

SOCIAL BUSINESS AND THE SOCIAL ENTREPRENEUR IN PERSPECTIVE OF SOCIOLOGICAL ECONOMY

Analice Araujo Silva

*Doctoral Candidate, PPED/IE/UFRJ and Co-Coordinator, LARES/IE/UFRJ.
Av. Pasteur, 250. Instituto de Economia 22.450-460, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
E-mail: analicearaujo1@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

This article makes a bibliographical research on the concepts and specific characteristics of social enterprise and social entrepreneur in the sociological economics literature to establish the main concepts and characteristics of these organizations and actors that has stood out in an incisive way in recent years. Setting limits and concepts will help to distinguish social entrepreneurship to provide social services and social activism, for example. What can be seen is that this type of social service strategy, often differ greatly from some hybrid models. Understand the modes of articulation of organizations and activities of social enterprises in the world today, it is necessary to make use of a theoretical bias that incorporates social aspects in their assessments and interpretations of economic relations, as if thinking of associative phenomena of the present is thinking about the bases of the foundations of solidarity and alliance in contemporary societies

Keywords: *Social Business, Social Entrepreneurship , Sociological Economy*

1-INTRODUCTION

The perception and requirement that the traditional for-profit companies should engage in socially responsible practices is already taking up space in academic discussions, and in the course of business, for over two decades. Social enterprises set up as organizations and the established administrative functions have evolved rapidly, but only in the last fifteen years (Defourny, and Nyssens, 2010); These companies reflect a new thinking and acting in an entrepreneurial way, and have the particularity a beaded common element by leading theorists who study: its product offerings and services must necessarily be directed to the good of society (Defourny J. & Nyssens, 2006; Cohen, 2011; DEES, 1998; Lewis 2006) . Integrating differentiated management processes in this new format, social innovators implement business plans in the service of its social mission, fiber and fuel this kind of enterprise. As experiments and innovative practices can bring competitiveness and development, with distinct characteristics and virtuous, as the social and cultural elements are strengthened. From the analysis presented here, we will identify their peculiarities, where creativity and entrepreneurial initiative depends on a complex pattern of institutional relationships that intervenes in the process and result in economic and sustainable social change.

Therefore, associated with concepts related to social entrepreneurship, we present theoretical and analytical aspects, addressing its causes and origins and fundamental social relations, enabled by the use of theoretical bias of economic sociology, which highlight the buildings and social relations that underlie economic phenomena.

Despite this rapidly developing, some controversy has been found on its main concepts. An example of such conflicts is the growing number of businesses that have emerged, aimed to occupy a space that grows alarmingly in recent years: businesses targeting the bottom of the pyramid. We believe that this business are not necessarily in social business, and often are not, but has been cheered by its inclusiveness and catalyst of social gains.

2 - OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

This article, through an exploratory research in the literature on social enterprises, social entrepreneurship using the theoretical framework of Economic Sociology, needed to analyze the role of social relations in this process. Understand the modes of articulation and organization of activities of social enterprises in the world today, it is necessary to use a theoretical framework that incorporates social aspects in their assessments and interpretations of economic relations, as if thinking of associative phenomena of our time is to think on the basis of the foundations of solidarity and alliance in contemporary societies.

3 – THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1- The globalized society and its limits to social and local development: an unorthodox approach

Starting from an unorthodox proposal evaluation, which favors social interactions, economic and cultural aspects of society, we will try to capture some of the changes and impacts to explain the catalytic background that

influences development of social entrepreneurs. Understanding these changes will in fact and innovations that emerge in an attempt to intervene in reality, implies dealing with more precise analysis tools and more stringent than those which the common-sense features. Therefore, this article uses the theoretical framework of economic sociology, needed to analyze the role of social relations in this process.

The differences and particularities of economic development and the causes of uneven development in the various regions and territories worldwide, has been better explained by systemic theories, with economic, historical, social and cultural intersections that denies the market and / or the state as single developing promoters. Institutional economics has merit and this has been accepted even explain the dynamics, and will be, here privileged as a current economic sociology. Discrediting of orthodox economics believer in the power of markets as an explanatory factor of development, the help of more heterodox lenses of the economy, allow us to recognize that a development policy requires a more complex understanding of systems that combine economic institutions, social, cultural and political, whose interactions change over time (Boyer, 2001: 14- 39).

The worldwide changes that have occurred in economic activities, work processes, employment, world geopolitics in national and international, cultural and social tensions requiring new uses of technology, access to information, forms of organization of social groups, in role of the state, in short, in all changes throughout the fabric of the contemporary world. This new development carry with them many ills and lay bare new, expressed in social inequalities, precariousness, social and environmental risks, unknown diseases, worsening vulnerabilities, increasing violence and resurgence of intolerance.

These imbalances open cracks in society and therefore on these weaknesses new practices are required. New risks and new forms of social issues become insufficient (but not unnecessary) traditional practices. There are movements, solutions and more specific actions, directed more and more accurate. And these new formats require greater diversity of actors involved and therefore new concepts.

Another effect of neoliberal policies was the disconnect between the macro global requirements to local micro realities. The expansion of urbanization processes and economic and cultural globalization, show awareness for approaching problems and interrelate the global and local levels. These are realities that are expressed in global, national, regional and local scales and mint and articulate problems relating to employment and unemployment, preservation and environmental degradation, production and consumption, export and import, to domination and resistance policy, to difference and cultural identity, equality and inequality, the rights and duties of citizens that intersect and inter influence planetary space.

