

EXPLORING THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CONVENTIONAL BUSINESS ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN BRAZIL.

Carlos Artur Krüger Passos ¹
Júlio C. Felix ²
Simara Maria de Souza Silveira Greco ³
Paulo Alberto Bastos Junior ⁴
Joana Paula Machado ⁵
Luciano Rossoni ⁶

ABSTRACT

Social entrepreneurship in Brazil has not won due prominence yet; there are very few publications on the subject. The GEM Brazilian Team has begun the studies about this theme in 2004. A range of questions related to the subject has been added to the GEM questionnaire in order to get the required information. The model and concepts supporting the study have been based on GEM research. It has also considered the adaptations done by UK for the study of Social Entrepreneurship, such as the SEA - Social Entrepreneurial Activity. The Brazilian questionnaire, despite taking into account the UK questionnaire, were modified and complemented in order to meet specific interests. The present empiric study discusses the relationship between the business entrepreneurship and the social entrepreneurship in Brazil. The data collected during 3 GEM cycles represents all the geographical areas of the country and the composition of the population in terms of gender, age, income and education. With a theoretical-empirical review of Social Entrepreneurship some research hypotheses are built based on national cases. In the results the tables are presented with their data and respective analysis, concerning the findings related to the relationship between social entrepreneurial activity and conventional (businesses) entrepreneurial activity.

INTRODUCTION

Despite the vast literature on entrepreneurship, one of its variations, the social entrepreneurship, is still receiving little attention from researchers, presenting only a few case studies on the subject. For example, in the Brazilian case, information about enterprises with social

¹ Economist, PhD. in Applied Social Science. IBQP President Director.

² Engineer, Specialist in Basic Industrial Technology. IBQP Director.

³ Statistician, Specialist in Economic Engineering. IBQP Project Coordinator and GEM Technical Coordinator.

⁴ Engineer, Master's in Technological and Scientific Information, Specialist in Knowledge Management. GEM Researcher

⁵ Statistician. GEM Statistician

⁶ Master in Administration, University Professor. GEM Fellow Researcher.

means is very rare and hardly found.

Filling this gap, the main purpose of this article is to find out if the Social Entrepreneurial Activity (SEA) reflects the rates of the national entrepreneurship.

In that sense, this work begins with a theoretical-practical review of the social entrepreneurship. Further on, researches based on the national entrepreneurship activities and methodology procedures are presented for a greater understanding of the analysis. In the discussion of the results, tables and their respective analysis are used to present the characteristics of the social entrepreneurial activity in Brazil and its respective relations with the conventional entrepreneurship. Finally, some final considerations are made concerning the limitations of the study and suggesting new subjects of research.

SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Dees (1998) affirms that the entrepreneurship concept can be applied in the commercial area as well as in the social area. For the researcher, the term social entrepreneurship may be new, but the phenomenon is not. The social entrepreneurs have always existed, even if not called as such. By the combination of different concepts related to the conventional Entrepreneurial activity: Say's value creation, Schumpeter's innovation and change agents, Drucker's opportunity pursue and Stevenson's resourcefulness, Dees (1998) defines social entrepreneurs as follows:

- They play the role of change agents in the social sector by facing the causes of the problems instead of merely dealing with the symptoms; they try to create sustainable changes and improvements.
- They adopt a mission to create and sustain social value: the social impact is the main measure; they look for long-term social returns in their investments.
- They recognize and pursue new opportunities: entrepreneurs see opportunities where others see problems; the social entrepreneurs are not guided simply by the perception of a social need or compassion. Quite the contrary, they envision how to make improvements; they are persistent and determined to make their vision prevail.
- They engage themselves in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation and learning: they look for innovative ways to guarantee that their enterprises have access to the resources as long as they're generating social value.
- They act boldly without being limited by resources currently available: they use the scarce resources on a very efficient basis – do much more with a lot less - and achieve to attract resources from investors, leveraging their limited resources through partnerships and contributions.

- They show a high sense of accountability and transparency to the constituencies served and for the outcomes created: they promote real improvements for the community and show the returns - social and/or economic - for the investing partners; they assess their progress in terms of social, financial and managerial outcomes.

Dees (1998) believes that the leaders of the social sector can express these characteristics in different ways. The closer a person gets to meet these conditions, the more that person fits the model of a social entrepreneur. The social entrepreneurs know the needs and values of their target market, understand the expectations of the people who help and invest some kind of resource such as time, money or expertise. They explore all kind of resources, from philanthropy to the economic commercial methods (DEES, 1998). The researcher says that the social entrepreneurs possess a set of outstanding behavioral characteristics; therefore, is mandatory to stimulate and reward such behaviors. However, the author remembers that not all leaders of social organizations can be considered entrepreneurs. The social entrepreneur is a rare breed of leader and must be recognized as such.

Other authors also define the social entrepreneur in a very close way to Dees' (1998). For instance, the social entrepreneurs, for the Ashoka (2001, p. 35) are "people that have new ideas, think and act creatively, have an entrepreneurial personality and place in everything they do and think the ideal of producing lasting and beneficial social impact."

