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INTRODUCTION

The process of value creation has a major relevance in entrepreneurship (Alvarez and Barney, 2007). Extending this theory to social entrepreneurship has led to a topic of interest for researchers and scientists in management and entrepreneurship (Austin, et all, 2006; Certo and Miller, 2008; Peredo and Chrisman, 2006; Schendel and Hitt, 2007), also for the business press (Gangemi, 2006), for enterprises (Bornstein, 2005, Hemingway, 2005) and also for decisional factors in politics (Korosec and Berman, 2006).

There is a variety of definitions related to social entrepreneurship field, but there is no unanimity as regards the terminology used. Thus, some definitions speak about social entrepreneurship when it comes of non-profit organizations (Lasprogata and Cotton, 2003), while others consider as a social entrepreneurial example businesses managed by nonprofit organizations (Wallace, 1999). Some philanthropy a synonym for social entrepreneurship (Ostrander, 2007), while other researchers report on broader definitions, which associate social entrepreneurship with individuals or organizations involved in entrepreneurial activities with a social purpose (Certo and Miller, 2008; Van de Ven et all, 2007). Therefore, these major differences in terminology make difficult establishing domain legitimacy (Neilsen and Rao, 1987, Short et all, 2008). A definition preset social entrepreneurship as being a process in which resources are used in various combinations in order to capitalize on existing opportunities, create value by satisfying social needs, to foster social change, or to establish new organizations with social mission (Mair and Marti, 2006). The essence of social entrepreneurship is the ability to establish the connection between it, the social and community values, seeking to adapt continuously for ensuring social progress (Kent and Anderson, 2003). Social entrepreneurship process reveals the balance between social and economic behavior that leads to social and economic value (Chellam, 2007).
Organizations with social mission are those organizations that are capable to connect social mission to innovation, and this can include both commercial organizations and those with an exclusively social mission, or a hybrid form of these (Austin et al., 2006). Under these circumstances it is very difficult to establish a clear boundary between organizations that promote and those that do not promote social entrepreneurship.

Corporate social responsibility has often been treated as an essential component in the initiation and promotion of social entrepreneurship (Austin, 2000, Austin, 2002; Austin et al. 2006 a, b, c, Austin, 2007). But there are approaches that define corporate social responsibility in terms of commercial benefits (Windsor, 2001) which can reveal the company’s wealth and power. Definitions used by Starbucks and Chiquita, point out that social responsibility is the tool through companies listen and respond to stakeholder interests. PricewaterhouseCoopers Company believes that social responsibility refers to creating a balance between maximizing profits and interest needs. Finally, the World Bank introduces additional elements on the responsibility of companies to support development of poor nations.

Corporate social responsibility, usually, is considered as firm responsibility of corporations beyond legal obligations or restrictions imposed by economic responsibility, to pursue long term goals for owners interest (shareholders), customers, suppliers, employees, government agencies, lenders, community local public opinion (Popa, 2006).

Existing research in this field has shown that organizations with a social mission can differentiate their activity by business one addressing priority firstly the social aspect of a specific matter and than the economic one (Austin, 2000, Austin et al. 2006 a, b, c, Shaw and Carter, 2007). Organizations that promote social entrepreneurship are essential parts trough the social value creation (Kerlin, 2006; Light, 2006, Spear and Bidet, 2005). Over time they came into being more and more social organizations for different reasons: adult day care centers, kindergartens, social housing, foster homes for elderly care, etc. For this reason we can say that social entrepreneurship has always existed, but the language of social entrepreneurship is the one that changed continuously, starting to crystallize after 1980. "We always had social entrepreneurs, even if we had not been called this way" (Dees, 1998), those are creators of many institutions that exist today.
Interpretations according social entrepreneurship are regarded as "the commercialization of non-profit" or "non-profit sector efficiency" does not seem to support the definition of (Schumpeter, 1934 in Swedberg, 2006) or Shane and Venkataraman (2000). Reaching the profit and the implementation of effective management are important in the process of social entrepreneurship, increasing considerably the chances of organization’s success. In many approaches to social entrepreneurship (Bornstein, 2005; Dees Anderson, 2003) the focus is specifically on the individual, rather than on collective models.

Despite growing interest related to social entrepreneurship, the field is not distinguished by rigorous empirical research (Elias and Dees, 1998; Dorado, 2006 Low, 2006). Currently, social issues, the available data about this phenomenon is limited to case studies and instrumental analysis on the efficiency and operational practices, thereby limiting the ability to obtain general conclusions based (Short, et all, 2002). Thus, research on social entrepreneurship will remain in a nascent state with ambiguous legitimacy till the empirical studies will confirm the existing theory (Aldrich and Baker, 1997, Busenitz et al., 2003).

**STAGE OF KNOWLEDGE IN THE FIELD**

*Social Entrepreneurship*

In the field of social entrepreneurship there is a great variety of approaches that can be classified into four major directions. Two of these were the starting point of this research on social entrepreneurship. Below we briefly present the four major ways that emphasize social entrepreneurship according several authors:

✔ A first perspective could be presented as the implementation of commercial practices in nonprofit sector. Using entrepreneurial approaches involves to create social and environmental benefits without searching to achieve private benefits by developing businesses that sustain social causes. Social enterprise is the perfect shape that promotes social entrepreneurship (Yunus, 1982; Yunus, 1987, DTI 2002). This approach offers nonprofits the opportunity to have access to know-how and facilities given by a profit-
oriented model which reduces their dependence on donations and grants. Commercial practices offer nonprofits organizations the opportunity to obtain additional resources, which may lead to self-sustainability and financial autonomy (Dees, 1998). This requires the implementation of best business practices at the level of social organizations, which refers to implement the most effective programs, while using strategic planning and adequate control mechanisms. In this way it will get better efficiency in the implementation of resources and thus increase the social impact (Drucker, 1989; Boschee, 1995; Dees, 1998 Dees et all, 2001 a, b, ESS, 2009; Sagawa and Segal, 2000). A disadvantage that may result from the implementation of trade practices is given by the possibility to diverge from the social mission (Dees, 1998b, Fowler, 2000, Perini, 2006). We can say that this approach considers the expertise and entrepreneurial qualities that allowed improvement of the process.

