



*Asesorías y Tutorías para la Investigación Científica en la Educación Puig-Salabarría S.C.
José María Pino Suárez 400-2 esq a Lerdo de Tejada, Toluca, Estado de México. 7223898475*

RFC: ATII20618V12

Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores.

<http://www.dilemascontemporaneoseduccionpoliticayvalores.com/>

Año: VI

Número: Edición Especial

Artículo no.:33

Período: Julio, 2019.

TÍTULO: El emprendimiento social como un camino prometedor de la seguridad económica.

AUTORES:

1. Ph.D. M. V. Golovko.
2. Sen. Lect. S. P. Agapova.
3. Ph.D. A. V. Antsibor.
4. Ph.D. A.A. Sukhoveeva.
5. Ph.D. O.V. Andreeva.

RESUMEN. Este estudio es relevante debido a la capacidad significativa del emprendimiento social para garantizar la seguridad económica del estado mediante la resolución de problemas sociales. El concepto y las características esenciales del emprendimiento social se estudian con métodos históricos y genéticos. El enfoque de actividad proporcionó la base para explorar el emprendimiento social como un tipo específico de actividad humana. Los procedimientos estadísticos permitieron dar sentido a las cifras de desarrollo del emprendimiento social. El artículo considera los diferentes enfoques del fenómeno del emprendimiento social y la necesidad de hacerlo con una ley separada está comprobada.

PALABRAS CLAVES: apoyo estatal, apoyo público, apoyo gubernamental, el sector sin ánimo de lucro.

TITLE: Social entrepreneurship as a promising way to economic security.

AUTHORS:

1. Ph.D. M. V. Golovko.
2. Sen. Lect. S. P. Agapova.
3. Ph.D. A. V. Antsibor.
4. Ph.D. A.A. Sukhoveeva.
5. Ph.D. O.V. Andreeva.

ABSTRACT: This study is relevant because of the significant capability of the social entrepreneurship to ensure economic security of the state by solving social problems. The concept and essential features of social entrepreneurship are studied with the historical and genetic method. Activity approach provided the basis to explore social entrepreneurship as a specific kind of human activity. Statistic procedures enabled to make sense of the social entrepreneurship development figures. The article considers different approaches to the phenomenon social entrepreneurship and the need to render it with a separate law is substantiated.

KEY WORDS: state support; public support; governmental support; non-profit sector.

INTRODUCTION.

The nature of the modern economic development in the context of economic security requires a faster improvement of the material level and quality of life of the population. Economic security is critical for strengthening of the state, ensuring social safety, developing corporate responsibility and democratic social partnership [10, c. 7].

Social entrepreneurship is a relatively new and promising economic phenomenon fostering the economic security of the state by solving social problems. In Russia, it is not yet strong due to the insufficient publicity despite the existing forms of support and general understanding of its idea and

principles. Therefore, it has to be furthered by state and discussed actively by the professionals. Financial problems are crucial for the development of social entrepreneurship because, first of all, it solves “financial matters” raising funds and distributing income.

The development of social entrepreneurship will deliver state administration and subordinate municipal bodies from some services and cut respective state budget costs making quality services provided to proper living standards more accessible to people.

As a social and economic phenomenon mitigating social problems, social entrepreneurship attracts scientists, activists, politicians and traditional businessmen.

Despite the longer history of social entrepreneurship studies abroad, it was rather a problem for many scientists to define it [30, The definition of social entrepreneurship: the failure of Schumpeter from David M. Key. *International journal of entrepreneurship and small business (IJESB)*, vol. 31, No. 3, 2017].

A serious advancement was achieved in the article of Susan Mueller, Robert S. D’Intino, Jennifer Walske, Michel L. Ehrenhard, Scott L. Newbert, Jeffrey A. Robinson & al., “What's Holding Back Social Entrepreneurship? Removing the Impediments to Theoretical Advancement” [23].

Economic, political and cultural aspects of implementation, institutionalization and prospects of social entrepreneurship are explicitly illustrated by research of many countries described in the book of Anders Lundström, Chunyan Zhou, Yvonne von Friedrichs and Elisabeth Sundin, “Social Entrepreneurship Leveraging Economic, Political, and Cultural Dimensions” [25].

An analysis of differences between the European and American versions of the social entrepreneurship concepts is also interesting. [24, Defourny, Jacques and Nyssens, Marthe. *Conceptions of Social Enterprise and Social Entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States: Convergences and Divergences*].