In the same direction, Melo Neto and Froes (2002, p. 34) consider the social entrepreneurs as "those focussed on transforming ideas and who assume a revolutionary attitude and criticism towards the existent social injustices in their areas and in the world". This kind of entrepreneur has the desire to help people, wants to develop society, enhance collective values and implement actions that guarantee the continuous support and improvement of the community's well-being. Concomitant to those ideas, Johnson (2003) believes that these individuals begin their works with strong sense of social justice and see profitable activities as a mean rather than an end to accomplish their goals.

For Barendsen and Gardner (2004), the social entrepreneurs are persistent and possess the ability to inspire other people to work with them. They feel responsible for their cause, their work and the people involved. Indeed, because their deep convictions, they are more likely to continue their projects and respond to their obligations. For some social entrepreneurs, it is very difficult to differentiate between professional and personal goals.

Despite the diversity of definitions of the social entrepreneurship exposed in the literature, there are two main points in common among the several authors.

The first refers to the elements related to the set of beliefs and values that are behind the desire

to create and develop a social enterprise. According to Barendsen and Gardner (2004), social entrepreneurs have different backgrounds and beliefs. After their case study, they concluded that atypical events helped in those individuals' formation. Their convictions are sometimes inspired by traumas: disfunctional families, suicide of relatives, accidents. Therefore, the reason for acting in the social area might have emerged from pain or a tragic situation. Many social entrepreneurs have experienced some kind of trauma at a very early age, but they demonstrated an ability to reframe these challenges into opportunities for growth.

Of those who didn't have an extremely traumatic experience, many described some sort of deeply transformative experience. These experiences include fighting depression, alcohol or drug abuse, living in a foreign country or working with troubled youth, all of which generated new life perspective. Many of them were involved with social issues at an early age, had role models or parents who were politically active (Barendsen; Gardner, 2004).

The second point refers to the competences that some people possess, some of those directly linked to the classic entrepreneurs' characteristics. As Roberts and Woods (2005) affirm, many of the attributes and talents of both are very similar. Both are visionary and innovative; both are attentive to opportunities, they value the construction of alliances and networks of contacts and are passionate about what they do. But unlike commercial entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs adopt a mission to make social impact and focus their efforts on social justice. Their minds are set on social impact instead of financial profits.

However, despite the similarities between the classic business entrepreneurs and social entrepreneurs, for Roper and Cheney (2005), what distinguishes the social entrepreneurs is their social commitment and the absence of interest in financial rewards generated by their social activity. For Barendsen and Gardner (2004), the main difference is that the conventional entrepreneurs create businesses, while the social entrepreneurs create changes, what reinforces Johnson's statement (2003) that they develop and implement initiatives that generate measurable results in the form of social transformations. The social entrepreneurs employ a lot of tools and knowledge from the business world; however, they have different motivations and purposes (Roberts and Woods, 2005).

Comparing some of these differences, Melo Neto and Froes (2002) present, in table 1, a summary with the main differences between the conventional and social entrepreneurship.

It is also important to discuss the role of social entrepreneurs in the current context of social organizations. Some authors try to understand the reasons for the proliferation of this subject in the academic and professional areas. According to Dees (1998), one of these reasons is that a lot of not-for-profit sector ventures are seen as inefficient, ineffective and unresponsive to problems. Therefore, the author states that social entrepreneurs are vital for the development of new administration models. Corroborating that opinion, Barendsen and Gardner (2004) comment that one of the reasons because social entrepreneurship has become such a recognizable field is the current dissatisfaction with the management of standard charity entities and foundations.

TABLE 1 - CONVENTIONAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP X SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Conventional Entrepreneurship	Social Entrepreneurship
1. Individual	1. Collective
2. Goods and services are market driven	2. Goods and services are community driven
3. Market oriented	3. Social problems oriented
4. Focus on profit	4. Focus on social impact
5. Aims to meet customer needs and enlarge business opportunities	5. Aims to help and promote people

Source: Melo Neto e Froes (2002, p. 11)

Dennis Young (2003 apud FERREIRA, 2005) says that the concept “social entrepreneur” has been ignored until the 1980’s by the not-for-profit sector. That concept has first emerged when not-for-profit organizations had to readjust and develop their commercial practices in order to deal with financial difficulties caused by the decrease of public funding. The managerial skills of their leaders were questioned; they were usually artists, social workers, doctors, nurses and teachers who ended up undertaking their organization’s management.

The authors' statements on the increasing professionalization of the social organizations lead to the increasing rationalization of the field. More and more, the social organizations are adopting market values and methods, pushing them to prospect resources out of their field in order to reach their social purposes (EIKENBERRY; KLUVER, 2004). It is very likely that the growing rationalization of the social organizations is intimately linked to the increasing dispute for resources. Besides that, as some private companies move forward to establish social responsible programs, generally using a not-for-profit organization as a partner, these companies have to readjust their administration methods to meet their investors’ expectations.

