

Development of social entrepreneurship on a given territory

Sergey Gennadyevich Simonov, Makka Alaudinovna Khamatkhonova and Natalia Nikolaevna Peshkova

Tyumen State Oil and Gas University, Volodarskogo, 38, Tyumen, 625000, Tyumen region

Abstract. Social entrepreneurship is innovative form of non-profit sector. It promotes solving socially important problems by application of economical mechanisms and reaching results at minimal cost. Experience of social entrepreneurship development is generalized on an example of Tyumen region. Results of sociological survey conducted at the end of 2012 in the scope of scientific society "Social responsibility of business" based on Tyumen State Oil and Gas University is presented. 50 people participated in the survey (representatives of the authorities and business).

[Simonov S.G., Khamatkhonova M.A., Peshkova N.N. **Development of social entrepreneurship on a given territory.** *Life Sci J* 2014;11(7s):314-317] (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 66

Keywords: social entrepreneurship, institutional settings, non-profit sector, depth interview.

Introduction

Problems of effective settling of social problems get special importance now in condition of global changes in the economy. It has become obvious that development of social institutions is necessary condition of economical development of a territory. So it is necessary for business not only to accumulate and reduce costs but to try to find some individual special engagement. Sometimes it requires alternating the vector of entrepreneurship and adds social orientation to it in the process of forming of economical structure [1].

Richard Cantillon may be considered as the founder of social entrepreneurship. He treat a man as decision maker and satisfying his (her) demands in the situation of uncertainty. Entrepreneur is an individual with vision and commitment to risk who is aimed in future and whose actions are characterized by the hope to have profit and readiness to losses [2].

Jean-Baptiste Say noted such qualities of an entrepreneur that form at the first place his social component: intellect, sense, commitment to order, honesty, knowledge of people, capability to understand situation, capability to evaluate importance of product correctly and demand the requires satisfying [3].

J. Schumpeter linked social orientation with innovative activity. He found out that revealing and using of a new combination of production factors i.e. realization of innovations is functional essence of an entrepreneur [4].

F. Hayek later developed this idea of Schumpeter. He made a conclusion that competition forced entrepreneur to innovate is a search for new products and new raw markets and thus diversify in social area. Focus should be done on a search for new ideas, on capability to discover or create new demands that nobody has yet satisfied [5].

To our mind, M.Yunus, W. Strickland, and B. Drayton may be considered social entrepreneurs. Nobel Peace Prize Winn we Yunus who was the initiator of the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh in late 1970s offered his variants of settling the most important social problem of microcrediting the poorest social strata. Strickland has founded the Manchester Craftsmen's Guild in 1968 to promote development of social programs in Pittsburgh. Drayton school (1980) became the base for individual social entrepreneurs' support [6].

Harward business school of corporate social initiatives requires special mentioning. It was founded in 1993 and was the first to promote study social entrepreneurship. Three years later (in 1996) European researchers founded EMES.

Organizational forms of social entrepreneurship depend on local conditions and possibilities, social and ecological demands and specifics of each country: legal base, social welfare, cultural and historical traditions, etc. Diversity of business is reflected in description of its initiatives that have pronounced social character: civil initiatives, corporate social responsibility, third sector of economy, social entrepreneurship, social enterprises, social innovations, social aims of an enterprise, etc. [7].

Enterprise is a feature if personality that is characterized by capability to overcome forced conditions, reach given aims in economical, social or other areas of social life due to some systems of actions that is based on such personal qualities as initiative, ingenuity, independence, commitment to unusual decision, commitment to risk and responsibility for results.

According to majority of scientists engaged in the problems of social entrepreneurship the best definition of social entrepreneurship was given by Jewell, Jóhannesson and Lundqvist. In their

interpretation social entrepreneurship is innovative initiative that develops functions useful for society [8].