Functioning of the social entrepreneurship in non-profit and profit sectors has been studied quite well by Marta Peris-Ortiz, Frédéric Teulon and Dominique Bonet-Fernandez. [26, *Social Entrepreneurship in Non-Profit and Profit Sectors: Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives*].

It is generally accepted, that social entrepreneurship is perceived as a legal and innovative solution to social problems. Nevertheless, the social problems to be solved by the social business have not been determined yet, whilst identification of these problems is crucial for many matters to include many areas of the state support [29].

Thus, the need for changing the social and economic role of social enterprises is stated [27, Stevens, R., Moray, N., & Bruneel, J. (2015). *The social and economic mission of social enterprises: Dimensions, measurement, validation, and relation*], as well as, for example, the ways to solve the poverty problem [28 - Bruton GD, Ketchen DJ. *Entrepreneurship as a solution to the problem of poverty*] and the problem of the social entrepreneurship efficacy [29, Bernard Arogyaswamy, *Social entrepreneurship performance measurement: A time-based organizing framework*; 22 - Lumina S. Albert, Thomas J. Dean & Robert A. Baron. *From Social Value to Social Cognition: How Social Ventures Obtain the Resources They Need for Social Transformation*].

In this article, it is important to stress the enormous role of the state support of social entrepreneurship which is indispensable for the development of this significant sector. Thus, in Great Britain, the number of social enterprises increased from 5,300 to 62,000 in only five years [21, S. Teasdale, F. Lyon & R. Baldock. *Playing with Numbers: A Methodological Critique of the Social Enterprise Growth Myth*].

Social entrepreneurship matters have not yet been sufficiently worked out by Russian professionals, which is due to the insufficient time to discuss them and relevant experience. Mostly, there are descriptive and synoptic works whereas practical studies of the Russian data are scarce. However, some of the most active researchers are worth noting to include A.F. Veksler [А.Ф. Векслер] [1],

N.I. Zvereva [Н.И. Зверева] [7, 8], N.F. Kadol [Н.Ф. Кадол] [9]. The theory of social entrepreneurship is being efficiently developed by V.A. Gaydarenky [В.А. Гайдаренко] [3], D.A. Gafarova [Д.А. Гафарова] [4], I.V. Manakhova [И.В. Манахова] [11], A.V. Mukhin [А.В. Мухин] [12]. The innovational nature of social entrepreneurship is studied as its most important feature by N.A. Voskolovich [Н.А. Восколович] [2], N.S. Poanshval [Н.С. Поаншваль] [13], A.I. Tatarkin [А.И. Татаркин] [15], D.O. Sheyanenko [Д.О. Шеяненко] [16]. The current state and peculiarities of the phenomenon are studied by K.P. Yegorova [К.П. Егорова] [5], O.A. Zakharchenko [О.А. Захарченко] [6] and Ye.M. Shmatkova [Е.М. Шматкова] [17].

This article aims to unfold theoretical and practical aspects of social entrepreneurship, reveal most topical problems of its development and the ways to solve them. To do this, the following tasks were completed: the concept of social entrepreneurship was defined as well as its substantial features; the federal bill on social entrepreneurship was described; the current trends in social entrepreneurship establishment in Russia were analyzed; the factors impeding the growth of its influence in the Russian economy were revealed; some solutions were proposed.

Materials and methods.

The concept and essential properties of social entrepreneurship were studied using the historical and genetic method enabling to show the development of this kind of business from its origins to the present state showing the laws of its changing in the history.

The activity approach formed the basis for the study of the social entrepreneurship as a specific domain of social (human) activity.

Statistic methods allowed to distribute social businesses and entrepreneurs as well as their products (services) by activities, audiences and regions.

The study is based on scientific literature as well as websites of public bodies and organisations dealing in organizational, informational and other support of social entrepreneurs promoting the social entrepreneurship in Russia.

The governmental programmes of the Russian Federation and particular regions aimed to include social entrepreneurship in the areas of their competence were studied.

Results.

The terms “social entrepreneurship” and “social entrepreneur” are first mentioned in 1960-s in the West where that phenomenon was considered as a way to solve social problems as well as a driver of economic and social change. The term “social” derives from a Latin word meaning “assistant” or “ally” or “companion”. It implies people united as a group living or working together [29]. Thus, the concept of social is related to something done for the society as a whole or in particular. It places the society over the individual.