Since the Entrepreneurial activity plays an important role in the current managerial activity, where its concepts are used more oftenly by the organizations, it arises in the social arena under the label of social entrepreneurship, reflecting the rationalization of the social sector. Perhaps due to the fact that the term “social entrepreneurship” is a combination of two conceptions that do not fit

naturally and is still looking for an acceptance as common sense, the term is still subject to resistance and challenges (ROPER; CHENEY, 2005). This vision is shared by Johnson (2003), that suggests that the lack of enthusiasm with social enterprises in Canada, in comparison to UK and United States, reflects the discomfort with the terminology “social entrepreneurship”. The reason for that discomfort is that many Canadians reject the move of the social sector activities towards the market and still regard the State as their main provider of social services.

There are few case studies comparing conventional and social entrepreneurship in Brazil . One of these works was developed by Feger (2004), who studied the different behaviors of social and private entrepreneurs, as well as the main differences between both groups (accomplishment, planning or power). After analyzing 53 questionnaires for each group, he discovered that there are no significant differences. However, after stratifying the information on the enterprising characteristics, he verified that the social entrepreneurs presented a smaller punctuation in the accomplishment area, suggesting that they tend to be less aggressive in the application of new methods and in the efforts to accomplish their goals.

Based on such results, the presupposition that the social entrepreneurial activity reflects the conventional entrepreneurial activity is mostly validated. At the same time, some elements of the entrepreneurial activity in Brazil are presented as a basis for the hypothetical enquiries.

ANALYTICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL PROCEDURES

There is an international effort to comprehend the entrepreneurial dynamics in several countries, in order to establish relationships between national characteristics and entrepreneurship and compare the enterprising activities of these countries. The main international program in that sense is GEM–Global Entrepreneurship Monitor, coordinated by the Babson College and the London Business School that, through the application of standardized methodologies, allows the comparison of the researched countries entrepreneurial activities. Since 1999, more than 50 countries, including Brazil, have been researched, representing all the continents and comprehending most of the global economy and population.

The main indicator developed by the GEM is the Early Stage Entrepreneurial Activity (TEA), that corresponds to the proportion of the population between the ages of 18 and 64 involved in the creation and development of new businesses of at most 42 months of existence.

For the means of the national entrepreneurial characteristics analysis, the numbers obtained in the TEA are opposed to the demographic characteristics of the country, reflecting a detailed picture of the national entrepreneurship as a whole.

In 2003 UK'S GEM team added new procedures to the methodology and instruments of data collection used in the United Kingdom's research to propitiate the analysis of social entrepreneurship. A specific rate has been created to express the behavior of this phenomenon: SEA–Social Entrepreneurial Activity.

In 2004, Brazil's GEM team has began the studies on the social entrepreneurship in the country, based on the concepts and subjects used by UK, with adaptations for local interests. The syntax of SEA calculation and other rates have followed, as they did in the UK, the same procedures for the TEA measurement and calculation.

This study, of exploratory character and descriptive nature, provides the data and results of the Brazilian research- 2001 to 2006, being the data on conventional entrepreneurship gathered during that period and the data on social entrepreneurship collected from 2004 to 2006 (as already mentioned, the study on the theme has began in 2004).

Information was made available through 8.000 face-to-face home interviews with adults between the ages of 18 and 64. The samples are probabilistic, with a level of reliability of 95% and a margin of error around 1,04%, comprehending all the geographical areas of the country and the composition of the population in terms of gender, age, income and education.

The pictures 2 and 3 present a summary of the samples.

TABLE 2 – SAMPLE PLAN'S SUMMARY/ RESEARCH WITH ADULT POPULATION – GEM BRAZIL – 2001 to 2003 and 2005 to 2006

REGION	QUANTITY	DISTRIB. PER STATE	DISTRIBUTION PER CITIES
South	300	2	Capital + Medium city +Small city
Southeast	850	3	Capital + Medium city +Small city
Northeast	570	2	Capital + Medium city +Small city
North	140	1	Capital + Medium city +Small city
Midwest	140	1	Capital + Medium city +Small city
TOTAL	2000	9 states	27 cities

SOURCE: GEM 2001 a 2003 e 2005 a 2006

TABLE 3 – SAMPLE PLAN'S SUMMARY/ RESEARCH WITH ADULT POPULATION – GEM BRAZIL – 2004

REGION	QUANTITY	DISTRIB. PER STATE	DISTRIBUTION PER CITIES
South	600	3	Capital + Medium city +Small city
Southeast	1700	4	Capital + Medium city +Small city
Northeast	1142	4	Capital + Medium city +Small city
North	280	2	Capital + Medium city +Small city
Midwest	278	2	Capital + Medium city +Small city
TOTAL	4000	15 states	51 cities

SOURCE: GEM 2004

In order to establish the SEA–Social Entrepreneurial activity, this research tried to find out if the respondents were developing or managing some enterprise with social purposes. There were two basic questions: if they were trying to set up or already managing some enterprise with social purposes. The term enterprise with social purposes have also included any training-free or rewarding promotion, guidance or support to individuals or organizations, activities that revert their financial returns to social purposes or the community. Five control questions were used, both to assess the respondent's answers and to classify the SEA in: (1) Nascent SEA (social enterprises with less than 3 months of existence); (2) New SEA (social enterprises ranging from 3 to 42 months of existence), compounding both the social entrepreneurial activity final numbers.