Giddens (1991 and 1999) and IANNI (1994) analyze this process of a globalized world, and point out that there is an "intensification of social relations on a global scale, linking distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa "Giddens (1991: 69). In addition, there is a standardization of management processes, highlighted by Castells (1999) where the capital and companies tend to increasingly, to be organized under the principles of flexibility, competitiveness, innovation, horizontality, networking, decentralization, information technology and precarious forms of work. The quick and the radius range of social changes indicate there was an increase of time-space distance in advanced societies, has led to a growing alienation and uprooting of individuals and society regarding the nature and social issues (Giddens, 1991;, LIMA and PORTILHO).

It is from this social construction of interactivity (or lack thereof) of men with their social and environmental problems, new solutions that converge and actors, acting, proactively, to improve the social well-being. Companies in this context that in recent decades have begun to engage in activities that traditionally have been regarded as government activities, such as public health, education, social security and protection of human rights, working where possibly failed the actions of governments. We can see that since 2000, more than 5,000 commercial companies signed the UN Global Compact, which can be understood as a kind of self-regulation emerged from the regulatory void arisen from globalization, in terms of global governance resolutions social and environmental problems of society (SCHERER AND PALAZZO, 2011; MARGOLIS And WALS, 2003; HART, 2005; Porter, 2006). Some authors, however, criticize these social actions because they think they do not correspond to the economic role of business in society, as traditionally expected (Henderson, 2001; Friedman, 1976)

Some authors who has been analyzing the question of the behavior of socially committed companies, from a business point of view, conclude that they go beyond the fulfillment of expectations of "stakeholders" Carroll (1991) and Whetton And MACKKEY (2002). Besides the fact that these actions meet multiple views on the legitimacy for the real achievement and sustainable well-being of society, as often the actions of some companies

may be restricted solely on a marketing action and self-promotion in attempt to make a business risk management among its public, an important character that little is discussed, and of fundamental importance pair to understand the institutional dynamics of the contemporary world, the political implications are (Cheibub and LOCKE, 2002) and cultural and impacts on the social capital of communities.

For there is still a gap in terms of global governance, that is, as the process of defining and implementing global rules and provide global public goods, social responsibility is a polycentric and multilateral process in governments, international institutions, civil society groups, businesses, foundations and institutes that contribute knowledge and resources.

Unlike national governance with the monopoly of institutional coercive force (standards, laws and regulations especially in the environmental area) to direct or control the activities of private actors in the country, global governance is based on contributions, standards and voluntary certification and weak enforcement mechanisms or even absent (SCHERER AND PALAZZO, 2011: 900).

Associated with increased social demands, the consolidation of democratic governments in Latin America and the dissemination of the values of citizenship and citizen's right, that legitimate social demands, led civil society to organize themselves to ensure accessibility to these goods and services. This organization formed the so-called Third Sector. In Latin America, the concept of third sector is closely linked to a double negation: non-profit and non-governmental. What is observed is that the common point of these different literatures is that the Third Sector appears or grows due to the absence and / or reduction of state shares (Maimon, 2006).

Landin points out that the relationship arising when observing the rise of the third sector in Brazil and in the world is a justification of the increase of the organization and associations of civil society, to justify the disclaimer processes of the state, doing focused and philanthropic, what fits the State guarantee universally, as citizens' rights, what is a mistake. And further that the new associative field is relevant, exactly, for their contribution to social and civic mobilization, being necessary to the democratic construction and new participatory design, combining direct and representative democracy.

Sprout, therefore, in the field of opportunities associated with this latent demand and a new way of organizing and structuring the offer, represented by the third sector and its articulation with the public sectors - private, the new social business, social shares of companies, the new social technologies, the solidarity economy, and many other concepts, constituting the new practices required by the new times.

All this entails designing and defining new concepts, such as social entrepreneurship, social business, inclusive social business, social innovation, social technology, etc. If the new times demand new practices, new practices require new investments in the reflection plane. In this scenario, this is the role of academia and that is the purpose of this article, which, through an exploratory research, will try to summarize some of the main authors who coined or organized or concepts are reflecting on new social business formats that currently thrive, worldwide.

3.2- Social Business: concepts, developments and fundamental assumptions

In the wake of rising inequality or the impossibility of solving all the demands of society by governments or private companies, either for lack of public funds or by private disinterest in their potential profitability, social business come with two concurrent functions: the be a business that provides and ensures its financial sustainability and to generate social value. However, despite the still low academic research on this topic in Brazil (COMINI, 2011;. Granados et al, 2011) reinforce this view, pointing out that although the increase, over the years 1991 to 2004, annual production articles on entrepreneurship social was at a very low level.

This company typology has been called Social Enterprises, inclusive business and social business, among others. However, what appeared to be dichotomous and paradoxical, business and social gain has been one of the most dynamic activities, helping to reduce social problems with elements of traditional enterprises, such as efficiency and financial gains through market mechanisms.

However, its distinctive character raises doubts as to the definitions, scope, modus operandi, internal organizational settings and interaction with their supply chains. COMINI (2012) recognizes the difficulties and stresses that there is no homogeneity in defining the social character of these projects, as well as in the form of evaluating its innovative character, since they have different shapes and positions as to their goals and interests.

It is worth mentioning here that the very decision to "how social" is an investment, product or service depends on a vision, perception and cultural values of groups, individuals or companies, and therefore not equal. The social

priorities are not seen in the same way by all people and use decisions of resources often are open to criticism and weights. It is possible that these limits and priorities are not defined in a society, because when you think of public spending and policies own priorities and government policies are often inconsistent with each other, impossible to define, for their readings, which the project of society and of desired country.

