

¹Determinant Factors of Social Innovation Capability in Nonprofit Organizations and Social Businesses

Eduardo Luiz Rodrigues

Master in Sustainability

Pontifical Catholic University of Campinas / SP-Brazil

eduardo.lr07@gmail.com

Cibele Roberta Sugahara (Corresponding author)

Doctor in information science University of São Paulo (USP) Brazil

Researcher of the Master's degree in Sustainability Pontifical Catholic University of Campinas / SP-Brazil

cibelesu@puc-campinas.edu.br

Samuel Carvalho De Benedicto

Doctor in Administration Federal University of Lavras(UFLA) Brazil

Researcher of the Master's degree in Sustainability Pontifical Catholic University of Campinas / SP-Brazil

samuel.benedicto@puc-campinas.edu.br

Denise Helena Lombardo Ferreira

Doctor in Mathematical Education University São Paulo Júlio de Mesquita Filho (UNESP)

Brazil

Researcher of the Master's degree in Sustainability Pontifical Catholic University of Campinas / SP-Brazil

lombardo@puc-campinas.edu.br

Abstract

The ability to create alternatives to social problems in a sustainable way can be understood as social innovation. Social innovation is a way of equalizing social problems, being considered an option for market, state and society failures. Thus, social innovation presents itself as a possible and necessary alternative for solving the problems related to Sustainable Development, especially education. This study seeks, from the perspective of the Innovation Capability, to identify the Capability for social innovation in Associations, Businesses Foundations and Social Businesses that work in the area of Education in the

¹ The present work was carried out with the support from the Coordination for Improvement of Higher Education Personnel - Brazil (CAPES) - Financing Code 001 and is part of the Sustainability Master of Science Postgraduate Program Dissertation in the Pontifical Catholic University of Campinas, Brazil.

Southeast of Brazil. In this research, the Social Innovation Capability is composed of five factors, namely: Facilitating Leadership; Strategic Intention to Innovate Socially; Democratic Management; Co-creation of Social Innovation and Open Social Innovation. The research methodology is qualitative descriptive. For the data collection, an online questionnaire was sent to a selection of organizations belonging to all three types of organizations studied (Associations, Businesses Foundations and Social Businesses) that work in the area of Education in the Southeast of Brazil. As results, the responses of eight organizations, each with three respondents, were analyzed. The organizations were identified as being three Associations, two Businesses Foundations and three Social Businesses. The results were analyzed in light of the social innovation literature. The results indicate that in the Associations, Businesses Foundations and in Social Businesses, the determinants factors of the Capability for social innovation Democratic Management and Open Social Innovation are highlighted. Among the results it is worth noting that the Co-creation factor of Social Innovation is not representative for the organizations studied.

Keywords: Innovation; Social Innovation; Third sector; Social Businesses; Businesses Foundations; Sustainable development.

1. Introduction

The Sustainable Development appears as a sphinx waiting for its Oedipus (Veiga, 2005), in the sense that it is a problem, an enigma, still without solution. It seems that old paradigms and practices will not be able to solve this issue, thus arising the importance of searching for innovative ways, tools and methods for old and new social problems (Boff, 2012, Silva Junior & Ferreira, 2013).

Among the challenges of Sustainable Development, well represented by the United Nations (UN) Sustainable Development Objectives (SDO) (ONU, 2015), it has been chosen, in this research, for a greater focus on education due to a personal affinity of one of the researchers.

Currently, it is estimated that only 68% of the population between 15 and 17 years old attend school. 25.9% of the students in the first year of high school dropped out or failed. More than 50% of children are not literate in the third year of elementary school. 82% of young people who complete high school do not enter university. More than 40% of the students of the 3rd year of elementary school in the Southeast of Brazil have insufficient level of reading and mathematics (Soares, 2018).

In this sense, it can be said that Brazilian education faces problems that go beyond the lack of resources, necessitating innovative solutions.

However, traditional approaches to innovation have a strictly commercial and generally technology-based focus in the industrial and service sectors (Estensoro, 2015). People play an important role in generating innovation, as different perspectives and flexibility in developing problem solving promote learning by combining new knowledge. In this context, the organization must be open to change by being able to promote people's learning from, for example, programs aimed at innovation with the participation of contributors. The education and the training, the teamwork and the creative atmosphere environment are essential to structuring long-term innovation activities. Considering that the organizational structure has a great influence on the behavior of the people, it is important to foster communication and the less rigid

hierarchy to foster creativity and innovation (Sugahara et al., 2018).

It is imperious for organizations the need to adapt their organizational structures in view of the market structure and the interaction between functions and functional specialists in various areas of the company and not only in R & D, this increases the exchange of knowledge and the development of creativity for innovation. In this sense, it is important to highlight that the use of information from the R & D department, universities and research institutes in certain contexts assumes a secondary character, which may show little concern with the formal research activities of Brazilian organizations. Innovations are mechanisms that, in addition to qualifying economic dynamics, promote sustainability for economic development (Sugahara et al., 2005).

In this context, innovations are producing growing disillusionment by demonstrating that they do not have the means to solve new and old social problems, as in the case of education (OECD, 2010; Phillips et al., 2015).

Thus, sustainability emerges as a new driving force for innovation, not only in companies, but also through social entrepreneurs, placing the creation of social value at the heart of their missions (Nidumolu, Prahalad & Rangaswami, 2009; Nicholls, 2010).

The creation of social value according to Phills, Deiglmeier and Miller (2013, p. 39) is defined as “[...] the creation of benefits or reductions of costs for society through efforts to address social needs and problems in ways that go beyond the private gains and general benefits of market activity”. Although it is an abstract concept and difficult to measure (Mulgan, 2010), it does not become less important, being the ultimate goal of all social entrepreneurs (Nicholls, 2006).

The ability to create social value in a sustainable way gains support with social innovation. According to Gupta, Dey and Singh (2017) social innovation is a way of equalizing social problems, when considered an option for market failures, from the state and society.

The objective of this research is to analyze the determinant factors of the Capability for social innovation in Associations, Businesses Foundations and Social Businesses, in order to verify how organizations behave in relation to innovation factors.

The importance of this research is justified because, when studying the Social Innovation capacities of Associations, Businesses Foundations and Social Businesses, it becomes possible to identify how each of these organizational types contributes to the creation of innovative solutions to problems related to human development and to sustainability.

Understanding the social innovation Capability of Associations, Businesses Foundations and Social Businesses allows social entrepreneurs better conditions for the management of social innovations.

2. Social Innovation and Social Innovation Capability

With regard to social innovation, as pointed out by Van Der Have and Rubalcaba (2016), the concept does not have a universal definition. Mulgan (2006, p. 33) defines Social Innovation in terms of its objectives and agents. For the author, social innovation is about “[...] innovative activities and services that are motivated by the goal of meeting a social need and that are predominantly diffused through organizations whose primary purposes are social”.

In addition, Bignetti (2011, p. 4) defines social innovation "[...] the result of knowledge applied to social needs through the participation and cooperation of all the actors involved, generating new and lasting solutions for social groups, communities or for society in general".

Cloutier (2003), on the hand, defines Social Innovation as a new solution with lasting effects for collective or individual problems. Cloutier (2003) also makes explicit the need for this innovation to take place through partnership with the community and with those who benefit from it so that it is considered as social innovation.