Besides the variables related to the SEA, other variables indicating gender, age, instruction degree and family income have been used. Respondents have been asked if they were undertaking any conventional entrepreneurial activity (included in the TEA); in other words, the individual involved in the creation or development of a new business or enterprise in the past 42 months. The relationships between the social entrepreneur and the conventional entrepreneur motivated by opportunity or necessity (without other option of income) have also been explored.

The analysis was made through the crossing of SEA cases, the respondents' demographic characteristics and the conventional entrepreneurial activity variables. Concerning the significance test, the test used was χ^2 (Chi-square), properly adapted when the variables were binary or ordinal of qualitative character (HAIR et al, 2005). Only in the comparison between SEA and age, the T-Test was also used for independent samples. To accept the results as significant, the level of significance was of 5% (p-value <0,05) with 95% of reliability. The statistical package used was SPSS 13® for data analysis.

HYPOTHETICAL ENQUIRIES ABOUT THE SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURIAL ACTIVITY

The study presupposes that the social entrepreneurial activity mirrors some indicators of the conventional entrepreneurship in Brazil. In that sense, the hypothetical enquiries were formulated based on demographic aspects of the entrepreneurial activity, as follows.

In relation to gender, in spite of men and women be seen as equals before the law, this equality doesn't appear in the daily economical and political relationships. For instance, in the job market, the men earn, on average, 70% more than women (IBGE, 2005). In the political field, women's participation is also weaker. According to Ferreira (2004), in Brazil, women occupy only 8% of federal representative positions and 12% of the Senate. Concerning the entrepreneurial activity, the country registers one of the largest proportions of enterprising women in comparison to the other countries researched. They represented 43% of the entrepreneurial activity in the period from 2001

to 2006 against 57% of men (picture 4).

H₁: The number of social entrepreneurship varies according to gender, being higher among men.

TABLE 4: CHARACTERISTICS OF ENTREPRENEURS PER GENDER - BRAZIL

Categories	EARLY-STAGE ENTREPRENEURS			
	CONVENTIONAL (TEA) 2001 A 2006		SOCIAL (SEA) 2004 A 2006	
	Rate (%)	Prop. (%)	Rate (%)	Prop. (%)
Male	14,5	57,0	1,1	65,0
Female	10,7	43,0	0,6	35,0

SOURCE: GEM 2001 a 2006

Concerning the entrepreneurial activity per age, there is a difference between the age groups. Individuals with ages between 25 and 34 present larger propensity to undertake, obtaining a TEA of 16,6%, a lot higher than the national average of 12,6%. In the table 5, we see National TEA per age group:

As shown in the table 2, there is also a difference concerning the entrepreneurial activity in relation to the age group. This activity is higher among the 25- 34 group, decreasing in the older age groups. As economical, social and personal aspects have different impacts on individuals during the course of their lives, it is true that just like the conventional entrepreneurship:

H₂: The social entrepreneurship varies according to population's age.

TABLE 5: CHARACTERISTICS OF ENTREPRENEURS PER AGE GROUP - BRAZIL

Categories	EARLY-STAGE ENTREPRENEURS			
	CONVENTIONAL (TEA) 2001 A 2006		SOCIAL (SEA) 2004 A 2006	
	Rate (%)	Prop. (%)	Rate (%)	Prop. (%)
18 to 24 yrs	11,6	20,6	0,9	25,8
25 to 34 yrs	16,6	35,6	0,8	25,8
35 to 44 yrs	14,2	24,8	0,8	21,2
45 to 54 yrs	10,2	12,9	1,2	24,2
55 to 64 yrs	6,0	6,1	0,2	3,0

SOURCE: GEM 2001 a 2006

Reflecting the low national education rates, the Brazilian entrepreneur presents low qualification as well. Individuals with less than 5 years of education represent 45% of entrepreneurs. The proportion of entrepreneurs with 5 to 11 years of education make 41%. Finally, those with more than 11 years of education are only 14% of the total (table 6). Despite the fact that the number of entrepreneurs decreases as education level increases, the higher the education level

the higher the rate of entrepreneurial activity–TEA. Therefore, it is also true that:

H3: The higher the instruction degree the higher the social entrepreneurial activity.