Thus, the momentum of the polemics and controversies, several authors, national and international, have been trying to define what a social business is. Among them, we highlight some of them in the following paragraphs. YOUNG (2008), making an analysis of the perceptions of the concept of social business, concludes that the term means for a development of trade or business by non-profit organizations, while for others, refers to the development of initiatives with social objectives by companies, and still others understand how the supply and delivery of public services by organizations. In Europe, for example, there is the perception that Social Enterprises are natural and some of its countries have specific legislation for this type of company (Kerlin, 2006 apud Liawatal, 201?).

Apparently, so many of the necessary elements to facilitate the growth and development of social enterprises are finding conditions of social roots, with the popular and financial support private (or public) in order to mobilize and stimulate social innovations and their companies. Despite this scenario, social entrepreneurs, face major obstacles to the creation of viable solutions such as better coordination of the mechanisms of entrepreneurship, for instance. In the following item, presents the main concepts related to social entrepreneurship, as well as some its diffusion conditions in society, from the perspective of Sociological Economics.

What we see, then, is that some social entrepreneurs has been developing sophisticated financial models and consistent business plans and building business models in tone of its value chain, and therefore providing financial returns. This reality is present mainly in the US market. It is the US that social business guide to occupy and develop public services and social technologies with administrative functions oriented to profitability. These social entrepreneurs, identified a segment of a chain of high positive social impact value, build sustainable business (and profitable) in this chain. The advantage and difference from the traditional business is its ability to create an enterprise culture embracing social objectives at the heart of its value proposition.

COMINI (2011) points out that social business also reflect a new configuration of civil society organizations for different formats to offer services, seeking alternative ways of fundraising to traditional in order to become more independent and financially sustainable. Arise social business hybrid models worldwide, combining intrinsically business market methods and generation of social value, combined often with third sector entities partnerships with the public and private sectors.

In terms of organizational gains and settings and organizational arrangements, can highlight the rapprochement between agents and actors who work separately in traditional businesses, such as civil society organizations of various businesses sizes, governments and funding agencies. COMINI (2012) highlights the different perspectives of the regions in the world, standing out among its differentiating elements motivation of the appearance, the adopted organizational structure, the ultimate goals, etc., all these targeted and conditioned by the social, political and economic country in which they operate.

Table 1: Social Business prospects North American, European and Developing Countries.

	American perspective	European and Canadian Perspective	Perspective of Developing Countries
Social Enterprise Concept	Called social enterprise or social business, entrepreneurial action includes any market that has social impact with its commercial action. Can take different legal shapes, corporations, corporations, limited companies and non-profit organizations.	Are called social enterprise, i.e. "organizations with the avowed purpose of benefiting the community, initiated by a group of citizens, in which the material interest of capital investors is subject to limits" - Organizations that seek social and economic goals with an entrepreneurial spirit and have different main purpose of profit maximization (OECD, 1999)	Confused with the term inclusive Social Business or the Bottom of the Pyramid of Business. the social or inclusive business has strong concern for poverty reduction and are initiatives that necessarily have a positive social impact, effective and, above all, long-term. -Organizations Or enterprises that generate social change through market activities

		-are Business with major social goals, in which the revenue generated is reinvested mainly for business purposes or in the community, rather than being for the need for profit maximization of shareholders and owners.	(SEKN, cited Comini, 2011: 10)
Source of Motivation	Generate revenue for nonprofits	Provide public services at a lower cost and serve as a working opportunity for an unemployed	Provide goods and services to people in Bottom of the Pyramid
Organizational Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May Have an organizational relationship with for-profit companies and their social arm. - Hybrid enterprises, which have profit targets to their founders, but with social objectives. - Organizations Nonprofit that develop commercial activities such as support, but has social purposes. - The organizational fluidity confuses and associated social enterprise with social entrepreneurship 	<p>Organizations with a social purpose eat assigning property rights and control power other stakeholders other than investors, coupled to an open and participatory governance model.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They take the form of a social ownership (social ownership), i.e., autonomous organizations with governance and ownership structure based on direct participation of stakeholder groups. 	Takes the form of non-governmental organizations (NGOs), private organizations for profit or business engaged in public sector activities, producing goods and services of significant figures.

Source: Prepared by the author from COMINI (2012) and LEVESQUE and MENDELL (1999)

Comini (2011) points out that when analyzing these different definitions and typologies social business in the literature is possible to draw a possible evolution of these businesses, some are closer to the market and others that are positioned and has predominance with the social logic. Using a natural evolution proposed by AUSTIN (2002), it presents a framework, then the continuum of social business growing through alliances and presents innovations are financial (funding or resource management) and administrative management or governance.

This evolution includes what we now perceive the business on "bottom of the pyramid" directed to meet a latent demand of excluded classes of traditional markets, such as microfinance, for example. We have pioneered the example developed by Muhammad Yunus in Bangladesh, called "Banker to the Poor: Micro-Lending and the Battle Against World Poverty" which shows that a development offering loans to thousands who are in poverty range is possible, enhancing programs training and entrepreneurial education to foster new business.

3.3- Social entrepreneurship, social networks, identities, capital social and socioeconomic development through a review of Economic Sociology

A legitimate definition of social entrepreneurship phenomenon is not yet consensus among theorists. Freire (2001) quoted in Godói-de-Sousa at all (2011), emphasizes that the great interest in this subject in recent years, makes it a field of knowledge without boundaries or sharp inner regions, hindering a precise definition of this phenomenon. What can be seen, however, is that the complexity of the term and its manifestations, hinder the establishment of divisions and boundaries.