Social problem shall be understood as a gap between desired social conditions and reality. As a rule, social problems are termed as a human pathology such as delinquency, alcohol and narcotic abuse, any dysfunction of a particular social institution (school, family etc.), any form of conflict (ethnic, labour etc.), lack of funds available to the society to satisfy current needs, such as healthcare, leisure etc. These made the social entrepreneurship popular. The concept itself became generally acknowledged and widespread in 70-s and 80-s due to some sociologists regarded presently as the founders of the movement.

To make sense of the term “social entrepreneur”, the definitions given by international organizations supporting social entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurs shall be used. The most influential of them are Schwab Foundation, Skoll Foundation, Social Enterprise London, The Social Enterprise Coalition, Ashoka Foundation.

Thus, Schwab Foundation defines social entrepreneurship as:

- “Useful, innovative and sustainable practices for the benefit of the society.
- Unique approach to economic and social problems.
- Based upon values and practices common for social entrepreneurs working in any sector of economy organizing for profit as well as for non-profit purposes.

A social entrepreneur is a pragmatic visionary in pursuit of a broad, systematic and sustainable social change.

All social entrepreneurs share common qualities including unshakeable faith, willingness to change, practical and innovational approach, willingness to measure and control their influence, healthy impatience. Social entrepreneurs cannot stand bureaucracy. They cannot wait for changes to happen – they make them happen instead”.

In Russia, the theoretical base of social entrepreneurship is in its infancy. The concept is vague, unusual and complicated for the public conscience. The very phenomenon is only being formed. Still it is not understood in the same terms by all parties of the process to include social entrepreneurs, public institutions empowered to nominate them, sociologists and anybody studying and interpreting the phenomenon. In default of a generally accepted definition, anybody feeling like social entrepreneur can consider himself a social entrepreneur. It turns out to be a matter of self-identification and social standing.

The term “social entrepreneurship” is used as a synonym of social facilities, socially responsible business and social issues as a whole. Therefore, it is extremely topical to develop, openly discuss and accept a federal law on the social entrepreneurship.

Social entrepreneurship is developing in Russia. A survey of existing grants and competitions in the field revealed, that all of them are held and financed by private foundations, local authorities or

foreign investors meaning, that social entrepreneurship is not supported at the federal level as it ought to be.

Federal laws have no such concept and provide no tax credit for social entrepreneurs, although there are some concessions for socially responsible business practices.

Information support of social entrepreneurs is also rather weak. There is only one internet resource containing some examples of social business: <http://coindex.ru/> (Social Entrepreneurship of Russia).

Two years ago, social entrepreneurship was present in different forms only in 14 of 85 constituents of the Russian Federation. Now, according to the said internet portal, 456 social enterprises named themselves in 58 regions and there are 329 individual social entrepreneurs in 44 regions. Given inter-regional and all-Russia projects, the number of social enterprises and entrepreneurs totals 824 which is neglectfully small compared to the real social business potential confirmed by the experience of the developed countries. Table 1 shows which Federal Districts are most active at developing social entrepreneurship. The greatest concentration is visible in the biggest constituents of the Russian Federation including Moscow and the Moscow Region (22.5%) and Saint Petersburg and Leningrad Region (8.6%).

Table 1. Social Entrepreneurs by Constituents of the Russian Federations and Kinds of Goods (Services).

Federal Districts	Social Entrepreneurs			Goods	Services
	Total	Enterprises	Entrepreneurs		
Total	824	480	344	-	-
Inter-regional Project	10	5	5	1	3
All-Russia Project	29	19	10	19	8
North-western	152	84	68	37	35
St. Petersburg and the Region	71	38	33	9	9
Central	221	124	97	224	70
Moscow and the Region	185	104	81	216	49
Volga	147	85	62	19	72
Southern District	36	28	8	5	9
North Caucasus	21	10	11	4	10
Ural	40	28	12	7	11
Siberian District	159	91	68	14	20
Far East	9	6	3	2	2

The Table includes and is based upon data of <http://coindex.ru/> (Social Entrepreneurship in Russia) as of 18.08.2017

All the territories are very much different in respect of their mentality, business and social issues to be solved. Therefore, the effects of the same activities are different in the regions. It is worth noting, that 27 constituents of the Russian Federation have no social entrepreneurs or enterprises.

The sectors of social entrepreneurship differ including mostly social services, healthcare, education etc. As to the audience, the foremost are children, families with children, socially disadvantaged and elderly people.

Discussion.