TABLE 6: CHARACTERISTICS OF ENTREPRENEURS PER EDUCATION - BRAZIL

Categories	EARLY-STAGE ENTREPRENEURS			
	CONVENTIONAL (TEA) 2001 A 2006		SOCIAL (SEA) 2004 A 2006	
	Rate (%)	Prop. (%)	Rate (%)	Prop. (%)
No formal education	8,88%	6,01%	0,0%	0%
1 to 4	11,06%	38,96%	0,3%	12%
5 to 11	14,29%	41,08%	0,9%	48%
More than 11	15,86%	13,96%	2,5%	39%

SOURCE: GEM 2001 a 2006

According to the data from GEM’s 2001 to 2006, the higher the family income the higher the rate of entrepreneurial activity–TEA. The entrepreneurial activity goes from 10,1% for entrepreneurs with a family income up to three minimum wages to 18,6% for those with a family income over 18 minimum wages (table 7). Seemingly, the entrepreneurship is an activity mainly performed by middle-class citizens that look for better life conditions, worried about basic needs as housing and food. It is likely that the entrepreneurial activity is more frequent among individuals with a higher income, due to their higher aspirations and needs. Through the social entrepreneurship, some of those needs can be met, specially those like solidarity and the search for a participative space in society. Therefore:

H4: The higher the family income the higher the social entrepreneurial activity.

TABLE 7: CHARACTERISTICS OF ENTREPRENEURS PER FAMILY INCOME - BRAZIL

Categories	EARLY-STAGE ENTREPRENEURS			
	CONVENTIONAL (TEA) 2001 A 2006		SOCIAL (SEA) 2004 A 2006	
	Rate (%)	Prop. (%)	Rate (%)	Prop. (%)
Less than 3 SM	10,1	47	0,5	38
3 to 6 SM	15,4	27	1,0	26
6 to 9 SM	17,1	10	1,4	12
9 to 12 SM	15,3	4	1,8	6
12 to 15 SM	20,0	3	3,6	8
15 to 18 SM	18,0	2	6,2	8
18 SM	18,6	3	1,3	3
Does not know	12,3	2	0,0	0
Did not answer	15,1	2	0,0	0

SOURCE: GEM 2001 a 2006 *SM=Minimum Wage

Besides the demographic aspects mentioned previously, it is strongly believed that other factors related to entrepreneurship reflect in the social entrepreneurial activity. Factors related to the profile and behavior of the entrepreneurs: despite the limitations they have to explain their actions, they can certainly contribute to the understanding of social entrepreneurship. Individuals with entrepreneurial skills have, most of the time, a strong propensity to proactiveness and leadership. Indeed, entrepreneurs are people that present special capabilities, mainly in managing resources. They are more likely to become social entrepreneurs than the rest of the population. Supporting this proposition:

H5a: The proportion of social entrepreneurs is higher among conventional entrepreneurs than among non-entrepreneurs.

Once again, as elucidated in other studies (FILION, 1999), entrepreneurs present different reasons to create their businesses. Some see the act of undertaking as an opportunity to accomplish a personal goal or to increase personal earnings: entrepreneurs driven by opportunity. On the other hand, some see the entrepreneurial activity as a way of meeting their survival needs, entrepreneurs driven by necessity. Accordingly, it is very probable that entrepreneurs driven by opportunity present higher social entrepreneurial activity than entrepreneurs driven by necessity, since these ones might have little time or interest in developing social entrepreneurship activities and be more concerned about basic needs. Therefore:

H5b: The proportion of social entrepreneurs is higher among entrepreneurs driven by opportunity than among the rest of the population.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

Based on the data from 2004 to 2006, it is possible to have a greater understanding of the dynamics concerning the creation of enterprises with social purposes in Brazil. The main analysis element, SEA - Social Entrepreneurial activity, was of 0,8%. Despite the low rate, if we think about the size of the national population between ages 18-64 (117.899.000 people in 2006, according to IBGE, 2006); it means 950.000 social entrepreneurs, which is very impressive.

Two main areas stand out: social care in general and actions developed for children and youth, such as educational, sport and leisure activities. In the first area, several social “interventions” with homeless people, children, families and senior citizens include the collection and donation of clothes, medicine and food, day-care and feeding services and so on. A significant part of these social entrepreneurs is involved with different religions: Catholic, evangelical, Baptist, spiritualists, etc. Actually, the actions of these entrepreneurs are focused on most primary needs such as protection and food and are the most traditional kind of society’s organized actions; which,

together with the enormous needs yet to be met help to understand such amount of answers.

The second area refers to initiatives like school reinforcement classes and sporting practices, such as soccer, capoeira and other martial arts. This result expresses the appeal that childhood exercises on those who want to develop volunteer work.

Following the guidelines of this article, the social entrepreneurial activity needs to be explored in its demographic aspects and its relationship with conventional entrepreneurship. Through the analysis of these variables, it is possible to establish a profile of these entrepreneurs.

Table 8 shows social entrepreneurial activity per gender. Of an overall number of 66 social entrepreneurs, 43 are male and 23 are female. The entrepreneurial activity-SEA is 1,11% among men and 0,55% among women.

There is a significant difference between men's social entrepreneurial activity and women's (p-value = 0,001), as men are more engaged in the creation of social enterprises than women, what corroborates the hypothesis 1. If we compare the proportion of male social entrepreneurs (65%) to females (35%) it is obvious that the difference between genders is more noticeable in the social entrepreneurial activity than in the conventional entrepreneurial activity: 57% for men and 43% for women.