Minuzziatall (2005), for example, give you a comprehensive outline and unrestrictive, noting that social entrepreneurship has been understood as a multidimensional process, engaging social variables (social mobility, culture), economic (incentives market, public policies, venture capital) and psychological as influencers in the act of undertaking.

Melo Neto and Froes (2002), for example, assessing the progress of social entrepreneurs manifestations, its varied typology forms of representation, we highlight four streams of studies and development of entrepreneurship, namely:

- (1) Entrepreneurship as technological development;
- (2) Entrepreneurship as management;
- (3) Entrepreneurship as integrated and sustainable local development strategy (DLIS) and;
- (4) Entrepreneurship as a development strategy of small and medium enterprises (SMEs).

The authors point out also that the goal is no longer the business of business, but it is, yes, the social business, which has civil society its main focus and partnership involving community, government and private sector its fundamental strategy of choice.

Although a potential importer of the concepts of business management areas themselves, entrepreneurship brings together a combination of social and economic manifestations important and differentiated, as we saw earlier. Seelos and Mair (2005), realizing this particularity, points out that social entrepreneurship appears to occupy a bundle of opportunities to improve production systems or existing distribution, creating solutions or new approaches in order to address basic human needs. Entrepreneurship thus help solve social and environmental problems by exploiting opportunities inherent market failures and thus will help move the global economic system for sustainability (Dean; McMullen, 2007).

Give meaning the types of social entrepreneurship and classify its manifestations in the economy, is neither the main nor the only purpose of this article. We believe that despite this theme is relevant and still subject to discussion, capture their socio-economic dynamism and contribute to a theoretical-conceptual review will be the main contribution here. Using the theoretical framework of the New Economic Sociology (NSE), which draws on the contributions of sociology at the expense of the rationality of economic utilitarianism, social relationships and not merely the maximization of individual interests, are the dynamic forces of a given market. This school believes that even in commercial relationships there is an influence on the way that social structures are presented, the historical processes and the organization of production.

In the field of social business and to realize their difference and make sense of its manifestations in society, draw on the contributions of Mauss, French anthropologist who lived in from 1872 to 1950, gave fundamental contributions to sociology. Systematizing the theory of the gift, rescued as an interpretive model of great relevance to think about the foundations of solidarity and alliance in contemporary societies. One of his central contributions to sociology was to demonstrate that the value of things cannot exceed the value of the relationship and that symbolism is fundamental to social life.

For Mauss, the motivations are complex and the interactions between people and groups, which run through different paths, form alliances. The exchange system can also be based on the gift (the triple obligation and giving, receiving and return) and not only on rational and utilitarian decisions. Caille And GRAEBER (2002: 21-22) quoted in Martins (2005), claim that Mauss stood out with a great contribution to understanding the link value to modern society, which along with Durkheim, the French school of sociology exponents, are a major source of theoretical inspiration to understand the emergence and the role of civil society also in the contemporary world, which can expand beyond the realms and influences own state and market, fruit of a movement of endogenous and dynamic basis.

Give a sociological approach to markets involves therefore conceive individuals in aggregate, influenced by the behavior of others and realize that there are economic and non-economic motivations. With this view, an important author who also contributed to the economic sociology and adds that here in our analysis of entrepreneurship was Granoveter. For this author, the economic action is a social action in the sense that it is driven by motivations that are not reduced merely to interest and may include a status recognition process, power or sociability. Moreover, its argument that the choices of an individual may be related to the choices of other individuals, print the notion of relationships and trust networks.

Still to this author, the third central thesis of Mark Granovetter (1973, 1979, 1985a, 2000, 2003 and 2005 cited Bittencourt, 2005) is that economic institutions are social constructions and as such should be reviewed and the trajectory of these savings institutions market is embedded in the social fabric and embedded in social networks.

Realize the entrepreneurial action and the strength of this movement of social entrepreneurship as development inductor, requires identify them from a socio-cultural and economic context of a globalized world, with new

combinations of time and space. HALL, 2000) identified some angular phenomena that context, which make up the driver horizon of social entrepreneurship, namely:

- “a) cultures hybridization living with social movements that claim the site;
- b) emergence of a plurality of identities built on plural identities markers made up of race, ethnicity, gender, social class, culture, language and other determinants in dynamic interaction;
- c) need to understand the entrepreneurial action as a cultural fact, source of contact between different visions of society and different proposed solutions to fundamental and peripheral issues; and
- d) need to recognize the embedded values in cultural symbols, guided by thoughts, attitudes, behaviors and practices significance for the entrepreneur that is manifested in the social order regionalized HALL (2000, apud in GRISI, 2008: 13).

Note well the conformation of Castells analysis (1999 saying that despite the overwhelming passage of the economic relations, globalization did not neutralize some cultural manifestations and expressions of identity of the companies represented in the form of reactive movements that pose a different defense causes, such as feminism and environmentalist, for example.

For identity, Castells defines as "the meaning-making process based on a cultural attribute, or a set of interrelated cultural attributes, which take precedence over other sources of meaning" Castells (1999: 23). Identities are therefore sources of meaning to social actors, originated and built by those in a process of individuation.