Despite some persuasive examples, the furthering of social entrepreneurship requires a separate law as well as some changes to the existing ones to include the Law on Non-profit Organizations, which has to be supplemented with a broader list of NPO activities.

A similar bill exists and is being discussed. However, it has not been accepted despite the order of the President. Although important, it is not devoid of shortcomings.

First of all, criteria are not properly worked out including the share of employees and activities.

The bill is based upon the order of the Ministry of Economic Development of Russia on Competitive Selection of Constituents of the Russian Federation Subsidised in 2013 from the Federal Budget for the State Support of Small and Medium Enterprises Provided by Constituents of the Russian Federation. The provisions of the order is only applied to entities eligible by the Ministry. Social entrepreneurship is a socially responsible activity of small and medium enterprises aiming to solve social problems and meeting the following requirements:

- a) Employment of disabled persons, mothers with children to 3 years of age, emissaries of orphanages, prisoners released during 2 years before the selection date, provided, that their average number is at least 50% and their share in the payroll budget is at least 25%.
- b) Provision of services (production of goods) in the following areas:
 - Assistance with vocational training and employment to include self-employment.

- Social services to private individuals to include healthcare, physical education and sports, educational activities for children and the youth.
- Assistance to persons affected by natural disasters, environmental, self-inflicted and other catastrophes, social, ethnic and confessional conflicts, as well as to refugees and immigrants.
- Production and/or selling of medical equipment, prosthetic appliances and other technical devices used exclusively for prevention of disabilities and rehabilitation of disabled persons.
- Cultural education including theatres, theatre schools, musical establishments and workshops.
- Educational services to people with limited access to educational services.
- Involvement of socially disadvantaged persons (disabled persons, orphans, emissaries of nursery schools, elderly people, drug and alcohol addicts) in social activities.
- Prevention of unsafe behavior.
- Issuance of periodicals and books related to education, science and culture.

The law has to define social entrepreneurs and enterprises to include commercial and non-profit entities and individual entrepreneurs more distinctly. It may provide for separate corporate forms of business. It is worth noting, that social entrepreneurship may be in all sectors not to be reduced to those narrowly restricted by the bill.

Secondly, the law must strictly define the way the status of social entrepreneur may be received, set out relevant requirements and constraints as well as tax preferences which the social entrepreneurship enthusiasts may be eligible to. The main ways of state support shall also include simplified procedures of registration and reporting, up-to-date financing schemes, easy terms of rent and access to franchise databases, educational programmes and public purchases.

Whatever it be, as soon as the meaning of social entrepreneurship is defined, the limits of the concept shall be set to make it clear that it is not already a charity but not yet purely commercial activity, since social entrepreneurship stays at the borderline of both. In particular, social entrepreneurship takes

social purposes from charity and entrepreneurship from business. Of course, any production has a social component including employment, salaries, labour compensations and organizational matters, not to mention various social programmes any big, medium and even small business has. All these features of a socially responsible business are present in any commercial entity. Therefore, it is important to legislatively separate the social entrepreneurship from public projects and traditional business charity.

A businessman managing a social enterprise has very much in common with a traditional businessman creating a non-commercial project. However, they differ in possibilities they use and values they create. A social entrepreneur strives to solve problems of the society (such as famine and poverty) measuring his success with humanistic values. With his innovation and resourcefulness, the entrepreneur improves the well-being of the society as a whole and sometimes even takes part in creation of economic value. However, the latter would be an instrument and not the goal. The social entrepreneur uses entrepreneurial innovation for the universal good and not for the personal profit. The advantages of pro bono enterprises are commonly known. They strengthen reputation, rise business efficacy, make the company more attractive to investors, improve the infrastructure etc. Nevertheless, social programmes are considered knowingly ineffective, irrational and profitless. The social entrepreneurship dispels this myth because it is based upon self-sufficiency and profitability placing social benefits higher than the economic ones.

In Russia, social entrepreneurship is connected with non-commercial organizations having socially-oriented goals, charity, venture philanthropy and corporate responsibility. Its viability is determined by conditions of competition for public contracts. Presently, the differences between the commercial and non-profit sectors are tending to degrade. Social enterprises pursuing non-standard goals are increasing in number in different parts of the world. Such organizations combine the functions of different sectors sweeping away their boundaries [14].