TABLE 8: SOCIAL ENTREPRENEUR PER GENDER

Social Entrepreneur	Gender		Total
	Male	Female	
No	3821	4113	7934
Yes	43	23	66
%	1,11%	0,55%	0,83%
Total	3864	4163	8000

Pearson Chi-Square = 7,568
df = 1
p-value = 0,006

According to Bastos Jr et al (2005), as the necessity-driven entrepreneurship is more common among women, they face a potential barrier to develop social enterprises, probably because they have to struggle more than men. Besides, men have more access to political positions and a higher income, increasing their social entrepreneurial activity rates.

It is worth to point that the activity of creating new enterprises is different of participating as an employee or volunteer. If that was the case, the number of women would be probably higher since they take part as volunteers in several social actions.

Concerning age groups, as it can be seen in the table 9, the percentage of social entrepreneurs is

higher in two age groups: individuals with ages from 18 to 24 (0,94%) and ages between 45 and 54 (1,19%). Though, in spite of those two groups presenting a higher percentage of entrepreneurial activity, there are no significant differences between them (p-value = 0,697). As the age of the respondents was also tabulated as a reason variable it was possible to perform parametric tests and the T-Test; notwithstanding, there was no significant difference either (p-value = 0,565; t = -0,576) between age and the individual's social entrepreneurship status; therefore, there is not a significant difference between SEA and the age of the population; in other words, the hypothesis 2 was not confirmed.

The fact that there were no significant differences between the participants' age and the entrepreneurial activity asks for some observations. If the social entrepreneurs' rate is the same, this probably means that the individual, of any age, faces the same odds or has the same probability of becoming a social entrepreneur. In this direction, public policies that stimulate youth partnerships and the creation of social activities are a very important development factor, as much as for the youth as for the community. As young people are less business-committed and also suffer with unemployment, it would be a valuable help for their professional development. Older individuals could be stimulated to create such types of enterprises as well, since many of them do not undertake professional activities, with a lot of spare time left.

TABLE 9: SOCIAL ENTREPRENEUR PER AGER GROUP

Social Entrepreneur	Age					Total
	18-24 years	25-34 years	35-44 years	45-54 years	55-64 years	
No	1791	2125	1669	1334	1015	7934
Yes	17	17	14	16	2	66
%	0,94	0,79	0,83	1,19	0,20	0,83
Total	1808	2142	1683	1350	1017	8000

Pearson Chi-Square = 7,368
df = 4
p-value = 0,118

In the table 10, the relationship between education and social entrepreneurship activity is presented. It can be noticed that the higher the education level the higher the social entrepreneurship activity rate. Individuals with less than 5 years of education have a SEA of only 0,24%, as individuals with more than 11 years of education present the highest rate: 2,5%. Using the Qui-square test it is possible to assess that the instruction degree interferes significantly (p-value <0,001) in the social entrepreneurship activity. The higher the instruction degree the higher the participation in this kind of enterprises, corroborating the hypothesis 3.

TABLE 10: SOCIAL ENTREPRENEUR PER EDUCATION

Social Entrepreneur	Age			Total
	Up to 4 years	5 to 11 years	More than 11 years	
No	3284	3655	995	7934
Yes	8	32	26	66
%	0,24	0,87	2,55	0,83
Total	3292	3687	1021	8000

Pearson Chi-Square = 50,693

df = 2

p-value = 0,001

It is very likely, as well as it happens in the conventional entrepreneurship, that individuals with a higher learning are more prepared to identify opportunities, presenting additional abilities in the administration of resources and fund-raising. As the creation of a social enterprise comes, most of the time, from some type of personal motivation, those with a better education seem more likely to accomplish their goals.

Concerning family income, the higher the income the higher the social entrepreneurship activity. According to table 11, individuals that have a family income up to three minimum wages present a SEA of only 0,5%. On the other hand, individuals that present a family income over 15 minimum wages present a SEA of 3%; therefore, the family income has a direct impact on the entrepreneurial activity, which is supported by the Qui-square test, that demonstrates that the difference between groups is significant ($p\text{-value} = 0,001$). Therefore, hypothesis 4 was corroborated.

TABLE 11: SOCIAL ENTREPRENEUR PER FAMILY INCOME

Social Entrepreneur	Family Income					Total
	< 3 M.W.	3 a 6 M.W.	6 a 9 M.W.	9 a 15 M.W.	> 15 M.W.	
No	4829	1681	581	348	227	7666
Yes	25	17	8	9	7	66
%	0,52	1,00	1,36	2,52	2,99	0,85
Total	4854	1698	589	357	234	7732

Pearson Chi-Square = 33,148

df = 4

p-value = 0,001

NOTE: S.M. – Minimum Wage

The fact that individuals with higher family income are more propense to become social entrepreneurs raise the following question: if an individual needs to struggle for survival, this individual will hardly engage into activities without short-term financial return. It leads to the perception that the solutions of social problems are less likely to be found by those people, but quite

the opposite, individuals with a higher income are much more capable of solving those problems. Besides, individuals with a higher income present personal needs that go far beyond material necessities. Many times, these people engage themselves in social enterprises for their self-accomplishment or in search of social prestige.

