the beginning of this course. The research aims to: 1/analyze to what extent students have assimilated the criteria of transformative SI from an environment protection perspective; 2/are able to propose such SI projects in different countries of the world. In addition, we plan to conduct semi-structured interviews with a dozen students to analyze students' critical reflexive posture in relation to the SI teachings.

Références bibliographiques

1. AVELINO, F., WITTMAYER, J. M., PEL, B., WEAVER, P., DUMITRU, A., HAXELTINE, A., KEMP, R., JØRGENSEN, M. S., BAULER, T., RUIJSINK, S. (2019), Transformative Social Innovation and (dis) Empowerment, *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 145, 195-206.
2. BELANGER, P. (2007), Innovations sociales et rapports sociaux, in Klein, J-L., Harrisson, D. (eds) *L'innovation sociale : émergence et effets sur la transformation des sociétés*, Québec, CRISES, Presses de l'Université du Québec, 413-423.
3. BESANÇON, E. (2015), La diffusion de l'innovation sociale, un processus de changement multiforme. Une illustration à partir d'une recyclerie, *Sociologies pratiques*, 31, 31-40.
4. BONNET, E., LANDIVAR, D., & MONNIN, A. (2021). *Héritage et fermeture : Une écologie du démantèlement*. Editions Divergences.
5. BRULÉ, G., & MUNIER, F. (2021). *Happiness, technology and innovation*. Springer.
6. COAD, A., NIGHTINGALE, P., STILGOE, J., & VEZZANI, A. (2021). The dark side of innovation. *Industry and Innovation*, 28(1), 102-112.
7. COYLE, D. (2017). *Precarious and productive work in the digital economy* (National Institute Economic Review, Vol. 240). Cambridge University Press.
8. MOULAERT, F. (2016), Social Innovation: Institutionally Embedded, Territorially (re)produced, in MacCallum, D., Moulaert, F., Hillier, J., Vicari, S. (eds) *Social Innovation and Territorial Development*, Routledge, 27-40.
9. KORMELINK, J. G. (2019). *Responsible Innovation: Ethics, Safety and Technology*. TU Delft Open.
10. KUPPELWIESER, V. G., KLAUS, P., MANTHIOU, A., & BOUJENA, O. (2019). Consumer responses to planned obsolescence. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 47, 157-165.

11. RICHEZ-BATTESTI, N. (2011), L'innovation sociale comme levier du développement entrepreneurial local, Un incubateur dédié en Languedoc-Roussillon, *Relief*, 33, 97-109.
12. VAN DE VEN, A. H. (2007). Engaged scholarship: A guide for organizational and social research, Oxford University Press on Demand.
13. VAN DE VEN, A. H. (2020). Cours en ligne, "Problem Formulation, Theory Building, Research Design, and Problem Solving", printemps 2020, Université de Minnesota, <<https://sites.google.com/a/umn.edu/avandeven/course-websites/mgmt-8101-theory-building-and-research-design>>.
14. ZUBOFF, S. (2019), *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*, London, Profile books.

Serhiienko S., Specialist of the educational and methodological department of distance learning technologies of the Center for Information Technologies in Education of the Institute of Postgraduate Education, National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute"

Safety innovative strategy for the development of agrarian enterprises: management aspect

An important role in increasing the innovative activity of agrarian enterprises is played by the selection and implementation of the appropriate strategy for the innovative development of the enterprise. To determine the future strategy of an agrarian enterprise, information is needed on the amount of innovation potential and the level of its use. The evaluation of the level of innovative potential is an urgent task, since its solution allows making strategic and tactical decisions regarding the innovative development of an agrarian enterprise and the development of its sustainable competitive advantages.

Strategic innovation management is a component of innovation management. It solves a wide range of issues of planning and implementation of innovative projects and programs, which are designed for qualitative changes in the organization's activities in the market, production or social sphere of an agrarian enterprise (organization).

It should be noted that any strategic steps of an agricultural enterprise are innovative in nature, as they are somehow based on innovations in the economic, production, sales or management spheres. For example, one of the strategies characteristic of market economy - the product strategy - is aimed at the development of new types of products and technologies, spheres and sales methods, that is, it is based exclusively on innovations. This applies to other types of strategies as well. Thus, the strategy of the development of an agrarian enterprise provides for the provision of stable rates of its growth and functioning in the future and is based on the use of scientific and technical achievements in the field of technology, organization, technology, management, that is, on a complex of innovations [1, 2].