To WAINWRIGHT (1998), the movements are putting into practice a new understanding of the process of knowledge through their socialization. Only through the view of knowledge as a social product, distributed, democratized and socialized under convertible forms, social change is made possible. Opposing the positivist legacy, social movements privilege other forms of knowledge, such as the everyday, individual and social skills, often not recognized in public policy.

This local knowledge, social identity and local resources are sources of constituents a key concept in our analysis, the capital. The roots of the concept of Social Capital traced to the work of Durkheim and Marx (Carroll and Stanfield, 2003: 397). North's (1990), another author who favors the immaterial aspects detailing the formal and informal institutions. Fukuyama (1995), in turn, works with the question of the role of confidence in the economy and Peter Evans' (1995) writes about the nature of state-society relations, authors preceding the concept, contemporarily, the use of the term capital and more often attributed to Bordieun (1986), Coleman (1988) and Putnam (1993.2000).

The capital also defined in a number of different ways, but generally refers to networks of social relations characterized by norms of trust and reciprocity that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions (Lehtonen, 2004: 207). Your concept, however, has been set closer and even more broadly. The narrower concept of social capital is associated with Putnam (1993), which sees it as social networks and associated standards that have an effect on community productivity. A broader definition is given by Coleman (1988), which describes social capital as "a variety of different entities, with two elements in common: they all consist of some aspect of social structure and facilitate certain actions of actors within the corporate structure Coleman (1988: 598). the most important of all this is that the definition of this term meets the principles and concepts of Sociological Economics, as it includes not only the relationships in large part informal and often local, but also the more institutions formalized, such as the government, the political regime, the rule of law, the court system, and civil and political liberties (Lehtonen, 2004: 207).

BENI (2004), a focus on institutional economics, relates the concept of social capital, cooperation, efficiency and local development, as can be seen below:

"The concept of social capital is concerned, therefore,` the incentive structure and sanctions on individual behavior, defined by a pre-existing set of formal and informal rules, organized behaviors and organizations that promote trust and cooperation between people . Therefore encompasses first place network of social contacts that a typical individual maintains, implying therefore social behaviors relatively stable over time and therefore reliable. But it also includes a dimension of collective good, in the sense that if a certain critical number of individuals belonging to these networks, the community as a whole will benefit in that emerges a general environment of trust and security, which encourages cooperation between people and, as we have seen, improves the economic efficiency of the community "BUENO (2004: 40).

The pattern of connections and horizontal, vertical and lateral relationships built basing the capital thus settle the trust links between individuals and encourage greater participation in civic life and thus strengthens collective action with important social and economic gains.

Putnam (1995), emphasizes this relationship, saying that social capital is able to weave networks and norms that facilitate cooperative action. What can we infer, therefore, that human capital, knowledge and information stored, health and the potential labor, capital goods, infrastructure and natural capital, are also forms of capital, which generate waves, and benefits define the wealth of a society. (CONSTANZA and Daly, 1992).

In terms of analysis of the importance of social entrepreneurship, object of this article, the capital expressed in its relations networks and accumulated knowledge of the networks of relationships and knowledge, serving as a "stock" of cooperative solutions, generating interpersonal trust. Represented, so as a "stock" of both tacit knowledge as explicit, making use of categorization Polanyi, as the knowledge of a social collectivity, as a kind of "intellectual property" of the human capital of the community, represented by the knowledge acquired, skills and abilities that enable people to act in new ways, developing new technologies, submitted an allocative efficiency (North, 1990), where the cooperative behavior is encouraged in search of innovative solutions (Fukuyama, 1995; Jacobs, 1965; Putnam, 1993)

Looking at the issue of social networks in the modern world regarding its dynamic and identity elements Castells (1999), realize in the network society three processes:

- Legitimizing identities, promoted by dominant social institutions, strengthening an attitude of submission of the subjects;
- Resistance identity, set to actors in disadvantaged social conditions, which have resistance to the dominant project, but still not even propose positive forms of identity construction;
- a project identity, in which the actors, based on the cultural materials available, build new identities, redefine their social place and seek changes in social structure.

Imbalances and social and environmental inequalities, therefore, strengthen and bring out a social identity that seeks to address and respond to these problems. And the entrepreneurial action, it seems, is framed in the third identity process indicated above, by Castells. The need, opportunity, social capital and social networks, Are the motivation and the resources to build new identities. The full development of social undertakings, promoted, then, social fragmentation, embodies and strengthens links between individuals and strengthens the associations and social capital.

Associated with this process of organization, DOWBOR (2006) recognizes a collaborative institutional process, which he calls collaborative economy, as opposed to the competition economy. Among its special features are the following:

- The growing importance of intellectual capital and social capital, since the activities in organizations are more technologically complex and interactive;
- a knowledge economy as a competitive factor, which requires a share and a more democratic management process;
- Connectivity as potentiates of collaborative activities through partnerships and actors from various sectors, such as companies, governments and NGOs;
- As urbanization trend, erecting cities and their surroundings as territorial units of economic accumulation, more or less dynamic and productive, depending on the level of collaborative joint;
- Primacy of the social with the social health policies, housing, education, etc., used as corrective measures of inequality and concentration of wealth.

DOWBOR (opcit) concludes that these particulars involve intense collaborative processes, not adjusting for profit and has, as a vital element, the formation of social capital and participatory decision-making processes.

What can emphasize to quote these authors is to present new ways of designing and developing visions, which integrate the economic, social, environmental and ethical dimensions, which are somehow interconnected. Apparently, given the purposes and characteristics of social business previously presented corroborate and strengthen the potential power of social entrepreneurship, as a genuine source of innovation and social development.