As seen before, the differences of gender, education and income present in social entrepreneurship echoes in the business entrepreneurship. So, if the demographic indicators are present in certain activity, one can expect that enterprising individuals are more likely to develop social activities.

Such relationship can be demonstrated from the crossing of SEA – Social Entrepreneurial activity and business entrepreneurship respective variables. In the table 12, it becomes evident that the proportion of social entrepreneurship individuals is higher among conventional entrepreneurs (1,56%) than among the rest of the population (0,73%). Therefore, the difference between these two groups is significant (p-value <0,001), corroborating the hypothesis 5a and proving that the social entrepreneurship reflects in the business entrepreneurship.

TABLE 12: SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURS AND CONVENTIONAL ENTREPRENEURS

Social Entrepreneur	Conventional Entrepreneur		Total
	No	Yes	
No	6973	961	7934
Yes	51	15	66
%	0,73	1,56	0,83
Total	7024	976	8000

Pearson Chi-Square = 6,885
df = 1
p-value = 0,009

Anyway, besides the significant difference between entrepreneurship and undertaking social entrepreneurs and those who are simply not, there is also a difference between two kinds of entrepreneurs: the ones that are opportunity driven and the ones that are necessity driven. Reason enough to perform tests with both kinds of entrepreneurs.

It was not a surprise that entrepreneurs are more engaged in social enterprises than the rest of the population; so are the entrepreneurs driven by opportunity. The difference between entrepreneurs driven by opportunity and the rest of the population was also significant (p-value <0,001); however, the self-explanatory power of opportunity-driven entrepreneurship is a lot stronger than conventional entrepreneurship's (Chi-Square 11,962 against Chi-Square 6,885). It also corroborates hypothesis 5b, since opportunity-oriented entrepreneurs are more propense to become social entrepreneurs.

TABLE 13: SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURS AND OPPORTUNITY ENTREPRENEURS

Social Entrepreneur	Opportunity Entrepreneur		Total
	No	Yes	
No	7438	496	7934
Yes	55	11	66
%	0,74%	2,22%	0,83%
Total	7493	507	8000

Pearson Chi-Square = 11,962

df = 1

p-value = 0,001

As a counterproof for the hypotheses 5a and 5b, the relationship between social and necessity-driven entrepreneurship has been also checked. Results were that there is not significant difference between necessity-driven entrepreneurs and the rest of the population in what concerns the start-up of social enterprises (Qui-square = 0,895, $p = 0,344$). Based on such non-significant results, one is able to state that opportunity-driven entrepreneurs are very much more likely to become social entrepreneurs.

Such relationships between social and classic business entrepreneurship happen, most of the time, among those individuals in the pursuit of material and personal accomplishments. Regarding necessity-driven individuals, their activities don't count for the social entrepreneurship. As already noted, if the individuals' immediate concern is with their survival, there are little time and interest left to build solidary enterprises.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

In consonance with the purposes of this article, it can be clearly stated that the social entrepreneurship has a direct connection to the conventional business entrepreneurship. One of the most evident aspects in the analysis is the similarity between the results found in both indicators. Many of the indicators referring to conventional entrepreneurship are found in the social modality, reinforcing the importance of the entrepreneurial activity, not for wealth creation purposes only but to meet public and social demands as well. It is understood that the development of entrepreneurial potentials will lead to a greater participation in the creation of social-oriented enterprises.

It is clear that the Brazilian social entrepreneur has a profile of high income individuals, with high education, predominantly male and engaged in the creation of new businesses. Such individuals seem to have already met their basic needs and they can count on intellectual resources and leadership abilities to develop such enterprises.

Besides the demographic aspects, it is important to note that the national cultural characteristics

are not favorable to the development of social-driven enterprises. In comparison to other countries, partnership initiatives are incipient; individuals prefer to develop actions, most of the time, solely in their own benefit; and there is a general belief that incrementing activities to meet social needs is still just an obligation of the State, not society's.

However, the increasing interest in the social area may be attributed to the multiplication of social organizations; such perception can contribute to the amplification of social entrepreneurship activities. It is difficult to diagnose if the interest in developing those activities is motivated by changes in society values; however, it is believed that the more people support new social enterprises the better will be the results of these organizations.

Due to the increasing interest of people and organizations in developing social enterprises, resources tend to be more scarce and disputed, making social organizations to rationalize their actions even more and adjust their administration methods after traditional companies. The rationalization of the social activity was also a reason for social organizations to search for an identity to legitimate the idea of professionalization of the social field, facilitating the dialogue of these organizations with their potential investors, mostly private companies. In that way, the term social entrepreneurship seems to express the rationalization of the field of social organizations in Brazil.

Concerning the limitations of this research, one reason is that data was mainly binary or ordinal, limiting the possibility of more solid tests. Another limiting factor is the small number of identified cases, hindering a desirable generalization of the results, despite the fact that the samples were statistically representative.