✓ Another approach focuses more on the individual's capacity to promote social change and innovation, not to the organization as a whole. People who promote social entrepreneurship, who can be society activists (Swamz, 1990, Henton et all, 1997, Leadbeater, 2000, James, 2001) consider entrepreneurship a necessary element of its efforts to achieve social goals. Boschee considers social entrepreneur as a "revolutionary vocal supporter of innovative ideas that combine visionary perspective rooted in a reality that requires strong adherence to ethical principles, and who is totally involved and dedicated to the desire for change (Bornstein, 1998).

✓ Another approach presented entrepreneurship from perspective of social mission organizations (foundations, associations) which collect founds and than is then given as grants, to individual entrepreneurs and organizations that have a social mission in order to succeed in the steps undertaken (Christopher, 2000, Orloff, 2002). Typically, these organizations collect resources within a certain number of years, without being engaged in activities philanthropic activities, meanwhile money are invested in the capital market. An example is given by Ashoka Fellow who has provided numerous grants to about 1,200 people from around the world, with the purpose of sustaining social innovation.
Commercial enterprises focused on solving social problems (Social Purpose Business Ventures) (Campbell, 1998; Foryt, 2002) may highlight a different direction of social entrepreneurship. Thus, this approach presents social entrepreneurship as the final stage of the process of corporate social responsibility, social engagement of companies reach the most complex stage of development (Austin, et all. In Nicholls 2006; Blowfield and Murray, 2008). In this context, social innovation is seen as a business opportunity exploited by profit-oriented enterprise, which develop a new market with a focus on social goals. These companies, ranging from a strong corporate social responsibility policy can have an important social impact that can significantly contribute to the consolidation of social entrepreneurship process (Boschee, 2003, Austin, 2000, Austin, 2002, Austin et al., 2006 , b, c Austin, 2007).

**Corporate Social Responsibility**

The meaning of corporate social responsibility has evolved significantly from business owner social responsibilities, to a company's responsibility towards society and environment (Falck and Heblich, 2007). Environmental awareness and the emergence of the current protected environment in most Western countries were key factors that have led companies and industries to meet the challenges imposed by the environment (Murphy and Bendell, 1997).

There are three major stages that can be identified when analyzing the evolution of corporate social responsibility John Elkington (2004):

**Stage I** - covers the period 1960-1978 when Western governments have sought to limit the negative impact on the environment and natural resources through legislation. Thus, companies were required to meet minimum environmental standards. This initiative was supported by the establishment in early 1960, Amnesty International and the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), which have served to establish social and environmental standards worldwide. The peak of this stage was reached in 1970, when there have been numerous summits and have created numerous organizations to protect society and the environment. Can be mentioned in this case
Stage II – at the beginning of 1980, when the focus shifted from imposing limits on the exploitation of the environment, to the production of "green." Thus, attention is moving towards sustainable use of natural resources. Sustainable development concept was invented during this period. This stage was marked by the publication of the Brundtland report in 1987. The consumer movement "green" began to appear in several Nordic countries in the late 1980s. Also in the 1992 Earth Summit held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. All the major efforts of the international community had to fight the critical issues that pose a danger not only environmental but also for business.

Stage III - debuted in 1999, with protests against international institutions like the World Bank and various global companies, characterized by "Battle of Seattle" and numerous protests that coincided with major meetings held at high level at the end twentieth century. Such protests have expressed concern about global capitalism, stressing at the same time, the beneficial role that the business sector could play in promoting sustainable development. The "global" stage was characterized by rapidly evolving information and communications technology (ICT), which helped companies to have a closer relationship with the public, helping stakeholders to access and share business information faster than before. Corporate governance issues and strategic competitive advantages have characterized this stage, and the problems of globalization have increased the complexity of the concept of corporate social responsibility. Over the last decade, the list of social and environmental responsibilities of a company continued to expand, including human rights issues, climate change and poverty issues.

The three stages highlight the evolution of the concept of corporate social responsibility. Starting from the idea that maximizing income should be the only responsibility that a company has to own (Friedman, 1962, Henderson 2001) (because the only so maximizing profit will enable
efficient recovery of resources), you get the idea that gradually environmental concern and people should be a matter of interest. Thus, social responsibility requires the collective welfare, even if it assumes some costs to the firm (Hutton, 1997, De George, 1999), later finding that social responsibility can be a positive factor for the company and may even help increase its profitability (Nash, 1995).

The company has the ability to choose the social problems which wants to get involved in, being able to choose whether social welfare may or may not constitute a prerequisite for increasing the profitability of the company (Lazar et al., 2006). Certainly the decision chosen will depend largely on consumer opinion and how this involvement will influence the company in terms of profitability.