In this context, local development occurs as a rescue route, recovery, or even renewal of social structures such as associations, cooperatives, municipal, state representatives and non-governmental organizations whose action accrues to the benefit mainly of local problems. Local development projects guided by the culture, the nature and

the ethical and ideological values local acquire greater economic efficiency, becoming abilities and distinctive capabilities. What we see, above all, is the sustainable character of these projects, for initiatives and social technologies developed from an endogenous movement, establishing solid and lasting foundations for local development that can substantiate the competitive advantage of the dynamic resources for development.

For its unifying character values and strengthening the social capital of individuals and communities, it should be borne in mind that the Social Entrepreneurship, in its various forms, should be perceived as a multidimensional phenomenon, integrating the cultural, ecological and political and development vector. The fundamental character and legacy of this development should be the promotion of quality of life, human development, working with responses to social transformation needs and sustainable development.

For Schumpeter, an Austrian economist who coined fundamental definitions of innovation, it is important to analyze social innovation, especially because it plays a key role in this entrepreneur process. It included different angles of innovation, technological, organizational, institutional and social innovation as well as the place and role of the institutions and their impact on the economic and social development. The economist, however, does not provide that social innovation will have a prominent place in the development of industrialized societies in the late twentieth century. That's why the thought of Schumpeter must be completed by recent theoretical developments and relevant to the understanding of innovation and social entrepreneurship.

Taking advantage of market failures or captaining business for the good of the community with new concepts or new forms of organization, social entrepreneur can be seen as an innovative accordance with the classifications identified by Schumpeter. As pointed out by Defourny and Mertens (2008), social entrepreneurship develops innovations that may take the five classifications of Schumpeter's type:

- The development of new activities (fair trade, for example) or improvement of existing activities (a former services to people of old age or no access to social services.);
- Innovative organizational methods (involving stakeholders such as employees in management);
- Changes in factors of production (E.g. changing the logic of the pair voluntary work makes it more pragmatic, and including paid work, in social enterprises, making it more professional);
- Be related a new market (introducing, in some situations, the logic of competition with capitalist enterprises, through bids or tenders for services to the government sector, for example);
- New forms of enterprises (with the creation of innovative legal status, with funding forms of differentiated resources, for example, the crowd funding).

There is, above all, a perception that social entrepreneurs differ from traditional businessman in question, for example, the creation of wealth, which in the latter reverts to the generation / consolidation of a social mission. The Economist (2010), points out, however, that many social entrepreneurs are operating in markets of traditional business with differences only of nuance, and often with a comparative advantage, and not always financial disadvantage, since new forms financing (with better rates) are entering the institutional environment of these businesses.

The Economist in 2010, analyzing the full development of social entrepreneurship and the dissemination of its practices in the world, devoted an article on the evaluation of this phenomenon. They conclude that pursue a professional career doing good and the difference to society has been increasingly attractive to people, bringing them personal, social and financial compensation. Some of the social entrepreneurs have been supported or catalyzed by organizations set up to help in some stages of their development, such as Ashoka, the Skoll Foundation and the Avina Foundation, among others.

Social entrepreneurs also bring together the particularities of innovative, applying his personal desire and their individual talents to put in place an innovation and bring value society. However, these businesses differ in terms of purpose, since it is not profit its mission, but the social gain, strengthening the social capital of the community, and printing the recognition, significance and role in society.

Despite the personal requirements of these entrepreneurs, we see the presence and the need for an institutional apparatus that catalyze and enable the process. In the US, for example, to strengthen and proliferation of social entrepreneurship, according to even the article in The Economist (2010), in 2009, Philadelphia became the first US city to create a tax credit for sustainable business, joining ten other states have created laws that support social enterprises. At the federal level was created JOBS (Jumpstart Our Business Startups) Act with the task of facilitating the development of tools that support social enterprises, formalizing mainly crowd funding. The crowd funding is a form of fundraising "online" in small amounts, but a large number of investors, the so-called "philanthrocapitalists".

The other support that has strengthened this niche business has been the "mainstream" of large banking financial institutions such as JP Morgan, which released a line of credit for potential investments of financial and social returns in 2010. According to the institution that time, it is estimated that the growth potential is \$ 500 billion over the next 10 years (JP Morgan Global Research 2010 apud in Freireich and Fulton, 2009).

4- CONCLUSIONS

By using economic sociology to analyze social entrepreneurship present the political-cultural approaches this new industry or initiatives should be taken into account to make sense of motivation and understanding of its strategic and / or dynamic motivations. What we see or we would like to stress that it is not only a political vacuum of occupation or government resources that this sector or social enterprises, must be developed, but having a meaning and providing identities and strengthening the social capital of the territories. Social entrepreneurship seeks to create new links as a way to bring social value or reduce conflicts through various social solutions. Creating new hierarchies, new types of business, new governance within and between enterprises and with other, new agreements and negotiating tactics and cooperation and new organizational designs they develop new technologies and bring social innovation. The economic sociology emphasizes the interaction between these organizations and their environment, realizing the new institutional rules.

So what we see is that these new economic initiatives have a meaning socially constructed, with multidimensional motivations for social values, cooperation and interests that also vary according to the historical and social context. A key question, however, is as well to innovate, these new initiatives can be widespread and institutionalized and under what conditions or institutional requirements can be created new orders and new horizons even social development, according to the precept of DiMaggio and Powell (1991).