In this sense, one can perceive in the concepts presented the 'common radical' of novelty that generates social value, as briefly explained in the definition of Pol and Ville (2009), which understands social innovation as a new idea with the potential to improve the lives of people. However, the definition of social innovation adopted by this study is that of Phillips, Deiglmeier and Miller (2013, p. 39). The authors define social innovation as "A novel solution to a social problem that is more effective, efficient, sustainable, or just than existing solutions and for which the value created accrues primarily to society as a whole rather than private individuals". Although this is the definition of social innovation defined by this study, the contributions of other authors (Cloutier, 2003; Mulgan, 2006; Pol & Ville, 2009; Bignetti, 2011; Van Der Have & Rubalcaba, 2016) are also important for contemplating different points of view and to give greater support to the theme, since they are similar.

Such a definition is prioritized before the others without, of course, disregard them, since it can contemplate different aspects of the sub-concepts 'innovation' and 'social', without making it excessively broad and therefore void of meaning.

Another important point in relation to social innovations is its process, as explicit in Bignetti (2011) definition of Social Innovation. The author reinforces the importance of the participatory process in creating a social innovation, this point of view is shared by Chesbrough and Minin (2014) through the concept of Open Social Innovation.

Open Social Innovation is described by Chesbrough and Minin (2014) as the process of using organizations internal an external ideas as a way to increase their innovative Capability. In other words, it is a process of distribution of knowledge flows along, and across, organizational boundaries, through economic and non-economic mechanisms aligned with its businesses model.

Unlike others, this study deals with the theme of innovation as a Capability rather than a process. Innovation Capability is an important topic of study, since it deals with innovation as an integral part of a living and systemic organization. Thus, this approach contrasts with the traditional view of the innovation process as a process disconnected from other organizational factors. The Capability for social innovation, is defined by Peng, Schroeder and Shah (2008, p. 20) as "the strength or proficiency of a bundle of interrelated organizational routines for incrementally improving existing products/processes".

The work from Valladares, Vasconcellos and Di Serio (2014) is a great theoretical contribution, assuming the responsibility of integrating the literature produced on the subject. The authors analyze in depth, theoretically, the models of innovation Capability presented by several studies, identify the determinant factors of innovation Capability, and present a valuable theoretical contribution on the theme Capability for innovation. From the study of Valladares, Vasconcellos and Di Serio (2014), this research is concerned

to present a reflection on the Capability for innovation applied to the context of social innovation, as shown in Table 1.

The factors proposed by Valladares, Vasconcellos and Di Serio (2014) were selected and regrouped according to the literature on social innovation. Thus, there were cuts, groupings and additions of new factors, according to Table 1.

Table 1. Synthesis of the Determinant factors and Resultant of Social Innovation Capability and Its Theoretical Domains

Factor	Definition	Authors	Proposed Factors	Proposed Definition
Transforming Leadership	The one that makes the followers more aware of the importance and value of work; activates their higher order needs; and induces them to transcend their personal interests for the sake of the organization.	<p>“We have shown that while much innovation is bound to be confusing and unpredictable, it is likely to be greatly aided by: Leaders who visibly encourage and reward successful innovation and who can situate themselves in different fields" (Googins, 2013, p. 6).</p> <p>It is important to recognize that successful social innovation requires a range of actors. In the early stages, it has individual ‘champions’ highly qualified and the enthusiastic support of a small, but dedicated and influential community (Nesta, 2007).</p> <p>Democratic management, where the leader directs the efforts of the group (João & Galina, 2013).</p> <p>Facilitators who possess the disciplinary field and procedural knowledge required by the process of social innovation (Estensoro, 2015).</p>	Facilitating Leadership	Highly capable individuals who act in a democratic way, facilitating the process of social innovation, encouraging and supporting the team to transcend their personal interests in favor of society.

<p>Innovating Strategic Intention</p>	<p>The extent to which the company is willing to take risks to encourage the change, the technological development and the innovation, and compete aggressively in order to gain a competitive edge for your company.</p>	<p>"We show that although much innovation is bound to be messy and unpredictable it is likely to be greatly helped by: - leaders who visibly encourage and reward successful innovation, and who can straddle different fields. - finance focused specifically on innovation, including public and philanthropic investment in high risk r&d, targeted at the areas of greatest need and greatest potential, and organised to support the key stages of innovation" (Googins, 2013, p. 6).</p>	<p>Intention to innovate socially</p>	<p>Degree in which the company is willing to take risks and make investments to favor, as a priority, the creation of social value.</p>
<p>People management for innovation</p>	<p>Orientation of people management for innovation, providing the granting of freedom or autonomy of action to employees, setting challenging goals, allowing them to decide how to achieve them and favoring self-realization and commitment to the organization's objectives.</p>	<p>Democratic management, where the leader directs the efforts of the group Taylor (1970) apud João & Galina, 2013). Joint work independent of organizational boundaries and freedom for creation Nomura and Kubota (2007); Taylor (1970) apud João & Galina, 2013).</p>	<p>Democratic Management</p>	<p>Democratic management of the organization, valuing horizontal communication, informal relations and autonomy to create responses to the problems of society faced by the organization.</p>
<p>Organicity of organizational structure</p>	<p>Degree in which the structure is characterized by the granting of autonomy, flexible controls, clear horizontal communication, valorization of knowledge and experience and informality in personal relationships. Organic structures allow faster response to changes in the external environment than so-called mechanists.</p>			

Innovation Performance	Innovative organizations are those that exhibit innovative behavior consistent over time.	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Technology Strategic Management	Management of the process of creation and development of technologies, aiming at the creation of value. The process of technology management comprises five steps: identification, selection, acquisition, exploration and protection.	<p>“We use the term ‘grassroots innovations’ to describe networks of activists and organisations generating novel bottom–up solutions for sustainable development; solutions that respond to the local situation and the interests and values of the communities involved” (Seyfang & Smith, 2007, p. 585).</p> <p>"We have shown that although much innovation is bound to be confusing and unpredictable, it is likely to be greatly aided by: [...]</p>	Co-creation of social innovation	Collaborative management of the process of creating and developing social innovations, empowering users so that they are an active part of their change.
Project Management	Planning, provision of resources, execution and control of the innovation process. It includes careful evaluation of the projects, analysis and planning aiming, mainly, to gain understanding, commitment and support both corporate and of the personnel that will be involved in the project.	<p>Ways to empower users to drive innovation - with tools, incentives, recognition, and access to financing for ideas that work" (Googins, 2013, p. 6).</p> <p>Co-creation between generators and users of innovation and feedback that produces improvement (Nomura & Kubota (2007); Murray; Caulier-Grice & Mulgan (2010).</p>		
Customer and market knowledge	Ability to detect events, needs and expectations, significant changes and customer and market trends. Understanding market changes ahead of your competitors provides competitive advantage to the company.			