**STRUCTURE AND THESIS ORGANIZATION**

This thesis will be structured into eight chapters that will focus on conceptual aspects of social entrepreneurship, compared to commercial entrepreneurship, based on the advantages, challenges and shortcomings of these two phenomena and as well on the identification of the shape that social entrepreneurship takes in Romania. These chapters will emphasize the way that social entrepreneurship and commercial entrepreneurship through corporate social responsibility policies create social value.

If the first part of the paper will be presented theoretical issues related to social entrepreneurship and in the second one we will emphasize some of the empirical research findings, so that in the third to highlight final conclusions. The structure of this paper may be highlighted in Table 1.1
The empirical part consists of a research based on two types of questionnaires which targeted two statistical populations: NGOs and commercial enterprises from N-W part of Romania. Thus, our research had two major directions which aimed of clarifying how NGOs and commercial enterprises sustain social entrepreneurship.
OBJECTIVES AND RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

There is a lack of empirical research when it comes of social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurship address social problems caused by the failure of public and social institutions in addressing societies’ needs (Nicholls, 2005, 2006). This social imbalance generates a constant need for systematic research and interventions, which is most often difficult. This doctoral thesis aims to clarify a number of issues based on our theoretical research trying to explain the extent to which theoretical approaches can be confirmed by the economic and social reality from Romania. In this regard, we have established a number of major objectives and a number of assumptions that will be the main points of this work.

I Theoretical Research

O1: Highlighting the characteristics that ensure the distinction between social entrepreneurship and commercial entrepreneurship. Thus, we will emphasize the limits between these two processes and we will identify start-up factors.

O2: Identifying the motivation that sustains social involvement of commercial enterprises, issues relating to factors that determine corporate social involvement, presenting from a business perspective, both the advantages and disadvantages resulting from this involvement.

O3: Observing social innovation’s role in social entrepreneurship by establishing conceptual meaning of terms like creativity and innovation for understanding better social innovation and its implications sustaining this process of social entrepreneurship.

O4: Establishing criteria for identifying organizations that sustain social entrepreneurship, by presenting characteristics, that in our view, permits identifying the organizations that promote social entrepreneurship.

O5: Presenting the framework of social entrepreneurship process (social economy), and the forms which this phenomenon can take.

O6: Emphasizing how corporate social responsibility can become an important factor in triggering the process of social entrepreneurship. Thus, we seek to provide an answer about the
way that organizations that sustain social mission can become a form of social entrepreneurship promotion.

**II Empirical Research**

O1: Observing how NGOs sustain social entrepreneurship spread. This will be followed by an investigation conducted at the NGO's from N-W part of Romania.

O2: Identifying the characteristics of corporate social responsibility policies of companies from N-W part of Romania and observing there contribution in solving social problems. We will follow up issues affecting the implementation of corporate social responsibility policies and benefits, disadvantages and typologies that characterize their social involvement.

O3: Examine the differences between the profile of social entrepreneurs and commercial entrepreneurs, and secondly to identify factors that influence the qualities required to a successful entrepreneur, in N-W part of Romania.

Based on these objectives, this thesis aims to offer answers for sustaining social entrepreneurship. We believe that both theoretical and practical research can successfully complete the literature and provide essential information in this growing field in the early stages of development.

In this research we want to confirm the validity of the following hypothesis:

H1: Social entrepreneurship can be promoted by NGOs;

H2: Social entrepreneurship can be identified as a final stage of social responsibility;

H3: Age of the organization affects the way that organization perceives a successful entrepreneur;

H4: Legal status of the organization influences the way that successful entrepreneur is perceived within it;

H5: Geographical coverage of the organization affects how successful entrepreneur is perceived within it;
H6: Operating status of the organization influences how successful entrepreneur is perceived within it;

H7: The nature of the characteristics of commercial and social entrepreneur varies significantly and the extend to which are influenced, differ in both cases.

**EXISTING STUDIES IN THE FIELD**

Social entrepreneurship is characterized by a lack of empirical research both nationally and internationally, and existing research are based mostly on intellectual activity and perceptions of researchers, and less on perceptions of practitioners. This research was inspired from a model developed by Professor Rob John in collaboration with the Skoll Center for Social Entrepreneurship at Oxford Said Business School in a European funded research Philanthropy Venture Association (EVPA) - a charity organization focused on promoting and sustaining, philanthropic activities in Europe. The study was conducted by Rob John after completing a PhD at Oxford a research and teaching internship in Switzerland, U.S. and Ethiopia. The results of his research have resulted in the presentation of features that characterize the collaboration between social entrepreneurs and organizations that finance them (John, 2007).

Unlike Rob John's model (2007), this study aims are to identify people who meet the profile of a social entrepreneur, but also to identify how social entrepreneurship is sustained by both NGOs and enterprises.

Therefore, the analysis carried out on enterprises, used as a starting point a series of research in the field such as Triple Bottom Line (Elkington, 1994), Carroll's pyramid model (1999), which refers to economic responsibility, legal, ethical and philanthropic model McAlister Ferrell-establishing a link between stakeholders, the strategies used in the philanthropic, business and social responsibility results (McAlister et all, 2003). Also, Meehan et all (2008) developed a model of social responsibility focused on social engagement, relationships with important partners, as well on main characteristics operational status of the enterprise.
These studies provided a useful theoretical and practical material for documentation, because there are many features that are required to be taken into account, starting with the main objective of both organizations.

In Romania the field of social entrepreneurship is relatively new being more prominent only in recent years. Our research was launched three years ago and during that time we noticed a growing concern, both internationally and nationally, linked to this issue. Literature in this area is very varied, with no established theoretical models, many of which are presented in a more abstract manner.