Social entrepreneurs, working in local communities, work with activities and traditional functions of Schumpeterian entrepreneur: identifies talents, form partnerships and leverages social programs in operation on site (GRISI: 2008). With its products, services and social mission, adds social value in the communities, engages innovation processes, adaptation and continuous learning, leveraging change and community development, becoming an agent of social change (EB 1998).

Entrepreneurship can the conclusions of Economic Sociology, constitute a new form of development that depends on the articulation and contribution through various actors and spheres of power as: civil society, government and its institutions, private and public policies, improved printing, gain and social value. We must realize, however, that solutions are territorial and localized because they reflect an identity of individuals and social groups inserted in them. Adopting Pierre Bourdieu's field of confectionery, these areas may play diverse interests within the processes of cooperation located. Are the values of cooperation, reciprocity and trust that will be the main vectors of association and coordination between the actors.

The sustainable territorial development, so it should be a social construction, with individuals who use its resources and features through a productive organization, relating, therefore, social and environmental systems. The initiatives and development policy must respond to the needs of local communities, their expectations coupled with its cultural, social and historical realities and we believe that this article has not yet exhausted the subject, may have contributed pair combine a demonstration and contemporary economic growth social entrepreneurship to an unorthodox theoretical bias, but that has elements that although little quantitative, are central to the observation and integration into development options.

REFERENCES

- AUSTIN, J. *The Collaboration Challenge: How Non profits and Businesses succeed Through Strategic Alliances*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey –Bass, 2002
- BITTENCOURT, Epaminondas; CARRIERI, Alexandre. Responsabilidade social: ideologia, poder e discurso na lógica empresarial. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, São Paulo, v. 45, p. 10-22, 2005
- Bourdieu, P.: The forms of capital, in: J.G. Richardson (ed.): *Handbook for Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, 1986, pp.. 241 – 258 Boyer, Robert, and Yves Saillard. *Regulation theory: The state of the art*. Routledge, 2001.
- Bueno, N.P. “ Lógica da Ação Coletiva, Instituições e Crescimento Econômico: Uma Resenha Temática sobre a Nova Economia Institucional in *Revista Economia*, Brasília(DF), v.5, n.2, p.361–420 jul./dez. 2004
- Caillé, Alain; Graeber, D. (2002), “Introdução”, in Paulo Henrique Martins (org.), *A dádiva entre os modernos: discussão sobre os fundamentos e as regras do social*. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- Carroll, A. B. (1991). ‘The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons*, 34, 39–48
- CASTELLS, M. (1999) "A sociedade em rede. São Paulo: Paz e Terra

- Cheibub, Z. B., & Locke, R. M. (2002). Valores ou interesses? Reflexões sobre a responsabilidade social das empresas. Empresa, empresários e globalização. Rio de Janeiro: Relume Dumará.
- Cohen, S. (2011). Sustainability management: Lessons from and for New York City, America and the planet. New York, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Carroll, M. C., & Stanfield, J. R. (2003). Social capital, Karl Polanyi, and American social and institutional economics. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 37(2), 397-404.
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, S95–120.
- Coleman, J. S. (1990). Foundations of social theory. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- COMINI, G. Negócio social: um novo conceito ou um novo rótulo? In <http://brasil.nextbillion.net/blog/2011/04/13/negocio-social-um-novo-conceito-ou-um-novo-rtulo->. Acesso em 13 de abril de 2011
- COMINI, G. Negócios Sociais e Inclusivos. Instituto Walmart, 2011. in <http://www.ruscheleassociados.com.br/pdf/panorama2.pdf>> Acessado em: 26 de setembro de 2013
- COMINI, G.; BARKI, E.; AGUIAR, L. T. A three-pronged approach to social business: a Brazilian multi-case analysis social businesses. *Revista de Administração*, v. 47, n. 3, p. 385-397, 2012
- Costanza, R., & Daly, H. E. (1992). Natural capital and sustainable development. *Conservation biology*, 6(1), 37-46.
- Dean, T. J., & McMullen, J. S. (2007). Toward a theory of sustainable entrepreneurship: Reducing environmental degradation through entrepreneurial action. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22(1), 50-76.
- Defourny Jacques, Nyssens Marthe (2010), "Conceptions of Social Enterprise and Social Entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States: Convergences and Divergences", *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, (1), pp. 32-53.
- DEFOURNY J, Nyssens M. Social enterprise in Europe: recent trends and developments. *Social Enterprise Journal*. 2008;4(3):202-228. In <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/10.1108/17508610810922703>
- Defourny J. & Nyssens M. (2006), "Defining Social Enterprise" in *Social Enterprise, at the Crossroads of Market, Public Policies and Civil Society* (M. Nyssens, ed.), Routledge, London & New York, pp. 3-26.
- Dees, G. J. (1998). The Meaning of Social Entrepreneurship, revision of May 30, 2001. Retrieved February 3, 2011 from http://www.caseatduke.org/documents/dees_sedef.pdf
- Freire, L. (2001). Empreendedorismo: fundamentos conceituais. Anais de Encontro Nacional de Empreendedorismo, Florianópolis, Brasil.
- Friedman, M. (1970). 'The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits'. *New York Times Magazine*, 13 September, 32–33, 122, 124, 126
- Giddens, A. (1991). *As conseqüências da modernidade*. Unesp.
- Giddens, A. (1999). *Teoria social hoje*. Livraria UNESP.
- Godói de Sousa, E., Elizandro Gandolfi, P., & Caixeta Gandolfi, M. R. (2011). Empreendedorismo social no Brasil: um fenômeno de inovação e desenvolvimento local. *Dimensão empresarial*, 9(2), 22-34.
- GRANADOS, M. L. et al. Social enterprise and social entrepreneurship research and theory: A bibliometric analysis from 1991 to 2010. *Social Enterprise Journal*, v. 7, n. 3, p. 20, 2011.
- Granovetter, M. (1985). Economic action and social structure: the problem of embeddedness. *American journal of sociology*, 481-510.
- GRISI, F.C. (2008). *Fernando Correa Grisi* (Doctoral dissertation, Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo).
- Hall, J. K., Daneke, G. A., & Lenox, M. J. (2010). Sustainable development and entrepreneurship: Past contributions and future directions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(5), 439-448.
- Henderson, D. (2001). The case against 'corporate social responsibility'. *POLICY-ST LEONARDS-*, 17(2), 28-32.
- IANNI, Octavio. Globalização: novo paradigma das ciências sociais. *Estudos Avançados*, v. 8, n. 21, p. 147-163, 1994.
- Jacobs J. 1965. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. Penguin: New York
- KERLIN J. A Comparative Analysis of the Global Emergence of Social Enterprise Working Paper 06-06 . r Andrew Young School of Policy Studies Andrew Young School of Policy Studies Internet: ayGeorgia State University Internet: aysps.gsu.edu/nonprofit
- LANDIM, Leilah. Para além do mercado e do Estado? Filantropia e cidadania no Brasil. Série Textos de Pesquisa. Rio de Janeiro: ISER, 1993.
- Lehtonen, M. (2004). The environmental–social interface of sustainable development: capabilities, social capital, institutions. *Ecological economics*, 49(2), 199-214.
- LÉVESQUE, Benoît and Marguerite MENDELL (1999), "L'économie sociale au Québec: éléments théoriques et empiriques pour le débat et la recherche", in *Lien social et Politiques*, 41, pp. 105-118
- LIMA G. F. C.; PORTILHO, F. Sociologia Ambiental: formação, dilemas e perspectivas. *Revista Teoria & Sociedade*. UFMG. Belo Horizonte, n.7, jun. 2001, p. 241-276.