Not Applicable	Not Applicable	<p>"We define Open Social Innovation (OSI) to be the application of either inbound or outbound open innovation strategies, along with innovations in the Associated Businesses model of the organization, to social challenges" (Chesbrough & Minin, 2014, p. 170).</p> <p>Broad diffusion of innovation to other organizations. Murray; Caulier-Grice & Mulgan (2010); Dawson & Daniel (2010).</p> <p>"Contradicting the traditional belief of social entrepreneurs as solitary bodies, innovating in isolation, existing studies show that social innovation is not undertaken in isolation by lone entrepreneurs, but rather it is shaped by a wide range of organizations and institutions that influence developments in certain areas to meet a social need or to promote social development. On this basis, it is suggested that social enterprises and social entrepreneurs exist within a social innovation system—a community of practitioners and institutions jointly addressing social issues, helping to shape society and innovation" (Phillips et al., 2015, p. 454).</p>	Open social innovation	Diffusion of social innovation to other organizations and communities, through inbound and outbound strategies.
----------------	----------------	---	------------------------	---

Source: Prepared by authors based in Valladares; Vasconcellos and Di Serio (2014, p. 604).

Among the types of existing organizations, this research focuses on highlighting the organizational models whose main objective is to solve social problems, called civil society organizations and Social Businesses (Yunus; Moingeon & Lehmann-Ortega, 2010; Comini; Barki & Aguiar, 2012; Mañas & Medeiros, 2012; Tachizawa, 2014).

These types of organizations have the common potential of being Social Entrepreneurs. Martin and Osberg (2014, p. 9) argue that the socially entrepreneurial organization must:

- Identify a stable but at the same time socially unjust situation;
- Identify an opportunity to develop social value and a new socially fairer balance;
- Forge a new socially fairer balance.

In this way, one can see a great alignment between the concepts of social entrepreneurship and social innovation.

Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) constitute the Third Sector and are non-profit entities and private entities, legally known as associations or foundations (Mañas & Medeiros, 2012; Tachizawa, 2014). Both are defined in this research by their specific legislation (articles no. 44 to 61 and 62 to 69, respectively, from Law number 10,406, dated January 10, 2002 (BRASIL, 2002), amended by Law number 13,151 of 2015 and by the criteria of FASFIL - Private Foundations and Non-Profit Associations (IBGE, 2012). Tables 2 and 3 present the main peculiarities of BusinessesAssociations and Foundations regarding their social innovation capabilities raised by this study.

Table 2. Main peculiarities of the associations regarding their Capability for social innovation

Factor	Peculiarity	Prepared based on:
Strategic Intension to Innovate Socially	Need to innovate due to competition by public notices and other sources of funds from private initiative. However, their level of competition is less aggressive than the market	Drucker (1990); Silva, (2010); Baggenstoss and Donadone (2013); Salimon and Siqueira (2013).
Democratic management	Structure of personnel differentiated by the presence of volunteer workers.	Salamon (2010); Alfes and Langner (2017); BRASIL (2018).
Co-creation of social innovation	Proximity with communities and common participatory management process; They act as an agglutinator of the desires and yearnings of society.	Seyfang and Smith, (2007); Tavares and Fernandes (2010); Santos (2012); Mañas and Medeiros (2012); Kirwan et al., (2013); Fernandes (2014).
Open social innovation	Proximity to other CSOs, to the Second Sector and to communities impacted in a collaborative way.	Holmes and Smart (2009); Fernandes (2014).

Source: Prepared from the authors.

Table 3. Main factors of the Capability for social innovation relatí to corporate foundations

Factor	Peculiarity	Prepared based on:
Strategic Intension to Innovate Socially	Old paradigm focused on philanthropy, on moral and religious values and new paradigm with focus on the organizational image. Social innovation and social needs are less prioritized.	Nogueira and Schommer (2009).
Co-creation of social innovation	Part of the ISP is through donations to third-party OSCs; Low interaction with impacted communities; top-down decision-making and elaboration.	Borges, Miranda and Valadão (2007); Nogueira and Schommer (2009); Andion et al. (2010); GIFE (2017).
Open social innovation	Low interaction with communities; Centralized decision-making process; Influence by the maintainer company, which holds great latent potential.	Holmes and Smart (2009); Perret, Junqueira and Ferreira (2011).

Source: Prepared from the authors quoted in the table.

Social Businesses (SB) in turn are understood as private initiatives that seek to solve social problems through market practices, such as marketing of products and services. The inclusion criterion considered in this research is the self-declaration as Social Businesses by the companies studied (Barboza, Silva and Bertolini, 2017). Table 4 presents the main peculiarities of Social Businesses as it relates to its Social Innovation Capabilities raised by this study.

Table 4. Main peculiarities of the Social Businesses regarding its Capability for social innovation.

Factor	Peculiarity	Prepared based on:
Strategic Intention to Innovate Socially	Meet the new markets and execute hybrid Businesses models, making innovation a part of their essence.	Mulgan (2006); Borzaga and Bodini (2012); Jappe (2013); João (2014).
Co-creation of social innovation	They vary widely. SB focused on social impact foster the participation of several stakeholders, while SB focused on the economic aspect tend to make centralized decisions.	Comini, Barki and Aguiar (2012).

<p>Open social innovation</p>	<p>They vary widely. SB focused on social impact foster the participation and sharing of information with several stakeholders, while SB focused on the economic aspect tend to make centralized decisions and prioritize traditional models of closed innovation.</p>	<p>João (2014); Svirina; Zabbarova and Oganisjana (2016).</p>
--------------------------------------	--	---

Source: Prepared from the authors.

3. Methodology

The methodology of this research is qualitative and, from the point of view of the objectives, the descriptive research is adopted. According to Gil (2010) the descriptive research aims to describe characteristics of a particular population or object of study, identifying possible relations between variables.

The instrument for data collection used in the research is the questionnaire. The elaboration of the questionnaire was based on the work by Valladares, Vasconcellos and Di Serio (2014) entitled Capability for innovation: a systematic review of the literature.

For the data gathering, an online questionnaire was sent to a selection of organizations belonging to all three types of organizations studied (Associations, Businesses Foundations and Social Businesses) that operate in the area of education in the Southeast of Brazil in order to verify the innovative Capability of organizations. The survey questionnaire consists of 26 (twenty-six) questions. In addition, the respondents were asked to respond in a discursive way about the answer of each third question of each factor. Table 5 below contains the questions related to social innovation Capability.

Table 5. Questionnaire on Determinant Factors of Social Innovation Capability

Factor	Definition	Affirmation and / or Question	
<p>Facilitating Leadership</p>	<p>Highly capable individuals who act in a democratic way, facilitating the process of social innovation, encouraging and supporting the team to transcend their personal interests in favor of the society.</p>		<p>People who act as innovation facilitators have communication skills.</p>
			<p>Facilitators actively stimulate a culture of creativity and innovation.</p>
			<p>Decisions about projects and work are taken in a participatory manner among those involved. How does this occur?</p>
	<p>Degree in which the company is willing to</p>		<p>The organization routinely allocates its own resources to innovative projects or initiatives.</p>

Intention to Innovate Socially	take risks and make investments to favor, as a priority, the creation of social value.		The vision of the future about how the organization develops itself with innovation is shared among employees
			Innovation is embedded in the organizational strategy. How does this occur?
Democratic Management	Democratic management of the organization, valuing horizontal communication, informal relations and autonomy to create responses to the problems of society faced by the organization.		Employees have autonomy to solve problems related to the work.
			The organizational structure facilitates communication.
			Employees are encouraged to create ideas to improve the organization's services, products and / or projects. How does this occur?
Co-creation of Social Innovation	Collaborative management of the process of creating and developing social innovations, empowering users so that they are an active part of their change.		People benefiting from innovation participate in the creation of innovation.
			People benefiting from innovation participate in innovation management.
			The organization works together with the beneficiaries in the development of new services, products and / or projects. How does this occur?
Open Social Innovation	Diffusion of social innovation to other organizations and communities, through inbound and outbound strategies.		The organization captures innovation opportunities outside its border through partnerships with other organizations.
			The organization's partnerships provide information relevant to innovation beyond its boundary.
			The organization actively participates in communities that foster the exchange of experiences in innovation with a focus on social impact. How does this occur?