The research aims to highlight the main features of empirical social economy in Romania from a series of criteria established after discussions conducted with researchers, but also from experience and established with foundations, like Skol and Ashoka Foundation. These two organizations are actively involved in supporting and promoting social entrepreneurship process and the steps taken in this regard emphasize some of the criteria considered in our research.

A major challenge for this research is the lack of clarity in scope, covering in particular the definition of abstract concepts and ideas. Starting from the fact that this concept has a high degree of subjectivity, this creates ambiguity in perception "(Chambliss et all, 2010), clearly defining the concepts being very difficult to meet them because of the broad scope of the field.

**IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY**

The research in the social sector aims to provide answers through data collection and analysis of verifiable empirical data (Creswell, 2009). Issues to be taken into account when seeking to initiate research in the social field must answer three major questions (King et al., 1994):

- ✓ Research may be completed taking into account available resources and time?
- ✓ The research will provide answers that will help improve social life, even it covers only to analyze and to understand the problem?
- ✓ The research solves conflicting data of social theory?
Related to our research, the answers to these three questions are affirmative, therefore, we can say that our research is feasible, relevant and socially important.

The importance of this study is given by the issues addressed but topicality, and that it is intended to supplement existing theory and practice in the field. Our goal is to identify the extent to which businesses and NGOs aimed at providing social services, are viable tools for the dissemination process of social entrepreneurship, but also to identify major obstacles that prevent these organizations to create social value. The study also seeks to shape the profile of social and commercial entrepreneurs, and to identify major differences between them, from a number of factors influence.

This study seeks to provide solutions to sustain social entrepreneurship process, analyzing the activity and the work of NGOs and enterprises in the northwestern region of Romania, to provide practical solutions to the problems identified. The study aims to identify how NGOs and businesses in the region to support the development of social economy, by identifying the differences and similarities between them.

Empirical research seeks to provide three major responses:

*NGOs meet the criteria for promotion of social entrepreneurship?*

NGOs are organizations that have the greatest chances to promote social causes, so we watched how these organizations can promote social entrepreneurship.

✓ *Social entrepreneurship can be promoted by commercial companies?*
  
  We wanted to track how companies in North-Western part of Romania sustain social responsibility through policies. We followed the major characteristics of these firms and the extent to which Austin’s theory is confirmed (Austin, 2000 Austin and Reavis, 2002, Austin et al., 2006 abc, Austin et al., 2007) that emphasize the fact that companies can successfully promote social entrepreneurship, especially through collaborations and partnerships.

✓ *What are the qualities that characterize the profile of a commercial and a social entrepreneur?*
Based on 12 qualities which shape best the profile of a commercial and social entrepreneur. Other aspect analyzed was to identify the way that this qualities are influenced by the age of the organization, the legal form, geographical coverage and operational status.

We believe that these questions provide answers that help enrich the field and provide a vision of the state of social entrepreneurship is the northwestern region of Romania, ensuring at the same time, the prerequisites for sustaining its development on a larger scale.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

Empirical study presented in this thesis is a deductive research that is based, first, treatment and follow-existing theory of how the theory is confirmed in the social environment in Romania. To this end, we collected information from two samples, based on a series of standardized questions. Statistical Universe was composed of all commercial firms and NGOs in the northwestern region of Romania. Sampling methods were different: in the case of NGOs we used a census, and in the case of companies we used a simple random sampling.

Processing both questionnaires we took into account two major steps:

**In the first stage** we calculated the relative frequencies to highlight the extent to which the established criteria is characterizing social entrepreneurship are met by both types of organizations and the extent to which companies can sustain social entrepreneurship through collaborations and partnerships. Thus, we calculated the relative frequencies for each question and using Crosstabs function we followed the association between some variables. Also, in order to identify the major characteristics of the social and commercial entrepreneurs, we used a set of 12 items to identify the particular trade contractor profile compared with those of the social entrepreneur. The research instrument used has consisted of 12 items, grouped in a symmetric
multi-scale, with a total of six steps, which we sought to examine the perceptions of respondents about the qualities required of a good entrepreneur, in other words, a successful entrepreneur. We opted for a scale with an even number of steps to avoid placement of respondents tend to neutral or middle.

**In the second step** we conducted a series of bi-varied analysis, calculating the correlations between variables using Spearman's correlation coefficient; we tested a series of statistical hypotheses using ANOVA test, comparing the specific environmental variables and test quantitative Student t, comparing the averages with a specified value. We also tested the validity and consistency of the model used to define the profile of a successful entrepreneur using Cronbach Alpha (Cronbach, 1951) and item-to-total correlation. Internal consistency coefficient quantifies recalled items that comprise a model, or scale factor (Peterson, 1994). With the help of variables can be eliminated from the analysis, which by their version, fail to explain very well the studied phenomenon. The Cronbach coefficient value ($\alpha$) is closer to one, the data shows increased confidence. Item-to-total correlation, Cronbach $\alpha$ coefficient linked closely to measure the degree to which an indicator is correlated with the others indicators included in the model. For a better identification of items included in the model we used the option and the Cronbach $\alpha$ if item deleted "to exclude variables that do not contribute significantly to the model.

1. **The instrument used**

An important tool for collecting information by questionnaire method is direct, being considered the most attractive way to collect quantitative data (Chelcea, 2004). We applied two types of NGOs questionnaire:

For NGOs the applied questionnaire was structured in order to explore how the identification criteria are met in the process of social entrepreneurship:

- Social problems pursued by the organizations surveyed;
- The transparency of developed activity;
- Skills needed to succeed in promoting social mission in a manner entrepreneurship;
- The pursued social mission;
The characteristics of innovation at the level of organization;
✓ Social impact;
✓ The extent to which NGOs fail to develop self-sustainable or financially autonomous activity.