More rigorous debate and studies are required, employing specific questionnaires on the subject and appropriate scales to perform more extensive and wider research. Data crossing between enquiries and other qualitative methods is strongly suggested, as it would assist in disclosing important elements of the social entrepreneurial activity in the country.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ASHOKA Empreendedores Sociais e McKinsey & Company, Inc. **Empreendimentos sociais sustentáveis: como elaborar planos de negócio para organizações sociais**. São Paulo: Petrópolis, 2001.

BARENSEN, Lynn; GARDNER, Howard. Is the social entrepreneur a new type of leader? **Leader to Leader**, New York, n. 34, p. 43-50, fall 2004.

BASTOS JÚNIOR, Paulo Alberto; GRECO, Simara Maria S. S.; HOROCHOVSKI, Rodrigo Rossi; MACHADO, Joana Paula; SCHLEMM, Marcos Muller. **Empreendedorismo no Brasil 2004**, Curitiba: IBQP; SEBRAE, 2005.

SCHLEMM, Marcos Muller, PASSOS; Carlos Artur Krüger; FELIX, Julio César; BASTOS JÚNIOR, Paulo Alberto; GRECO, Simara Maria S. S.; MACHADO, Joana Paula; KRUPA, Solange. **Empreendedorismo no Brasil 2006**, Curitiba: IBQP, 2007.

HARDING, Rebecca; BOSNA, Niels. **Global Entrepreneurship Monitor: GEM 2006 Results**, UK, 2006.

HARDING, Rebecca; COWLING, Marc. **Social Entrepreneurship Monitor**, UK, 2006.

DEES, Gregory J. **The meaning of “social entrepreneurship”**. Disponível em: <http://www.fuqua.duke.edu/centers/case/documents/dees_SE.pdf> Texto original criado em: 31 out. 1998. Reformado e revisado em: 30 mai. 2001. Acesso em: 18 ago. 2005.

EIKENBERRY, Angela M.; KLUVER, Jodie Drapal. The Marketization of the Nonprofit Sector: Civil Society at Risk?, **Public Administration Review**, v. 64, n. 2, p. 132-140, March/April 2004.

FEGER, José Elmar. Empreendedores sociais e privados: existem diferenças? In: EnAPG - Encontro de Administração Pública e Governança, 2004, Rio de Janeiro. **Anais...**, Rio de Janeiro: Anpad, 2004.

FERREIRA, M. Do Voto Feminino à Lei das Cotas: a difícil inserção das mulheres nas democracias representativas, **Revista Espaço Acadêmico**, n. 37, jun. 2004.

FERREIRA, Sílvia. **O que tem de especial o empreendedor social?** O perfil de emprego do empresário social em Portugal. Faculdade de Economia da Universidade de Coimbra, Oficina do Centro de Estudos Sociais, n. 223, março, 2005. Disponível em: <<http://www.ces.fe.uc.pt/publicacoes/oficina/223/223.pdf>>. Acesso em: 26 mar. 2006.

FILION, Louis Jaques. Empreendedorismo: empreendedores e proprietários-gerentes de pequenos negócios, **RAUSP – Revista de Administração da Universidade de São Paulo**, São Paulo, v. 34, p. 05-28, Abril/Junho 1999.

JOHNSON, Sherrill. **Young Social Entrepreneurs in Canada**. Canadian Centre for Social Entrepreneurship. Edmonton, May 2003. Disponível em: <[http://www.bus.ualberta.ca/ccse/Publications/Publications/Sherrill%20Johnson%20case%20study%20\(June%202nd,%202003\)%20--%20Young%20SocialEntrepreneurs%20\(final\).doc](http://www.bus.ualberta.ca/ccse/Publications/Publications/Sherrill%20Johnson%20case%20study%20(June%202nd,%202003)%20--%20Young%20SocialEntrepreneurs%20(final).doc)>. Acesso em: 30 mai. 2006.

HAIR, Joseph; ANDERSON, Rolph E.; TATHAM, Ronaldo L.; BLACK William C. **Análise Multivariada de Dados**. Porto Alegre: Bookman, 2005.

IBGE. **Síntese dos Indicadores Sociais 2004**. Brasília: Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística, 2005.

MELO NETO, Francisco P. de; FROES, César. **Empreendedorismo Social: a transição para a sociedade sustentável**. Rio de Janeiro: Qualitymark, 2002.

ROBERTS, Dave; WOODS, Christine. Changing the world on a shoestring: the concept of social entrepreneurship. **University of Auckland Business Review**. v. 7, n. 1, p. 45-51, 2005.

ROPER, Juliet; CHENEY, George. Leadership, learning and human resource management: the meaning of social entrepreneurship today. **Corporate Governance**, v. 5, n. 3, p. 95-104, 2005.

YOUNG, Dennis R. **The Non-profit Sector in a Changing Economy**. Montreal: OCDE, 2003.

Contribution of the Text: The present empiric study discusses the relationship between conventional business entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship in Brazil, based on the national entrepreneurship indicators.