Source: Prepared by the authors.

In order to analyze the determinant factors of the social innovation Capability in organizations, the management practices related to the innovation factors identified in the study by Valladares, Vasconcellos and Di Serio (2014) were adapted in light of the social innovation literature.

The responses from eight organizations, each with three respondents, were analyzed. The organizations were identified as being three Associations, two Businesses Foundations and three Social Businesses. All active in the area of education in Southeast Brazil. The results obtained were analyzed according to the literature on the subject.

The averages of the answers to the quantitative questions obtained were analyzed based on the scale contained in Table 6, in order to make the data more readable.

Table 6. Scale of Agreement for evaluation

1	2,49	2,5	3,5	3,51	5
Disagreement		Neutral	Agreement		

Source: Prepared by the authors.

The methodology allows to explain the determinant factors of the Capability for social innovation in the studied entities.

4. Results and Discussions

4.1 Capability for Social Innovation in the studied organizations

The results pointed out in relation to the determinant factors of the Capability for social innovation of Associations, Foundations and Social Businesses are analyzed in light of the literature. In order to proceed with the analysis, organizations were grouped according to organizational types.

4.1.1 Social Innovation Capabilities in Associations

Out of the types of organization studied, the Associations are the ones that presented less evidence of the determinant factors for Capability of social innovation. Although Salimon and Siqueira (2013) point out that there is growing competition among the Associations for obtaining financing, and consequent pressure for professionalization, this research allowed us to observe a different reality.

The group of Associations studied presented a level of agreement lower than that of the Businesses Foundations and Social Businesses in all the analyzed factors. Among the five factors, only two were indicated by the respondents with agreement, which allows to infer that these are strong and present factors in this type of organization, being: Democratic Management (3.56) and Open Social Innovation (3.52), both near the lower limit of the scale.

The Associations studied presented neutrality in relation to the Strategic Intention Factor for Social Innovation (3,44). This result, as pointed out in studies by Drucker (1990), indicates that there is a need to

innovate among the Associations, due to the competition for notices and other sources of funds, but that this competition is not as strong as observed, for instance, in the Second Sector. It can be said that the effectivation of the intention to innovate socially in the Associations is still weak, since the strategic concern with innovation is incipient.

In fact, it can be seen in the Associations studied a very strong component of philanthropy, since they combine action in favor of a group with some specific need, religious values and lack of strategic vision on the subject. To affirm this is not in any way a criticism to the work done, but only as a reading of reality. The Associations are of great importance in assisting people in situations of social vulnerability and play an important role in activities not fulfilled by the State.

Regarding the Democratic Management factor, the Associations studied showed agreement (3.56). However, it should be noted that one of the organizations studied presented strong hierarchical and centralizing characteristics, which influenced the performance of Associations in general. Moreover, in most cases observed participation in decisions is usually carried out through feedbacks and informal contacts only.

It is worth mentioning that all Associations studied work with volunteers, which requires an extra challenge in relation to the development of their activities. The volunteers perform their work due to altruistic, affective or self-interest values. In addition, Alfes and Langner (2017) emphasize that this behavior demands the involvement of the Associations so that they remain motivated and engaged with the activities of the organization. Thus, when presenting a medium / high agreement regarding the Democratic Management factor, it is noticed that in two Associations studied these challenges do not affect the management of the organization, which leads to believe that, in a less challenging scenario, the Democratic Management would be even more present.

The Associations studied presented neutrality regarding the Facilitating Leadership Factor (3,41). However, as already mentioned, one of the organizations had strong hierarchical and centralizing characteristics, which influenced the overall performance of the factor.

In addition, it is also important to note that the more hierarchical profile observed is not necessarily negative. Alfes and Langner (2017) cite, for example, that paradoxical leadership that combines participatory and managerial elements in dealing with volunteers is needed. In this way, clear and directive goals can be combined with a healthy level of autonomy, and this increases engagement (Alfes & Langner, 2017).

In this sense, it is understood that the more centralizing leadership present in the Associations can meet the objectives of this type of organization. It is worth noting that it may not contribute, as the facilitating leadership, to an environment more favorable to social innovation.

However, the Co-creation of Social Innovation is inserted in different relations with the studied organizations. As evidenced by the results, the Associations presented a disagreement regarding the Co-creation Factor of Social Innovation (2,22). This result was surprising, since several authors cited in this study point to the importance of Co-creation of innovation with the participation of beneficiaries in the processes and projects of the Associations (Seyfang & Smith, 2007, Kirwan et al., 2013, Comini, 2016). For Tavares and Fernandes (2010) the Associations act mainly based on the interests of the community.

However, the research results reveal a distancing of the ‘collectivities’ or the ‘beneficiaries’ in the planning, execution and evaluation moments of the programs. It is not a question of going against the importance of the Third Sector for communities lacking resources and opportunities, as Mañas and Medeiros (2012) point out, but of evaluating that the solution to such problems is not born, at least in the institutions studied, in partnership with affected communities.

Thus, the results obtained are surprising since they contradict the concept of grassroots social innovations (Seyfang & Smith, 2007; Kirwan et al., 2013), whose manifestation was expected in the Associations. Such results also contradict the notes of Santos (2012), since for the author the Associations act as agglutinators of the communities desires. The Associations are expected to be much closer to the society and the beneficiary communities when creating and managing their projects, which was not observed in this research.

Still to compose the universe of the analysis of the Co-creation for the social innovation again it is observed a strong character of the philanthropy culture. In this sense, it is understood that philanthropic thinking is not intended to systematically work and solve social problems, but rather to collaborate with individuals and communities in need on the basis of moral values. Therefore, there is no strategic thinking to solve the problem within philanthropic logic.

On the Open Social Innovation Factor, the Associations studied showed agreement (3.52). Only one of the three organizations studied did not report participating in networks or sector forums. In addition, out of the eight organizations participating in this research, only one Association reported that it participates in a municipal forum or a forum whose main entity is the public sector.

As pointed out by Holmes and Smart (2009) there is evidence in the Associations studied that point out to the existence of partnerships of the type of Engagement, that is, those partnerships without predetermined objectives, but that also help to foster innovation through the interaction between agents and exchanges of experience.