Research method

In the survey aimed on defining of determinative factors of social entrepreneurship on the territory of Tyumen region we carried out sociological survey of the Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Area youth dedicated to the problems of business activity. 3390 were surveyed that meets the requirements of representativeness of sample. Expert survey of two groups of respondents was carried out in the scope of research: state authorities (25 persons) and businessmen (25 persons). Social entrepreneurship is new unexplored phenomenon for the region. Survey by questionnaire and deep interview were selected as research method because it allows gather maximum information considering individual opinion of respondent.

All participants were represented by four groups:

- entrepreneurs engaged in social area (12 persons);
- representatives of big business of Tyumen region as the main locomotives of regional economy development (13 persons);
- state authorities supervising social objects (cultural, educational, health care institutions) (15 persons);
- clerks fulfilling normative control of social business (10 persons).

Such classification of participants made it possible to carry out thorough analysis of the problem of social entrepreneurship development in Tyumen region. As it was mentioned earlier social entrepreneurship is innovative form of social sector development. Its philosophy is a whole of life positions of business subject. Followers of this philosophy consider all people and their actions actually as market products thus everybody and everything has its price. Preachers of really free social entrepreneurship think that a person can serve society only serving him [9].

Entrepreneurs pay much attention to state social institutions and hierarchy in which everybody

takes his place. Their deep belief in social institutions is what plays leading role here. Democracy and capitalism in their coexistence, interaction and complementarity make private property not only the base for free social entrepreneurship but the source of a freedom of individual. That is the source of firm conviction of entrepreneurs that each low passed by government that relates to social sphere is a potential threat to future freedom and they should oppose it by all means.

Subjects of social entrepreneurship are capable and ready to act as direct representatives of the interests of territory. They become indignant because of numerous different rules, runaround with communicating those to entrepreneurs and the fact that decisions of regulatory agencies are non-appealable. New initiatives of business that correspond to the spirit of the age may become important contribution to conducting of economical policy of developing Russian social capitalism in wide scope. Government and business solve pressing problems together for the sake of society.

Social entrepreneurship arose in the second half of XX century and positioned itself between philanthropy and commerce. Now there is no matured theory of social entrepreneurship despite existing views on the problem. A certain experience has been gained that is diverse but has no system.

Results of deep interview

Only 25% of participants said they wanted to make business in social area, 44% rejected making business and prefer stable guaranteed salary in federal enterprise. Results of survey were correlated accounting for the fact is participant has permanent position or not. There is no direct dependence of readiness to make social business and permanent position [10].

Respondents have vague idea of entrepreneurship in general and social entrepreneurship, most of them have never been engaged in business activity and have no idea of financial, organizational and managerial difficulties of making business in social area (Table 1).

Table 1. Readiness to be engaged in social entrepreneurship (distribution in dependence of permanent position, %)

	Respondents with permanent position	Respondents without permanent position
Ready to make business	36.9	36.4
Rather ready to make business than no	17.6	15.9
Rather are not ready to make business	15.5	5.6
Not ready to make business	15.7	18.9
Difficult to answer	14.3	23.2

Tyumen region has potential for social entrepreneurship development. This fact may be effectively used for solving social problems on the territory [11].

Participants of deep interview gave different answers on the same questions. Opinions varied: representatives of housing and communal services and hotel services are cautious regarding investment in human factor considering it the problem of the state. Representatives of services of children's vacation organization, education, health care and media think that business technologies should and have possibilities to enter social area.

Subjects of big business of Tyumen region are positive regarding development of human resources. Most of large corporations have already changed their orientation and are investing in human capital.

Representatives of state authorities understand that a time for surplus profits for private companies has gone and it is necessary to focus business on a person. Authorities note that companies are unable to make significant contributions to social area and so the task of the authorities is to make conditions for promoting development of social entrepreneurship in the region.

Responding entrepreneurs in turn think that successful business activity in social area is possible but a certain investments from the government are necessary. Although Tyumen region is attractive for business in general it is rather difficult to make business in social area by them without support from the state.

So it is developing partnership of the state and business in Tyumen region that gives hope for solving problems of social area and it lies in the foundation of forming of social entrepreneurship in the region.