The questionnaire applied to enterprises contains a series of questions designed to prove the validity of his Austin’s theory (Austin, 2000 Austin and Reavis, 2002, Austin et all, 2006 abc, Austin et all, 2007) that points out the fact that social entrepreneurship can be sustained through partnerships and collaboration can support social entrepreneurship.

2. Sampling and sample size

NGOs

In Transylvania at the level of NGOs a census-based survey was made with 497 NGOs that provide social services. Thus, we obtained a response rate of 39.63% resulted in 185 questionnaires. The data basis was made based on the information obtained from the "Department of Social and Family Policy", under the Ministry of Labor, Social and Child Protection in every county in the northwestern region, the Office of Education and Culture, Religious, sports, civil society "in Cluj-Napoca and accessing existing databases online. These sources have allowed the identification of NGOs active in the records of the above institutions. We included in this research only active NGOs as existing national data is not updated and their recorded number is larger of NGOs than there is in reality.
Table 2.: Statistic universe of NGOs in 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northwestern region of Romania</th>
<th>No. ONG-uri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bihor</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bistriţa-Năsăud</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluj-Napoca</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maramureş</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satu Mare</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sălaj</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>497</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commercial Enterprise

The database in the case of commercial enterprises was obtained based on the reports of generated from listefirme.ro on 2008 and we took into account businesses from northwestern region of Romania. The survey was non-exhaustive, and for calculating the sample we took into accounts the formula (Pop, 2004) which serves to calculate the size of a simple random sampling.

Thus, statistical population was calculated using the following formula:

\[1.96^2 \times 0.5 \times (1-0.5) = 398\]

\[(0.05)^2\]

The sample size was of 398 de firms and we obtained a number of 196 questionnaires.
HIPOTESIS VALIDITY

In recent years we have seen a positive development of social sector and NGOs are increasingly contributing to solving environmental problems, health, education, discrimination, arguing for policies to protect the social environment. Also, businesses plays an important role in supporting social values and hence the social mission organizations, but this depends on many factors.

Even if non-profit sector had a negative image for a long time due to lack credibility, inefficiency, fraud, conflict at management level, we must accept the fact that NGOs have played a significant role in the social economy.

Validation of assumptions

IP1: Social entrepreneurship can be promoted by NGOs: assumption partially validated

Based on the seven criteria established for social entrepreneurship, I noticed that not all criteria are fully confirmed (Table 3).

Tabel 3.: Validation criteria of social entrepreneurship in the NGOs studied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria of social entrepreneurship</th>
<th>The degree of fulfillment of criteria</th>
<th>Characteristics of NGOs based on criteria established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social mission</td>
<td>Validated</td>
<td>All the NGOs surveyed have argued that activities aimed primarily at the interests of society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>Validated in a small extent</td>
<td>Access to financial data and those relating to the use of the resources require a series of hardship that reduce accessibility to data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Innovation Validated

There is an increasing concern for 97% of respondents to the implementation and organizational change, as evidenced by the use of resources, methods, products and services for the most part.

Social Problems Validated

The work carried out by NGOs addressing issues of human and environmental problems, with preference referring to young children and the local community.

Social Impact Validated

The results are quantified, but not based on comprehensive analysis of measurement covering long periods of time.

Necessary competences Validated

The skills needed to confirm a social entrepreneur highlighting qualities necessary for a social entrepreneur, social entrepreneur profile was confirmed by a series of indispensable qualities such as communication skills, developed sense of ethics, adaptability to change, empathy, conflict management. Although theoretically innovative skills are considered extremely important for the profile of social entrepreneurs, our study revealed that the quality is not considered very important.

Self-sustainability Validated

There are NGOs that develop economic activities creating the prerequisites to acquire status and financial autonomy, but donations have a majority in total revenue.

Analyzing the criteria used to identify social entrepreneurship, we see that they are confirmed for the most part. However, we note that there are criteria that are not fully validated, such as transparency and social impact. To suggest that these criteria measures the level of NGOs and addressing the imposition of mandatory submission of updated data, namely the use of financial performance indicators to measure the utilization of financial
resources owned social purpose, the development of people helped while the number of people helped in relation to the total number of those who need help. Also, a proposal would consist of establishing criteria for selecting beneficiaries, applicable to all organizations with social missions that have the same profile, in a defined geographic area, allowing for selection in order of importance and seriousness of their situation.

**IP2:** Social entrepreneurship can be identified as a final stage of social accountability - *The hypothesis is not validated.*

Businesses seek change at the organization level, but most aim to improve economic performance, social problems are not a priority for most businesses. Of all enterprises surveyed, 111 claimed to be involved in solving social problems, help is geared more towards supporting people with disabilities, children and youth. Major advantages are identified and most of the respondents argued that the involvement is based on owner satisfaction, which is not a sufficient reason to promote social responsibility policies in the long term. Also, the bureaucratic problems and legislation are the most important barriers that restrict social engagement. Collaborations with other organizations or persons, to support social causes, are not preferred by most respondents. But those who resort to do so by calling the collaboration for businesses, family and friends, clients and organizations with social mission. Although the relationship between businesses and NGOs could increase the social impact and thus increase the social value, businesses have found the 78% that did not make a partnership with an NGO. Place the stage at which most of the collaboration is identified as Austin's philanthropic classification.