Another aspect pointed out by Homes and Smart (2009) is the existence of partnerships with the public sector without purely economic purpose. This type of partnership indicates a search for legitimization of the activities carried out by the associations before the community. In this sense, it was identified, in the Associations a tension in the answers obtained regarding the participation and the collaboration of the collaborators and benefited ones, which affirms in practice the one pointed out by Fernandes (2014). More specifically, in one of the Associations, was reported the type of tension presented by Fernandes (2014) regarding local traditions and the professionalization demanded by the Third Sector.

4.1.2 Social Innovation Capabilities in Businesses Foundations

The Businesses Foundations presented positive results regarding the capacities of social innovation, contrary to what was expected. They presented agreement on four of the five factors analyzed: Facilitating Leadership, Intention to Innovate Socially, Democratic Management and Open Social Innovation, with the exception of the factor Co-creation of Social Innovation.

The Businesses Foundations studied showed agreement on the Facilitating Leadership Factor (4.1). A strong presence of participatory and democratic decisions was observed. However, no specific studies were

found on the role and profile of leadership in Businesses Foundations. The Foundations studied showed agreement with regard to the factor Strategic Intention to Innovate Socially (3,72). This intention occurs in an unstructured way and is inserted most often as processes of continuous improvement within the processes themselves (as Kaizens).

Although the results indicate that there is agreement related to the factor Strategic Intention of Socially Innovate, these do not contradict the one pointed out by Nogueira and Schommer (2009). For the authors, private social investments, in this study represented by the Businesses Foundations, do not have a clear focus and prioritize investments with greater return in image than those most needed by the population. In the Foundations studied it was not possible to find evidence that the focus of the investment is only on the image, since the Foundations have their own projects, not outsourcing this activity as pointed out by GIFE (2017) and by Borger, Miranda and Valadão (2007).

In this context, although the results obtained point to a management of internal process innovation and not to strategic management, it is not possible to say that the Businesses Foundations studied are only concerned with the impact of the image of their activities. In this sense, the work of these organizations is understood, in the literature, as being as relevant as the work carried out by non-Businesses Foundations and Associations.

The Foundations studied showed agreement regarding the Democratic Management factor (4.39). Among the determinant factors for the social innovation the Democratic Management is the one that showed the highest agreement among the Foundations. This factor is more expressive in Foundations compared to Associations and Social Businesses.

The autonomy in projects and activities in the Foundations is pointed out as very strong by the respondents of these organizations. From the results, it is possible to verify if this would be due to the proximity and the interaction between the Foundations studied and the supporting companies. Such proximity could help the maintainers bring more professional practices of people management to the Foundations. This assumption is based on the idea of Homes and Smart (2009) that there is an exploratory or directed exchange between any financing company and the funded Third Sector organization. Thus, the fact that the Businesses Foundation represents the Private Social Investment of a specific company would collaborate even more so that these exchanges happened.

Such specific practices were not raised by this research in a profound way, but it is possible to say that they are already valuable material for future research that wants to find ways to improve people management in non-Businesses Foundations and Associations, since organizational types are quite alike.

The Foundations studied showed agreement regarding the Open Innovation factor (4.0). In addition, the Foundations were the organizations with better agreement for open innovation as a determining factor for social innovation, obtaining equal score with Social Businesses. Both foundations reported participating in forums and networks of the sector, although they also pointed out that the focus of the forums is not social innovation. Thus, a posture different from that posed by Perret, Junqueira and Ferreira (2011) was observed. For these authors, the Businesses Foundations have a low level of information sharing. However, what was observed was the participation of the Foundations studied in networks and sector forums, which implies the exchange of information.

This observation makes it possible to verify that, contrary to what was raised in the literature, the studied foundations propose themselves to seek partnerships and to know realities of other entities of the sector. The foundations presented neutrality in relation to the factor Co-creation of social innovation (2,5), being the only factor in which the Foundations did not obtain agreement. The interactions with the beneficiaries take place through public consultations and opinion polls. However, it can be seen that they do not occur in all the projects and activities of the foundations studied, but only in those that have a very explicit strand of engagement.

In agreement with Nogueira and Schommer (2009) and Andion et al. (2010), it can be seen that the collaboration between the Foundations and the beneficiary communities is not a positive point. Although the process is not characterized exclusively top-down, as the authors point out, it is possible to identify that the relationship with communities, other than specific projects, is limited to feedbacks and management of indicators, far from the population.

However, it is important to note that, unlike that reported by Andion et al. (2010), the participation of the target public of the Foundations was not lower compared to the public participation from the Associations, which revealed surprisingly in this study. However, it can not be said that people are seen as beneficiaries / collaborators of the solution.

4.1.3 Capability for social innovation in Social Businesses

Among the organizational types studied, the Social Businesses group was the one that stood out the most having presented agreement with four of the five factors studied. Like the other organizational types, it also did not show agreement with the Co-creation factor of social innovation. However, it was the one that presented the highest agreement in this factor, being situated at the lower limit of the neutrality.

The social businesses studied were in agreement with the Facilitating Leadership Factor (4,56). It is important to notice that among all the eight organizations studied, Social Businesses were the ones that obtained the highest degree of agreement regarding this factor. This can be confirmed from the answers obtained in which it was observed that the decisions are usually taken in meetings and in a group.

In addition, it is possible to see an approach of the facilitator leader profile with the so-called 'hero entrepreneur' considered the entrepreneur and leader who is endowed with some skills such as enthusiasm, ability to improve the organization's performance, generation of commitment to the mission and to the organizational strategies (Nicholls, 2006, 2010).

The Social Businesses studied were in agreement with the Strategic Intention Factor of Socially Innovating (4,0). It is important to note that among all the eight organizations studied, Social Businesses were the ones that obtained the highest degree of agreement with regard to the factor.

However, the organizations studied do not present a systematization of this intention, which is seen as a natural consequence of the nature of the organization, such as acting in the area of technology or working directly with science. This result reinforces the arguments found in the literature. As can be illustrated by Jappe (2013) study, it is possible to perceive that given the demand of the consumer market and the hybrid nature of Social Businesses, Social Innovation arises as a necessity.

For Borzaga and Bodini (2012) and Mulgan (2006) there is a predisposition of companies with a social

mission to innovate socially. João (2014) further emphasizes that, in his study of Social Businesses, social innovation was found more often than other types of innovation, including technological innovation, with 40% of them starting with one innovation. Moreover, the organizations that have a social purpose were the ones that presented greater agreement with the Strategic Intention for socially Innovating.

Furthermore, the lack of capital has not been identified as a problem that impacts the intention to innovate socially, as pointed out by Smith, Gonin and Besharov (2013).

The Social Businesses studied were in agreement with the Democratic Management Factor (4.37). Although, as in the case of the Facilitating Leadership factor, the decisions are taken in groups, it has also been observed that an 'excess of democracy' can hinder the speed of meetings and the speed with which decisions are made. This is due to the pulverization of the decision power, so the time to reach consensus is greater than if the decision depended only on one person. In addition, a great presence of autonomy between the respondents was observed, at least with regard to the management of their activities.

Thus, it is understood that Social Businesses are the ones that come closest to participatory management, as already mentioned by João (2014), regarding collaboration and inclusion of all in the decision-making process, a key factor to leverage the Capability for social innovation.

The Social Businesses studied were in agreement with the Open Innovation Factor (4,00). It is important to note that among all the eight organizations studied, Social Businesses was the one that obtained the highest degree of agreement with regard to the factor, along with the Foundations.