In the economic situation of the modern Russia there are some conditions making social entrepreneurship necessary, such as:

- Numerous social problems.
- Weak public policy under scarce budget
- Low quality public (municipal) services in crucial sectors (healthcare, social services etc.).
- Outsourcing of public services to private contractors through public contracting.
- Need to make people more socially conscious, responsible and active.
- Increasing financing by grantors; for example, the Presidential Programs Fund increased financial support of non-commercial organizations from RUR 4.3 to 7 billion in 2017.
- Social investors with funds exceeding those of the proposed social projects.

At the same time, there are some barriers impeding social entrepreneurship and innovation related to the state government including:

- Vague and mixed delineation of responsibility areas between department (by sectors or types of business organization) isolating independent organizations from state on one hand, and bringing social entrepreneurs out of the scope of competence of departments seemingly “relevant” to them;
- Concentration of social departments on regulation of publicly-financed organizations, whereas non-profit social companies are on the fringes, and commercial ones are totally beyond the field of their attention.
- Missing or formal criteria of small and medium business support, most of which are copied from the law of 2007; there are no social ones among them.
- Formal approach to business incubators; no strategy for their development; as a result, they are regarded as mere premises and not as the business and professional consultation and education centres.

- Lack of meaningful criteria of “socially-oriented non-profit organizations”, which is why the most efficient and innovative of them are not supported.

- No mechanisms to support social innovation projects: at early phases (which is relatively expensive requiring financing, administrative and expert support) as well as at the phases of growth of the projects that have already proved their viability (which is more “cost-saving”) etc.

Today most of the social entrepreneurs build their businesses for borrowed money, and excessive leveraging is risky involving possible insolvency. The appraisal of economic stability appears an instrument to reveal unhealthy businesses enabling to monitor their positions improving or deteriorating, thus, predicting and possibly preventing bankruptcy. The main risk related to borrowed capital is the lack of funds to meet financial obligations under unfavourable conditions. Therefore, it is expedient to keep a part of monetary assets ready to meet the obligations which decreases the bankruptcy risk significantly.

Factors of financial instability can be revealed by analysis of activities of social enterprises. Then, the revealed problems may be ordered by their influence to solve the existing problems and avoid further ones. It is possible to determine which factors or ratios influence the economic situation of an economic entity most and work out managerial actions to improve it.

One of the most important problems is the absence of definite and measurable indicators of the social effect of projects undertaken by social entrepreneurs. Organizations are often pressed upon by their founders requesting the social effect to be calculated. For example, it was said at the Social Investors Forum in Amsterdam (2016) that the investment in social enterprises had totaled USD 77 billion by the end of 2015. USD 15 billion of them were invested during 2015 and 38% of all that amount fall to the North America.

Investors and other interested parties want to know the real effect of their donations and investments. According to some researchers, the present methods of measuring the social influence do not stand up to scrutiny due to the following two reasons: general immaturity of appraisal methods and diversity of goals to be reached by the analysis. We can see the future of social entrepreneurship full of possibilities and innovation capable of solving many serious human problems. Most important is our understanding how the attention to the projects aimed to cure social diseases moves. The system to support social entrepreneurs facing obstacles must be built.

As mentioned previously, the law does not consider social entrepreneurship a separate sector of economy, which is why many social businessmen find public support through the programmes devoted to small and medium businesses. Presently, there are commercial and non-profit funds and private persons supporting and financing social entrepreneurs. The increasing role of the state was an important aspect of development during last several years. The Ministry of Economic Development prioritised the support of the constituents of the Russian Federation subsidising medium and small businesses among whose types the social entrepreneurship was a separate item.

Given, that social entrepreneurship is a business putting mission over profit its governmental support has to be more tangible.

The Russian state and municipal budgeting follow programs and pursues goals. There are state or municipal programmes for all governmental functions. A programme named Development of Social Entrepreneurship as a part of the programs of each constituent of the Russian Federation devoted to economic development and innovational economy would improve the situation with the state support of this sector. The main goal may be a larger share of social enterprises in local economies. Hence, the following tasks would have to be solved:

- Available financial, material, educational, informational and consultation support of social entrepreneur.

- Cutting social entrepreneurs' costs related to the state regulation.
- Improving social entrepreneurship taxation related to the state regulation.
- Improving taxation of social enterprises as a whole.