**IP3:** Age of the organizations affects the commercial and social entrepreneurs are seen – *Hypothesis is validated.*

Qualities such as “leadership skills”, “conflict management”, and “self-discipline” are greatly influenced by the age of the enterprise. The same goes for social entrepreneurs, age, influencing the enterprise utmost qualities as “leadership skills”, “communication skills”,
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“sense of ethics”. Also, these influences of NGOs become particularly important in those older than 20 years.

**IP4**: Pattern of formation of the organization affect how successful entrepreneur is perceived within it - *The hypothesis is validated.*

For enterprises that are required to possess qualities such as commercial entrepreneurs „self-improvement” and ”self discipline”, ”capacitive to lead”, ”authority”, ”persuasion” and ”adaptability to change”. The last two traits are influenced by the entrepreneur and social entrepreneur in the case, of the type of NGOs, plus a number of significant differences related to ”developed sense of ethics”, ”self-improvement” and ”conflict management” (important for companies and associations).

**IP5**: Geographical coverage of the organization affects how successful entrepreneur is perceived within it - *The hypothesis is validated.*

For enterprises it is noted that coverage largely influence "risk taking" and to a lesser extent "leadership skills", "conflict management" and "persuasion". Analyzing influences on social entrepreneurs, attributes that change depending largely on the coverage are: "leadership skills" and "communication skills", "sense of ethics " and "empathy”. In the case of NGOs, but two features are all influenced by the geographical coverage of the organization. Also, "a sense of ethics" is an important quality for those working in organizations that have an international activity.

**IP6**: Operating status of the organization affect how successful entrepreneur is perceived within it – *the hypothesis is partly validated.*

Operating status of the organization affects half of the features needed for a commercial entrepreneur, however, are significantly influenced by two qualities, namely: self-improvement and self-discipline. In the case of entrepreneurs there are social influences, but not major because the materiality threshold is not less than 0,001. Differences occur at qualities such as ”self-improvement”, ”sense of ethics”, ”persuasion” and ”adaptability
to change” significantly influenced the quality of the status of the NGO. For commercial entrepreneurs is recorded the highest value of "adaptability to change" which is considered the most important quality for independent organizations. The NGOs studied the higher values are recorded by qualities such as "developed sense of ethics" and "self-improvement".

IP7: The nature and characteristics of social marketing entrepreneurs varies greatly, and the extent to which they are influenced differ in both cases - the hypothesis is validated.

While the pattern is less consistent for NGOs than for commercial firms, based on Cronbach's analysis we can define two distinct profiles of the entrepreneurs studied, one characterized by a developed sense of ethics and communication skills that reflect the basic qualities social entrepreneurs and other, closer to the classic portrait of a business entrepreneur, based in part on self-discipline, leadership skills, self-improvement.

Based on these hypotheses we can assert that social entrepreneurship can provide practical solutions to real problems of the Romanian social system, which is why we support the need to deepen the study area. Certainly, as long as there are problems, there is a strong need for social entrepreneurs that would seek and offer solutions to social problems consistently, through approaches that combine the best shape, social vision and the market practices business.

PERSONAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE RESEARCH

Although social entrepreneurship is very relevant and offer solutions to the problems of humanity, we believe that it is not addressed sufficiently in terms of theory, but mostly practical, and highlights the views of existing approaches, classifications, criteria and no limits, most many times, unanimously. These variations are caused by different perspectives on life experience, vision, education and existing social systems, but at the same time, the complexity of social entrepreneurship as a process.
Our interests (Borza et al., 2008 ab, Borza et all, 2009abcd, Mitra et all 2009, Mitra et all, 2010) related to the research topic of social entrepreneurship, gave us the chance to interact with researchers practitioners, who had a decisive role in the evolution of this research. Also, the participation at international conferences in the field has offered access a valuable source of documentation. Below we present arguments needed to sustain the innovative character of this PhD thesis:

1. In the state of knowledge of social entrepreneurship:

   • Identifying research trends in social entrepreneurship

   Starting from a very wide range of approaches, we tried to fit the opinions of the authors related to this topic in four major directions. Even if for some social entrepreneurship mean improving social performance of an organization or creating a social organization based on commercial principles, or an organization focused on creating social value, social entrepreneurship has in common: social and environmental problems through innovative means on long term.

   • Identification of international research contributions to the development of social entrepreneurship.

   This research has an innovative character based on the fact that there is a lack of empirical research. We believe that this research can be an important starting point for future research in this field. This research was influenced by case studies, existing empirical research both on social entrepreneurship and corporate social responsibility.

2. At the conceptual level theoretical approaches:

   • Clarify the theoretical and conceptual approaches

   From our point of view, social entrepreneurship can be characterized as a mechanism aimed solving social and environmental problems in an innovative approach and transparent manner to ensure sustainable development.

   The objectives of social entrepreneurship refer to the identification of practical solutions to social problems, using resources in order to capitalize on opportunities by:
Identifying social problems and transforming them into business opportunities.
Finding appropriate financing strategies and alternative managerial models for creating social value.
Developing a model for reaching self-sustainability and even financial autonomy

Based on the approaches we conclude that the phenomenon of social entrepreneurship may be a promising solution for the shortcomings of capitalism. However, we believe that social entrepreneurship can be easily interpreted as one that is too idealistic. Until recently, there was belief among social mission organizations with business skills and competencies that are necessary so completely wrong. An organization will increase their independence as they will increase their ability to provide quality goods and services, as they will use marketing techniques in a way more creative and use the advantages of technology for the benefit of progress etc.. Unlike a traditional non-profit organization, which believes that entrepreneurship is not a necessity for a social enterprise entrepreneurship plays an important part of its mission.