In this way, it is also possible to observe that there is participation in network or in events by the studied Social Businesses. Among the organizations, Social Businesses were those that clearly identified the networks of which they are part of and the connection with social innovation. Here it is interesting to note that the Social Businesses are situated closer to the so-called grassroots social innovations than the Associations.

For Svirina, Zabbarova, and Oganisjana (2016), this approach is natural, although no evidence of the Social Businesses with economic focus has been found, this type of organization has a greater propensity for open innovation with regard to participation in forums etc, which one can not say in relation to the Co-Creation of social innovation.

The Social Businesses studied presented neutrality regarding the Factor Co-creation of social innovation (3,41). However, they were also the ones that presented the best concordance when compared to the Associations and the Businesses Foundations studied. In a very similar way to that observed in other organizational types, Social Businesses interact with its beneficiaries primarily through a feedback system or informally. In addition, organizations that have a social purpose were the ones that best scored in the Co-creation of social innovation, this fact is not in line with studies carried out by Comini, Barki and Aguiar (2012) and by João (2014).

In addition, contrary to what some authors (Iizuka; Varela & Larroudé, 2015) point out, the Social Businesses with a greater focus on the market, that is, profit oriented, showed a greater approximation with the beneficiaries/clients. It was also observed that the Social Businesses obtained a better agreement with this factor compared to the Associations and Businesses Foundations, which act in a more philanthropic way. It is believed that this difference is due to the need of the Social Businesses to sell their products or

services to their clients/beneficiaries. Therefore, it is necessary to deliver the product or service that best meets the clients' needs, at the risk of being penalized if it does not, which is not the case with the Associations and Foundations, since the project sponsors are not usually the beneficiaries.

Table 7 below presents the Factors of Social Innovation Capability of each type of organization studied.

Table 7. Summary of the Social Innovation Capability in non-profit organizations and Social Businesses

	Organizational Types		
Factor	Associations	Businesses Foundations	Social Businesses
Facilitating Leadership	The associations have neutrality in relation to the Facilitating Leadership factor. It was observed that the presence of a more rigid and centralized hierarchy in the associations studied contributed to this factor.	Agreement with the factor and strong presence of participatory and democratic decisions. Autonomy in project management was a highlight.	Among the organizational groups studied, Social Businesses were the ones that best scored on this factor. It was observed that most of the decisions are taken collectively. In addition, it is possible to see an approach of the facilitator leader profile with the so-called 'hero entrepreneur' considered the entrepreneur and leader who is endowed with some skills such as enthusiasm, ability to improve the performance of the organization, generation of commitment to the mission and with the organizational strategies
Strategic Intention to Innovate Socially	Possessing a philanthropic and assistentialist logic, social innovation is not a priority for associations.	Agreement with the factor, demonstrating that contrary to what the literature points out, there is a concern of corporate foundations to act in a systematic and strategic way in society, not only aiming a gain in image.	Although they have presented greater agreement with the factor than the other organizational types, the Social Businesses do not present a systematization of this intention, being seen as a natural consequence of the nature of the organization, as acting in the area of technology or working directly with science.

<p>Democratic Management</p>	<p>Although there are several problems with a strong hierarchy present, the associations show agreement with the factor. However, the associations were worse, comparatively, relative to the factor.</p>	<p>Among the determinant factors for social innovation the Democratic Management is the one that presented the highest (high) agreement among the Foundations. This factor is more expressive in Foundations compared to the Associations and Social Businesses. It is possible that the proximity to the maintainer company helps the foundations on having a more professional management of people than the other organizations studied.</p>	<p>The social affairs studied were in agreement with the Democratic Management Factor. Although decisions are taken as a group, it has also been observed that an ‘excess of democracy’ can hinder the speed of meetings and the speed with which decisions are made because of the pulverization of decision-making power. In addition, there was also a great presence of autonomy between the respondents, at least with regard to the management of their activities and projects.</p>
-------------------------------------	---	---	--

<p>Co-creation of Social Innovation</p>	<p>Contrary to expectations, the associations were the worst organizational group in this factor. The presence of grassroots social innovations or of any more systematic contact to understand the demands of its beneficiaries was not identified. Thus, it is understood that this result is due to the assistencialist and philanthropic logical still quite present.</p>	<p>Neutrality with respect to the factor, being the only one in which the Businesses Foundations did not obtain agreement. The interactions with the beneficiaries take place through public consultations and opinion polls. However, it can be seen that they do not occur in all the projects and activities of the foundations studied, but only in those that have a very explicit strand of engagement. However, the result was better in comparison to the associations, which shows a closer approximation of the foundations with their beneficiaries than was expected.</p>	<p>Although they presented neutrality in relation to the factor, Social Businesses were the organizational type that best scored on the factor. Here it is interesting to note that the Social Businesses are situated closer to so-called grassroots social innovations than Associations. In addition, contrary to what some authors have pointed out, the Social Businesses with a greater focus on the market, that is, for a lucrative purpose, demonstrated a greater approximation with the beneficiaries / clients.</p>
--	---	---	---

<p>Open Social Innovation</p>	<p>Presenting agreement with the factor, the associations seek partnerships with other civil society organizations, with companies and with the public power. Such partnerships take place with different objectives, such as fund-raising or seeking legitimacy before society.</p>	<p>The Foundations studied showed agreement regarding the Open Innovation factor. The Foundations studied reported participating in forums and networks of the sector, although they also pointed out that the focus of the forums is not social innovation. This result is also contrary to the literature, which points to a low level of information sharing by Businesses Foundations.</p>	<p>It is possible to observe that there is participation in network or in events by the studied Social Businesses. Among the organizations, Social Businesses were those that clearly identified the networks of which they are part and the connection with social innovation.</p>
--------------------------------------	--	--	---

Source: Prepared by the authors.

5. Considerations

The ability to create alternatives to social problems in a sustainable way can be understood as social innovation. Social Innovation is a way of equalizing social problems, as it is considered an option for the failures from the market, State and society. Thus, it presents itself as a possible and necessary alternative for the solution of the problems related to Sustainable Development, and especially for education.

From the research it was possible to identify that the factors Democratic Management and Open Social Innovation presented agreement in the three organizational types studied, Associations, Businesses Foundations and Social Businesses. This indicates that there may be in the Third Sector as a whole a preponderance of a more participatory management style that involves collaborators in the decisions and that operates in a transparent way.

The results allow to observe that in relation to the positive agreement of the factors Democratic Management and Open Social Innovation there is a predisposition of the Third Sector to act in a network. That is, to form partnerships with other organizations of the Third Sector, with companies and with the public power.

On the other hand, the Co-creation factor of Social Innovation did not present agreement in any group of

organizations studied. This means that Associations, Businesses Foundations and Social Businesses scored below 3.5 in the factor.

Such result shows that, although the organizations studied propose themselves to solve part of the education problem in Brazil, each one in its sphere, they do less than they should to approach the impacted people and, consequently, better understand what they could do to help in solving their problems.

It is important to notice that a tendency was observed that the greater the focus on direct financial benefits for the organization, the greater the approximation of these with its target public, whether in the case of Businesses Foundations or clients, in the case of Social Businesses.