Target indicators of the sub-programme shall include:

- Number of social enterprises per 1 thousand of population.
- Number of social entrepreneurship jobs created by the sub-programme annually.
- Number of social enterprises founded by people under 30 years of age, inclusive.
- Number of people under 30 years of age, inclusive, having completed educational programmes teaching social business.
- Number of people under 30 years of age, inclusive, taking part in the programme events.
- Increase in the number of social enterprises founded by people under 30 years of age, inclusive (this indicator will be applied since 2018).
- Share of social enterprises founded by people under 30 years of age, inclusive, in the whole number of social enterprises.

The sub-programme is expected to yield the following results:

1. In qualitative terms:

- Simpler business procedures.
- More affordable financing for social businesses.
- Infrastructure supporting social business basing upon unified requirements.
- Systems compensating difference in welfare by means of the social entrepreneurship.
- Mitigating thorny social issues making them solved by increasing the number of interested persons.

2. In quantitative terms:

- Larger number of social enterprises per capita.

- Larger number of public support beneficiaries in the social entrepreneurship sector.
- Increased number of new jobs in the sector.
- Larger share of socially-disadvantaged persons serviced.
- More social enterprises founded by people under 30 years of age, inclusive.
- More people under 30 years of age, inclusive, having completed social business education programmes.
- More people under 30 years of age, inclusive, involved in the programme events.
- Larger number of social enterprises founded by people under 30 years of age, inclusive.
- Greater share of social enterprises founded by private individuals.

To solve the organizational and economic problems at the regional level the experience of the social entrepreneurship centres has to be reproduced. Such centres shall be devoted to the social and economic development of relevant territories aiming, first of all, to develop and carry out an efficient system of measures fostering social entrepreneurship in the constituents of the Russian Federation and largest municipalities.

This may be achieved with the following:

- Favourable conditions for the social entrepreneurship to develop in the region.
- Supplementary financing of the social sphere by medium and large businesses.
- Programmes to rise the efficiency of public support to the social entrepreneurship, preferably, within the aforementioned sub-programmes.
- Higher quality of social services in the region through outsourcing of municipal services to social enterprises.
- Improving business development climate and overcoming administrative barriers by interaction of business with the government.
- Educating people in social entrepreneurship issues.

- Creating a positive image of social entrepreneurs in the region.

The centre will work to improve the existing support of social entrepreneurship and introduce efficient measures to solve social problems, improve social services quality and make social organizations and businessmen more efficient in the region and large municipalities.

CONCLUSIONS.

A socially responsible economic system has to solve social problems. It is one of the crucial economic security requirements. Modern developed economies are already proving the economic and social usefulness of social entrepreneurship aiming to mitigate social issues by giving business a special mission.

The concept of social entrepreneurship is multi-faceted reflecting a wide spectrum of properties inherent to it. The very name means, that it is not the maximum profit but mitigation of social problems and their consequences it is aimed to.

In the modern Russia, social entrepreneurship is a real opportunity to improve social and economic security. Therefore, the following issues impeding its development shall be addressed:

- Insufficient understanding of social entrepreneurship by potential businessmen, youths and authorities.
- Legislative and administrative difficulties.
- Complicated search of financing for social entrepreneurs; narrow opportunities to find an interesting projects for social investors.

Therefore, for the social entrepreneurship to develop, the following is required.

1. To upgrade the bill on social entrepreneurship and the law on non-profit organizations.
2. To supplement the state programmes of economic development with sub-programmes to promote social entrepreneurship.
3. To create social entrepreneurship centres in all regions and large municipalities.

Thus, social entrepreneurship is a quite promising line of the Russian business furthering the full employment, broader and better social services available to all social strata. Solving these problems would encourage the development of social entrepreneurship and civil society with greater social responsibility and quality of life.

This study is significant theoretically and practically because it clears up the concept as well as functional and developmental features of social entrepreneurship and suggests specific instruments to promote social entrepreneurship ideas more actively.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES.