Social entrepreneurship takes many forms and can be viewed as an example by itself or as an evolutionary process, marking the transition from a traditional non-profit (dependent), an example of social enterprise (independent). Social enterprise is an organization that combines social objectives with a successful business practices designed to promote social causes, without neglecting the importance of effective production of goods and services. Social enterprise may be owned by one or more owners having the right to control its gains being responsible, you do not distribute personal interest, but he reinvested in social causes. Social enterprise should be subject to a permanent expansion and development process, as a commercial enterprise, as only in this kind of innovation, which is important in the process of social entrepreneurship, promote new ways of creating value for those they can not do it alone.

• Presenting and introducing tools to quantify the process of social entrepreneurship, little discussed in the literature.

At the level NGOs we established a set of key criteria such as social problem, social mission, innovation, social value, transparency, social impact, required skills, self-
sustainability. In the case of commercial enterprises the focus was on the nature of social responsibility policies applied and the criteria used were: social problem, social mission, innovation, social value created, skills required and the role of collaborations and partnerships in providing social support.

• Comparative analysis of the profile of the commercial and social entrepreneurs

This analysis allowed the identification of the basic characteristics based on 12 items, offering the possibility of differentiating two categories of entrepreneurs. The analysis also helped to identify the prior qualities that both commercial and social entrepreneurs must possess.

• Identifying the degree of influence of several factors on the quality of the social and commercial entrepreneurs.

We therefore sought to analyze the extent to which factors such as age, area of action, the legal form and operating status can influence the entrepreneurs. All these factors create a premises which enable entrepreneurs development (commercial and social) in a certain direction. So we followed what factors influence on qualities that a successful entrepreneur must possess. This analysis enables the identification of the necessary framework to develop the qualities of successful entrepreneurs studied.

• Review and provide a proper perspective on social entrepreneurship in Romania.

NGOs were most likely to promote social entrepreneurship as social mission is set from the very beginning the organization. The research has confirmed that Romania's market NGOs providing social services, have grate chances, to promote social entrepreneurship. All the criteria followed in our study were largely confirmed, whit the exception of transparency and social impact criteria, which require the adoption of corrective measures.

In addition, commercial enterprises under study do not confirm Austin's theory, or at least collaborations and partnerships are not a form approved by them, to create value both for themselves and for society and the environment. Any move made by the businesses surveyed is based on gain business advantage, and the efforts made in the social sphere are made largely from this principle. This is why business involvement is much deeper study. Businesses primarily aimed commercial profit, and if social responsibility policies will facilitate this, there is likely to be implemented.
Taking into account the dimensions of social responsibility leading to competitive advantage (risk, efficiency, brand, winning new markets), we noticed that businesses which are not caring about corporate social responsibility are extremely focused on reducing risk and achieving efficiency. The situation is distinct in the case of enterprises with social performances being unable to achieve a better balance between the four dimensions. In this Under this circumstances SMSE, are positioned in the first category because of scarcity of resources, while the larger companies that we have identified, were mostly positioned in the second category. Social responsibility programs are undertaken mostly by large enterprises in an effort to gain a competitive advantage, an aspect that was noticed in a small extent in the case of SMEs.

Unfortunately the desire to be competitive requires an intense pressure on the Romanian commercial enterprises, a significant part of them associate social implication with consumption of resources and effort which is superior benefits. Thus, when engaging in projects without a contribution to enterprise development, human resources and materials, the effort allocated to corporate social responsibility is minimized or even eliminated. Somewhat justified in the context in which businesses conduct activities aimed at profitable and less to the charities.

MANAGERIAL RESEARCH IMPLICATION

All entrepreneurs have the objective of creating value. Value provides the basis for arguing that the role and contribution of entrepreneurship - even if we speak about the commercial or social entrepreneurship - it has in society. In business, value seems to be something objective, is seen as a result of supply and demand. However, after a more detailed analysis, we can say that the amount is more than that. First, the entire amount comes from consumers, the willingness to spend money on goods and services, but is constantly changing depending on the influence of fashion and preferences that they exhibit at a time. Secondly, the organization's value tends to be addressed very specifically, from the costs incurred and revenue generated.
Measuring social value is an issue that raises controversy. Even if the social value could be quantified (crime rate, number of homeless people, etc.) by social entrepreneurs, most times, they can not capture the value created in an economic form. An issue that arises in measuring the value is different perception of value for the commercial and social entrepreneurship. If in the first case the value is mostly associated with productivity and profits earned, in the second case the value is associated with social impact, with results in the fight for social problem solving, productivity is only one ingredient and not a decisive factor in creating social value. Thus, if the value of social entrepreneurship is associated with social outcomes, such as number of persons in distress who have been helped, the benefits to be made by addressing social indicators aimed at poverty reduction, etc. However, from the perspective of social entrepreneurship there are some crucial issues to be considered, namely that value is subjective and is perceived differently and that is the result of life experience. Subjectivism appears in client satisfaction and quantifies how they perceive and value the social aspect.

However we consider it is necessary to impose rules that require the publication of financial data to target annual NGOs and their use of the universally accepted indicators to measure performance in the utilization of financial resources held in social goal, the development of people adjusted for the number of people helped in relation to the total number of those who need help. Another proposal concerns the establishment of criteria for selecting beneficiaries, applicable to all organizations with a social mission with the same profile, in a defined geographic area, as potential beneficiaries would be selected depending on the seriousness of the situation in their state.