The Associations, contrary to what was expected, presented a lower overall result in all the determinant factors for Capability of social innovation compared to the other organizations studied. This can be explained in part not because of informality (given that two of the three Associations are very old organizations, and two of them are internationally active), but to philanthropic logic, which aims to 'help others', but not in a systematic way so as to solve the roots of the problems.

With the research, it was possible to identify several aspects of the philanthropic / charitable logic, such as more centralized decisions, little contact with beneficiaries in the formulation and management of programs and projects, and low intention to innovate socially.

The factor in which the Associations obtained agreement was the Democratic Management factor. However, it can be said that the level of agreement was below expectations, which was found close to the lower limit of the scale.

In addition, the biggest surprise was the lack of observation of the so-called grassroots social innovations, so present in the literature. Out of the organizations studied, two work with more standardized projects, which prevents adaptation to local realities and the development of new ideas and initiatives. Nevertheless, the factor with low agreement indicated by the associations was the Co-creation of Social Innovation. This indicates that there is a low interaction of the organizations studied with the communities, people and clients impacted by their actions.

The Businesses Foundations also surprised in some ways. Being the organizational type with the lowest content in the literature, little was expected from them. The main idea was that as part of the Private Social Investment of the organizations, its action would be very superficial in solving social problems, when compared to Associations and Social Businesses, which was not confirmed by the results of this research. Its strongest point was Democratic Management, which even surpassed the Associations and Social Businesses, indicating that the management practices adopted by the Foundations are generating good results. Although there is no data that point directly to this, it is inferred that good democratic management can be the fruit of a proximity to the financing company, which has a greater professionalism in people management.

With regard to Democratic Management, it is also correct to say that 'autonomy' is the key word for Businesses Foundations. Practically all respondents point to autonomy as the main cause for democratic management. Autonomy is understood as the freedom of collaborators to make important decisions related to their own projects.

The Foundations, as well as other organizational types, also presented the Co-creation of Social Innovation

as the weakest factor. Contrary to what happened in the Associations, this result was expected in the Businesses Foundations, given that they have a history of distancing from their target audiences, with a strong foothold on philanthropy and in the creation of shared value.

The Social Businesses performed better than other organizational types in general, with special emphasis on profit-oriented Social Businesses. Contrary to what was observed in the literature, it was noticed that, probably for the sake of survival need in the market, the financially focused Social Businesses have more contact with their clients/beneficiaries. Co-creation being a way to guarantee the success of a given product. In addition, the factor with high level of agreement presented by the Social Businesses studied is the Facilitating Leadership. It is believed that this outcome is related to the profile of the social entrepreneur, or entrepreneurial hero, who is seen as a skilled and motivating person who leads social entrepreneurship. On the other hand, also to the other types of organization, Social Businesses obtained neutrality in relation to the Co-creation factor of Social Innovation. However, Social Businesses presented the best score for this factor. Although there is no agreement, it can be stipulated that the need to be close to the 'client' encourages Social Businesses to foster collaborative processes.

A comparison between the results of the Social Innovation Capability factors among the three different organizational types may point to possible paths for all in their quest for innovation.

It is concluded from this research that the determinant factors of the Capability of Social Innovation in the organizations studied served as a way of evaluating the organizations through different points of view, all of them converging towards the promotion of innovation.

The main limitation presented by this research is the low number of organizations willing to participate in the research, which limited the adoption of a quantitative methodology on the social innovation Capability of Associations, Foundations and Social Businesses.

When considering that one of the main problems of Associations, Businesses Foundations and Social Businesses refers to the collaboration with its beneficiaries/clients, it is suggested, for future studies, research that identifies ways to foster and facilitate collaboration among beneficiaries in organizations of the Third Sector.

In addition, it is suggested that future research study in depth the Social Innovation in Businesses Foundations considering the scarcity of this subject in the literature. Based on this research, it is believed that the potential of social innovation and resolution of social problems of the Businesses Foundations is underestimated but the importance of this type of organization for Sustainable Development is recognized.

6. References

Alfes, K., & Langner, N. (2017). Paradoxical leadership: Understanding and managing conflicting tensions to foster volunteer engagement. *Organizational Dynamics*, 46(2), 96–103.

Andion, C. Becker, Y. Pires, A. Victor, I., & Souza, L. (2010). Investimento Social Privado: uma forma de coprodução do bem público? *EnAPG – Grupo de Pesquisa em Sustentabilidade e Inovação*, 1–17.

Baggenstoss, S., & Donadone, J. C. (2013). Empreendedorismo Social: Reflexões Acerca do Papel das

Organizações edo Estado. *Gestão e Sociedade*, 7(16), 112–131.

Bignetti, L. P. (2011). As inovações sociais: uma incursão por ideias, tendências e focos de pesquisa. *Ciências Sociais Unisinos*, 47(1), 3–14.

Boff, L. (2012). *Sustentabilidade: o que é- o que não é*. 4. ed. Petrópolis: Ed. Vozes.

Borges, J. F., Miranda, R., & Valadão, V. M. J. (2007). O discurso das fundações corporativas: caminhos de uma “nova” filantropia? *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 47(4), 101–115.

Borzaga, C., & Bodini, R. (2012). What to Make of Social Innovation? Towards a Framework for Policy Development. *Social Policy and Society*.

BRASIL. Lei No. 10.406, de 10 de Janeiro de 2002. Available: <http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/2002/L10406.htm>. Access: 18th dez. 2017.

BRASIL. L9608. Available: <http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/19608.htm>. Access: 7th fev. 2018.

Chesbrough, H., & Minin, A. DI. (2014). Open Social Innovation. p. 189-188. In: Henry, C. *New Frontiers in Open Innovations*. Oxford Press: USA.

Cloutier, J. (2003). *Qu 'est-ce que l 'innovation sociale ?* Crises: Quebec.

Comini, G., Barki, E., & Aguiar, L. T. de. (2012). A three-pronged approach to social business: a Brazilian multi-case analysis. *Revista de Administração*, 47(3), 385–397.

Comini, G. M. (2016). *Negócios sociais e inovação social: um retrato de experiências brasileiras*. São Paulo: Universidade De São Paulo.

Dawson, P. M., & Daniel, L. (2010) Understanding social innovation: a provisional framework. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 51(1), 9-21.

Drucker, P. (1990). *Managing the non-profit organization*. HarperCollins Publishers: New York.

Estensoro, M. (2015). How Can Social Innovation be Facilitated? Experiences from an Action Research Process in a Local Network. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, 28, 527–545.

Fernandes, C. R. O. C. (2014). *Tecnologia Social: o Papel do Terceiro Setor no Fomento de Inovações*

para a Sociedade. Fundação Getúlio Vargas: Rio de Janeiro.

GIFE (2017). *Censo GIFE 2016*. São Paulo.

Gil, A. C. (2010). *Como Elaborar Projetos de Pesquisa*. São Paulo: Editora Atlas.

Googins, B. (2013). Social Innovation What It Is, Why It Matters And How It Can Be Accelerated. In: *Social Innovation: Solutions for a Sustainable Future*. Oxford, 89–98.