- MAIMON, Dália, Determinantes de Responsabilidade Socioambiental das Empresas Brasileiras, CADMA, Rio de Janeiro, 2006
- Margolis, J. D., & Walsh, J. 2003. Misery loves company: Rethinking social initiatives by business. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48(2): 268-305.
- Margolis, J. D., & Walsh, J. P. (2003). Misery loves companies: Rethinking social initiatives by business. *Administrative science quarterly*, 48(2), 268-305.
- Margolis, J. D., & Walsh, J. P. (2003). Misery loves companies: Rethinking social initiatives by business. *Administrative science quarterly*, 48(2), 268-305.
- Martins, P. H. (2005). A sociologia de Marcel Mauss: dádiva, simbolismo e associação. *Revista crítica de ciências sociais*, (73), 45-66.
- Melo Neto, F. P. de, & Froes, C. (2002). Empreendedorismo social: a transição para a sociedade sustentável. Rio de Janeiro: qualitymark.
- Minuzzi, J., Belinazo, D. P., & Lezana, Á. G. R. (2005). As relações entre empreendedorismo e marketing social. *As Relações entre Empreendedorismo e Marketing Social. Anais do II Seminário de Gestão de Negócios. Curitiba, PR, Brasil.*
- North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge university press.
- Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons. The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge, UK
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2006). Strategy and society. *Harvard business review*, 84(12), 78-92.
- Porter, E.M., & Kramer, M.R. (2011). Creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review*, (January-February), 1-17.
- PRAHALAD, C. K. **A Riqueza na Base da Pirâmide: Como Erradicar a Pobreza com o Lucro**. Ed. rer. atual. – Porto Alegre: Bookman, 2010.
- Putnam, R. D. (1993). *Making democracy work*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- Putnam, R. (2001). Social capital: Measurement and consequences. *Isuma*, 2(1), 41–51.
- Seelos, C., & Mair, J. (2004). *Entrepreneurs in service of the poor: Models for business contributions to sustainable development*. IESE Occasional Paper, University of Navarra, IESE Business School.
- Smith, A. (1904). *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. London: Methuen & Co.
- Seelos, C., & Mair, J. 2005. Social entrepreneurship: Creating new business models to serve to poor. *Business Horizons*, 48: 241-246.
- Scherer, A. G., & Palazzo, G. (2011). The new political role of business in a globalized world: A review of a new perspective on CSR and its implications for the firm, governance, and democracy. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48(4), 899-931.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development*. Published in German (1912), 1st edition in English: Cambridge, Mass, Harvard University Press 1934
- YOUNG, D. R. A unified theory of social enterprise. In: SHOCKLEY, G. E.; STOUGH, R. R.; FRANK, P. M. (ed.). *Non-market Entrepreneurship – Interdisciplinary Approaches*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing. 2008
- Yunus, M. (2010). *Building social business: The new kind of capitalism that serves humanity's most pressing needs*. New York: Public Affairs.
- The Economist. (2010, August 12). Let's hear those ideas: In American and Britain governments hope that a partnership with "social entrepreneurs" can solve some of society's most intractable problems. *The Economist*. Available at <http://www.economist.com/node/16789766>
- Wainwright, H. "Uma Resposta ao Neoliberalismo: Argumentos para uma nova esquerda"; 1998
- Whetten, D. A., & Mackey, A. (2002). A social actor conception of organizational identity and its implications for the study of organizational reputation. *Business & Society*, 41(4), 393-414.