The survey has also showed that respondents agree in opinion that all business is socially related because it is aimed in satisfying the demands of society. Division of business on social and non-social has conditional character and people do not always understand what it is necessary for and whom for. It is easier to understand business division into commercial and non-profit structures.

Private kindergartens, aid buttons for aged people, additional education, fee-based medical services and children vacation organization services were named as examples of social entrepreneurship in the region. Participants noted that entrepreneurship in the areas of organization of children and family vacations are the most developed sectors of social entrepreneurship in the region.

Conclusion

Institutional character of social entrepreneurship relies of individual capabilities of a person to play definite role in society far beyond the scope of one certain activity. This role is social in its essence and today it should be combined with other roles: businessman and entrepreneur, manager and entrepreneur, director and entrepreneur, etc.

As the survey has shown there is a small share of commercial structures in Tyumen region that regulate and plan social activity for solving social problems of inhabitants. It presumes existence of priorities and funds provided in budget. Program formalizes the procedure of decision making regarding provisioning of social aid. The procedure itself gets institutional character and personal preferences of management of such business structure do not add the element of uncertainty and groundlessness in decisions.

Respondents think that social entrepreneurship is economically grounded and potentially may be thought from the point of view of rational management. The main function of social entrepreneurship program is regulating and ordering, definition and clearness as a result of demarcation of relations with outer environment of organization. It is the way to strengthen ties of business structure with its valuable environment. Intensity of these ties eventually defines capability of business structure to adequately react on environmental changes (or in the environment) and lack of non-simultaneity lacuna (lost of trust).

The survey has shown that stimulating of social entrepreneurship in the region is pressing problem but it is far from adequate practical realization. Not all entrepreneurs and authorities fully understand the importance of its solving. There are potential for development of social entrepreneurship in the region but entrepreneurs are almost not interested in it.

In general the process of changes of social functions of business is going on in Tyumen region, unregulated flow of primary material aid for indigents and the importance of social entrepreneurship vector is growing. This vector is oriented in increase of creative and business activity of different social strata and at the first place of the youth [12].

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Simonov Sergey Gennadyevich
Tyumen State Oil and Gas University, Volodarskogo,
38, Tyumen, 625000, Tyumen region, Russia

References

1. Simonov, S. and M. Khamatkhanova, 2013. The Problems of the Development of Innovation Potential of Youth Business in the Process of Functioning of the Enterprise / World Applied Sciences Journal, 26 (7): 902-906.
2. Hone, J., 1994. Biographical Note on Richard Cantillon. Economic Journal.
3. Say J.-B., 1971. A Treatise on Political Economy. pp: 492.
4. Schumpeter J. A., 1964. Theory of economic development; Duncker and Humbolt. Berlin. pp: 400.
5. Hayek F. A., 1976. The Road to Serfdom. Chicago. The University of Chicago Press. pp:262.
6. Bauer-Leeb. M., 2011. Social Entrepreneurs and Business Angels – A Quest for Factors Facilitating Business Relationships. Vienna: Haslau, pp: 245.
7. Sidakova S.S., 2010. Knowledge in a Modern Paradigm of Innovations / Vestnic of Moscow's University. Serie 6. Ekonomy, 4: 74-84.
8. Lehner O. M., 2012. Social Entrepreneurship Perspectives – Triangulated Approaches to Hybridity. Syäskylä, pp. 97
9. Newman P. 1975. The Canadian Establishment. Toronto. pp: 357.
10. Mikheeva, E.M., T.V. Dovgotkho, N.N. Mikheeva and M.I. Cheliyk, 2007. Youth of the Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Area as labor resource of the territory: sociological analysis. Tyumen: TSAA, pp: 228.
11. Popova, A.I., 2010. Resource supplement of concurrent benefits in region: author. candidate dissertation of economical sciences. – Shakhty, 21 pp.
12. Peshkova, N. 2013. Motives of charitable behavior of Russians. Proceedings in Electronic International Interdisciplinary Conference: The 2nd Electronic International Interdisciplinary Conference, 2:258-261.

5/8/2014