1. Veksler, A.F., What are Sponsorship and Charity for to Business [Zachem biznesu sponsorstvo i blagotvoritelnost] - A F. Veksler, A. G. Tulchinskiy. N. Novgorod: PR-ekspert, 2002. - 106 s.
2. Voskolovich, N.A., Social Entrepreneurship as an Innovative Growth Area [Sotsialnoye predprinimatelstvo kak innovatsionnoye napravleniye razvitiya uslug] - N.A. Voskolovich // Vestnik UGAES. Ser.: Ekonomika. – 2013. № 1 (3). S. 52-55.
3. Gaydarenko, V. A., The Concept of Social Entrepreneurship [Kontsept «sotsialnoye predprinimatelstvo»] - V. A. Gaydarenko // Humanitarian Studies Scientific Review [Nauchnoye obozreniye: gumanitarnyye issledovaniya] - 2014. № 7. S. 86-89.
4. Gafarova, D. A., Social Entrepreneurship [Sotsialnoye predprinimatelstvo] - D. A. Gafarova // Social Development of the Contemporary Russian Society: Achievements, Problems, Prospects [Sotsialnoye razvitiye sovremennogo rossiyskogo obshchestva: dostizheniya, problemy, perspektivy] - 2013. № 5. S.76-81.
5. Yegorova, K. P., Social Entrepreneurship in Russia: Contemporary State [Sotsialnoye predprinimatelstvo v Rossii: sovremennoye sostoyaniye] - K. P. Yegorova, E. YU. Yesipova // Bulletin of the International Institute of Management LINK [Vestnik Mezhdunarodnogo instituta menedzhmenta LINK] - 2012. № 28. S. 130-134.

6. Zakharchenko, O.A., From Charity to Social Entrepreneurship [Ot blagotvoritelnosti k sotsialnomu predprinimatelstvu] / O.A. Zakharchenko // Bulletin of Irkutsk State University [Vestnik Irkutskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta] - 2012. № 3 (62). S. 296-299.
7. Zvereva, N., Social Entrepreneurship: a Look Forward [Sotsialnoye predprinimatelstvo: vzglyad v budushcheye] [an electronic resource] / N.Zvereva // Rezhim dostupa.
8. Izotova, G., Social Entrepreneurship as a New Social Institution [Sotsialnoye predprinimatelstvo kak novyy obshchestvennyy institut] / G. Izotova, N. Zvereva // Economic Strategies [Ekonomicheskiye strategii] - 2011. № 9. C.2-7.
9. Kadol, N. F., Social Entrepreneurship in Market Economy [Sotsialnoye predprinimatelstvo v rynochnoy ekonomike] / N. F. Kadol. Bryansk: Delta, 2009. - 148 s.
10. Ilin, V.N., Economic Security in the National Security System [Ekonomicheskaya bezopasnost v sisteme natsionalnoy bezopasnosti] - RF/ V.N. Ilin// NovaInfo.Ru - № 50, 2016. S. 1- 8.
11. Manakhova, I.V., Social Entrepreneurship as an Economic Phenomenon [Sotsialnoye predprinimatelstvo kak ekonomicheskoye yavleniye] / I.V. Manakhova // Bulletin of the Volga Academy of State Service [Vestnik Povolzhskoy Akademii gosudarstvennoy sluzhby] - 2011.
12. Mukhin, A.V., Evolution of the Social Entrepreneurship Concept. The Main Social Entrepreneurship Functions [Evolyutsiya ponyatiya sotsialnogo predprinimatelstva. Osnovnyye funktsii sotsialnogo predprinimatelstva] / A. V. Mukhin // New Technologies [Novyye tekhnologii] - 2011. № 2. C. 103-106.
13. Poanshval, N.S., Social Entrepreneurship as an Innovational Tool for Solving Social Problems in the Market Economy [Sotsialnoye predprinimatelstvo kak innovatsionnyy instrument resheniya sotsialnykh problem v rynochnoy ekonomike] / N.S. Poanshval // Modern Trends in Economy and Management: a New Vision [Sovremennyye tendentsii v ekonomike i upravlenii: novyy vzglyad] - 2014. № 25. S. 170-176.