Approximately 50% of respondents claimed to be involved in solving social problems, help being geared more toward people with disabilities, children and youth. Benefits from involvement of social enterprises are not significant, and the problems of bureaucracy and legislation constitute a major impediment to social involvement. We believe that economic progress in our country, which is a barrier to the development of an appropriate climate into commercial enterprises, because many of them barely manage to maintain their profits and how it was observed in the study, they do not see significant advantages for the expansion of collaboration. A role in this has the culture on the development of corporate social responsibility
policies that support long term some social cause. Commercial enterprises that engage in such approaches carry out sporadic and often random actions, without ensuring continuous and with long-term effects; the main motivation being personal satisfaction, followed by increase public awareness. Although the relationship between enterprises and NGOs could increase the social impact, and hence, increase the social value, businesses have found the 78% that did not make a partnership with an NGO. Place the stage at which most of the collaboration is identified as Austin's philanthropic classification.

Shortcomings in the legislation and bureaucracy also are causes of existing problems in the social economy in Romania. Development of social economy in our country is not considered a priority sector being viewed more as a consumer of resources. Based on economic principles, social economy can be revitalized. Reduced dependence on foreign aid can be achieved by developing the premises that allow self-financing their activities.

Social involvement requires collaboration and partnerships as the framework for how the company and its partner develop long-term goals, projects and mechanisms of social involvement. Although our research has not confirmed the existence of close links between commercial firms and NGOs, taken as examples and case studies (Petrom, Vodafone, Lafarge Romania, etc.) confirm once again that partnerships and collaborations with NGOs sites are viable and feasible solutions in the present context of Romania. However, are not very common, which requires conditional use of this theory at the large enterprises level. Typically the profile of enterprises that like the long-term collaborations and partnerships can be characterized as follows: are big companies, which generally have an international presence whose success depends on the image acquired on the market and organizational culture plays an important role.

We believe that corporate social responsibility can be considered an instrument in sustaining social entrepreneurship which triggers the process that can bring substantial benefits both through their support, and the social impact that cannot be neglected. Even if in Romania this theory is not strongly supported, large companies are those that can make a difference, having the required resources and necessary skills that can support the acquisition of competitive advantage. Given the current trend of supporting sustainable development, it is prominently
displayed globally and especially in developed countries, we believe that Romania will follow the same trend.

Our approach regarding the model designed to support social entrepreneurship that involve enterprises can be emphasized by the following figure.

Figure 1.: The Process of Social entrepreneurship

As one can see companies can help sustain social entrepreneurship, being a factor which triggered the process of social entrepreneurship. This can manifest itself as collaborations, partnerships, or even by creating an organization with social mission. Not all organizations that promote social mission fall under social entrepreneurship, but only those which meet the data social entrepreneurship (Mitra et al., 2009). Finally organizations substantial benefit society by creating social value. The benefits are mutual to both social organizations, organizations that
promote social entrepreneurship and companies. If the first two will get a considerable advantage to sustain social mission, the last one will get many benefits that will have a big influence on its activities. Social involvement is based on partnerships throughout the organizations and their partners develop long term projects and mechanisms.

Propria viziune legată de modul în care valoarea socială poate fi susținută de organizațiile cu misiune socială și uneori de întreprinderi, este redată în figura 1.

Social entrepreneurs operate in the same imperfect market as commercial entrepreneurs; however, this market raises many other impediments in attracting the necessary financial and material resources. This affects the ability to create economic value, which is reflected on the ability to create social value. From this perspective, NGOs are forced use the benefits given by voluntary acts, donations, membership fees, which are more and more difficult to obtain. The results depend on a number of factors such as access to resources and support provided for this purpose, scope of work undertaken, its reputation, how they can assess the social value achieved by the enterprise.

**LIMITS AND PROPOSALS FOR EXTENDING THE RESEARCH IN THE FUTURE**

As all scientific researches are susceptible to improvements, this one can also be improved through further research. This doctoral thesis has a pioneer character in our country and we know that errors are inevitable in these circumstances.

The main limitations of this the results of research:

- Low degree of notoriety of social entrepreneurship process

The term has not been well known by some managers involved in the research, which increased the time allocated for the informing them before sending the questionnaire.

- Difficulties in collecting responses
This has resulted in increasing non-response. Many managers have refused to because of the lack of an appropriate research culture of organizations included in the study, this problem was encountered especially in the case of commercial enterprises.

- Lack of a complete database of active NGOs, geographically defined, which imposed a series of measures that delayed the research. However we encountered situations in which NGOs included in the database have suspended their activities, which increased the number of non-response.

We believe that this scientific research has a high potential to be continued in future, especially considering that everyone is affected by social problems, whether if we refer to commercial enterprises or NGOs.

Perspectives of this research

This work may be successfully emphasized in the future choosing some of the following directions:

- Expanding the research exclusively at the level of large enterprises to analyze the extent to which they can help to support social entrepreneurship. Also, another issue that can be pursued is to observe the role that corporate social responsibility policies can have upon corporate governance, analyzing the impact of these measures internally.
- Expanding geographic area to national level to see the extent to which findings are confirmed and collaboration with researchers in the field from abroad to allow comparison of the results.
- Setting up focus groups with representatives of NGOs to measure the awareness about social entrepreneurship, using as a starting point to research results.

Research theme addressed in this doctoral thesis has a high novelty character, which allows to deepen the scope of researchers both national and international ones. The results of our
scientific effort will be published in journals and books, which will facilitate access to our research results, and provide other researchers the chance to have a starting point for the study of social entrepreneurship.
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