14. Poltavskaya M.B., Social Entrepreneurship Development in Russia: the Problems of Definition and Principal Properties [Razvitiye sotsialnogo predprinimatelstva v Rossii: problemy opredeleniya i osnovnyye kharakteristiki} // Kontsept. 2014. Contemporary Scientific Research [Sovremennyye nauchnyye issledovaniya] - Vypusk 2.
15. Tatarkin, A.I., Social Entrepreneurship as an Innovative Line of Social Development [Sotsialnoye predprinimatelstvo kak innovatsionnoye napravleniye obshchestvennogo razvitiya] / A. I. Tatarkin, A. V. Maslov // Bulletin of Ural Federal University [Vestnik URFU] – Economy and Management Serites [Seriya: Ekonomika i upravleniye] - 2012. № 3. S. 22-29.
16. Sheyanenko, D.O., Innovative Forms of Provision of Social Services: Social Entrepreneurship [Innovatsionnyye formy okazaniya sotsialnykh uslug: sotsialnoye predprinimatelstvo] / D.O. Sheyanenko, T.N. Martynova // Innovation Management: Theory, Methodology, Practice [Upravleniye innovatsiyami: teoriya, metodologiya, praktika] - 2014. № 11. S. 111-119.
17. Shmatkova, Ye.M., Social Entrepreneurship as a Part of Business and Civic Society [Sotsialnoye predprinimatelstvo kak chast biznesa i grazhdanskogo obshchestva] / Ye.M. Shmatkova // Social and Economic Phenomena and Processes [Sotsialno-ekonomicheskkiye yavleniya i protsessy] - 2013. № 10 (056). S. 143-146.
18. S. Teasdale, F. Lyon & R. Baldock (2013) Playing with Numbers: A Methodological Critique of the Social Enterprise Growth Myth, Journal of Social Entrepreneurship, 4:2, 113-131
19. Lumina S. Albert, Thomas J. Dean & Robert A. Baron. From Social Value to Social Cognition: How Social Ventures Obtain the Resources They Need for Social Transformation. Pages: 289-311. Journal of Social Entrepreneurship. Published online: 02 Jun 2016.

20. Susan Mueller, Robert S. DIntino, Jennifer Walske, Michel L. Ehrenhard, Scott L. Newbert, Jeffrey A. Robinson & show all. Whats Holding Back Social Entrepreneurship? Removing the Impediments to Theoretical Advancement. Pages 245-256 | Published online: 17 Sep 2014 Journal of Social Entrepreneurship.
21. Defourny, Jacques and Nyssens, Marthe (2010) Conceptions of Social Enterprise and Social Entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States: Convergences and Divergences, Journal of Social Entrepreneurship, 1: 1, 32 — 53.
22. Anders Lundström, Chunyan Zhou, Yvonne von Friedrichs, Elisabeth Sundin// Social Entrepreneurship Leveraging Economic, Political, and Cultural Dimensions. - Cham: Springer, 2014. – 363 c.
23. Social Entrepreneurship in Non-Profit and Profit Sectors: Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives/Marta Peris-Ortiz, Frédéric Teulon, Dominique Bonet-Fernandez, Editors.- Cham, Switzerland : Springer International Publishing- 2017. -125 c.
24. Stevens, R., Moray, N., & Bruneel, J. (2015). The social and economic mission of social enterprises: Dimensions, measurement, validation, and relation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 39(5), 1051–1082.
25. Bruton GD, Ketchen DJ, Ireland RD (2013) Entrepreneurship as a solution to the problem of poverty. *Journal of business venturing* 28 (6): 683 – 689
26. Bernard Arogyaswamy, Social entrepreneurship performance measurement: A time-based organizing framework, *Business Horizons*, 2017 г. ISSN 0007-6813, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2017.05.004>
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0007681317300629>
27. The definition of social entrepreneurship: the failure of Schumpeter from David M. Key. *International journal of entrepreneurship and small business (IJESB)*, vol. 31, No. 3, 2017.

28. Chantal Ervi; Annika Voltan. Samples of social issues in social entrepreneurship Publication: journal of business ethics, (2016). n1, p. 1-15.

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10551-016-3252-1>

29. Fartash K., Davoudi, S.M.M., Tatiana A. Baklashova, Natalia V. Svechnikova 4, Yulia V. Nikolaeva, Svetlana A. Grimalskaya (2018). The Impact of Technology Acquisition & Exploitation on Organizational Innovation and Organizational Performance in Knowledge-Intensive Organizations, EURASIA Journal of Mathematics Science and Technology Education, 14(4), 1497-1507.

DATA OF THE AUTHORS.

1. Golovko M. V. Ph.D., and National Research Nuclear University MEPhI (Moscow Engineering Physics Institute). Email: golovko178@mail.ru

2. Agapova S. P. Senior lecturer. National Research Nuclear University MEPhI (Moscow Engineering Physics Institute). Email: svetlana-1164@mail.ru

3. Antsibor A. V. Ph.D., National Research Nuclear University MEPhI (Moscow Engineering Physics Institute). Email: anna-ancibor@yandex.ru

4. Sukhoveeva A.A. Ph.D. Rostov State University of Economics. Email: suhoveeva_anna@mail.ru

5. Andreeva O.V. Ph.D., Rostov State University of Economics. Email: olvandr@ya.ru

RECIBIDO: 11 de junio del 2019.

APROBADO: 24 de junio del 2019.