Gupta, A., Dey, A., & Singh, G. (2017). Open Innovation at Different Levels for Higher Climate Risk Resilience. *Science, Technology and Society*, 22(3), 388–406.

Holmes, S., & Smart, P. (2009). Exploring open innovation practice in firm-nonprofit engagements: A corporate social responsibility perspective. *R and D Management*, 39(4), 394–409.

IBGE - Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística. (2012). *As Fundações Privadas e Associações Sem Fins Lucrativos no Brasil 2010 (FASFIL)* Rio de Janeiro.

Iizuka, E. S., Varela, C. A., & Larroudé, E. R. A. (2015). Social Businesses Dilemmas In Brazil: Rede Astacase. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 55(4), 385–396.

Jappe, M. L. M. (2013). *Fatores Contributivos E Fatores Limitadores Para Negócios sociais No Brasil: um estudo exploratório nas regiões sul e sudeste*. [s.l.] Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul.

João, I. de S., & Galina, S. V. R. (2013). Práticas efetivas na geração da inovação social. *ALTEC – Congresso Latino-Iberoamericano de Gestão de Tecnologia*, São Paulo.

João, I. de S. (2014). *Modelo de gestão da inovação social para empresas sociais*. São Paulo: Universidade de São Paulo,

Kirwan, J., Ilbery, B., Maye, D., & Carey, J. (2013). Grassroots social innovations and food localisation: An investigation of the Local Food programme in England. *Global Environmental Change*, 23(5), 830–837.

Mañas, A. V., & Medeiros, E. E. de. (2012). Terceiro Setor: Um estudo sobre a importância no processo de desenvolvimento socio-econômico. *Perspectivas em Gestão & Conhecimento*, 2(2), 15–29.

Martin, R. L., & Osberg, S. (2014). Social Entrepreneurship: The Case for Definition. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 1–17.

Mulgan, G. (2006). The Process of Social Innovation. *Innovations Techonology Governance Globalization*, 1(2), 145-162.

Mulgan, G. (2010). Stanford Social Innovation Review Measuring Social Value. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, v. Summer, 38–43.

Murray, R., Caulier-Grice, J., & Mulgan, G. (2010). *The open book of social innovation*. London: The Young Foundation.

Nesta. (2007). *Innovation in Response to Social Challenges*. Policy Briefing, (March), 1–4.

Nicholls, A. (2006). *Social Entrepreneurship: New Models of Sustainable Social Change*. Oxford University Press: New York.

Nicholls, A. (2010). The legitimacy of social entrepreneurship: Reflexive isomorphism in a pre-paradigmatic field. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, New York.

Nidumolu, R., Prahalad, C. K., & Rangaswami, M. R. (2009). Why Sustainability Is Now the Key Driver of Innovation. *Harvard Business Review*, Setembro, 57–64.

Nogueira, F. D. A., & Schommer, P. C. (2009). Quinze anos de investimento social privado no Brasil : Conceito e práticas em construção. *XXXIII EnANPAD*, 1–16.

Nomura, T., & Kubota, Y. (2007). Social Innovation Management with Resonant Individuals' Insights. *PICMET 2007 Proceedings*, 483-492.

OECD. (2010). Social Entrepreneurship and Social Innovation. In: *Smes, Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 185–215.

ONU. Transformando Nosso Mundo: A Agenda 2030 para o Desenvolvimento Sustentável Preâmbulo, 2015.

Peng, D. X., Schroeder, R. G., & Shah, R. (2008). Linking routines to operations capabilities: A new perspective. *Journal of Operations Management*, 26(6), 730–748.

Perret, N., Junqueira, L., & Ferreira, R. (2011). Investimento Social Privado: O Papel das Fundações Corporativas na Gestão das Políticas Sociais Private Social Investment: Corporate Foundations Role. *REUNA*, 16(12), 121–138.

Phillips, W., Hazel, L., Ghobadian, A., O' Regan, N., & James, P. (2015). Social Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship: A Systematic Review. *Group & Organization Management*, 40(3), 428–461.

Phills, J. A., Deiglmeier, K., & Miller, D. T. (2013). Rediscovering Social Innovation. In: *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. v. Fall, 89–98.

Pol, E., & Ville, S. (2009). Social innovation: Buzz word or enduring term? *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 38(6), 878–885.

Salamon, L. M. (2010). Putting the civil society sector on. *Analys of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 81(2), 167–210.

Salimon, M. I., & Siqueira, M. V. S. (2013). Ideologia gerencialista e subjetividade do trabalhador no terceiro setor. *Revista de Administração*, 48(4), 643–657.

Santos, A. C. M. Z. dos. (2012). *O Desenvolvimento da inovação social: inibidores e facilitadores do processo: o caso de um projeto piloto da ONG Parceiros Voluntários*. Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos –Unisinos.

Seyfang, G., & Smith, A. (2007). Grassroots innovations for sustainable development: Towards a new research and policy agenda. *Environmental Politics*, 16(4), 584–603.

Silva, C. E. G. (2010). Gestão, legislação e fontes de recursos no terceiro setor brasileiro: uma perspectiva histórica. *Revista de Administração Pública*, 44(6), 1301–1325.

Silva Júnior, R. D., & Ferreira, L. D. C. (2013). Sustentabilidade na era das conferências sobre meio ambiente e desenvolvimento - um olhar para ecologia e economia. *Ambiente & Sociedade*, 16(1), 1–18.

Smith, W. K., Gonin, M., & Besharov, M. L. (2013). Managing Social-Business Tensions: A Review and Research Agenda for Social Enterprise. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 23(3), 407–442.

Soares, R. (2018). *Educação para o Brasil avançar Panorama da Educação Brasileira*. Ministério da Educação. Brasília.

Souza, W. J. de, & Carvalho, V. D. de. (2006). Elementos do comportamento organizacional no trabalho voluntário: motivação na Pastoral da Criança à luz da teoria da expectativa. *30º ENANPAD – Encontro Nacional de Pesquisa em Administração*. Bahia, setembro, 1-16.

Sugahara, C. R., & Jannuzzi, P. de M. (2005). Estudo de uso de fontes de informação para inovação

tecnológica na indústria brasileira. *Ciência da Informação*, 34(1), 45-56.

Sugahara, C. R., Jannuzzi, C. A. S. C., & Falsarella, O. M. (2018). Os componentes do ambiente e sua influência na geração da inovação nas organizações. *Revista da Micro e Pequena Empresa*, 12, 51-66.

Svirina, A., Zabbarova, A., & Oganisjana, K. (2016). Implementing open innovation concept in social business. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*. 2(20), 1-10.

Tachizawa, T. (2014). *Organizações Não Governamentais e Terceiro Setor: Criação de ONGs e Estratégias de Atuação*. 6. ed. São Paulo: Atlas.

Tavares, J. Q., & Fernandes, A. O. F. (2010). Terceiro setor e interesses coletivos: as alternativas sociais na busca da cidadania. *Sequência*, 31(60), 371–390.

Valladares, P. S. D. de A., Vasconcellos, M. A. de, & Di Serio, L. C.. (2014). Capacidade de inovação: Revisão Sistemática da Literatura Innovation Capability: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 18(3), 598–626.

Van Der Have, R. P., & Rubalcaba, L. (2016). Social innovation research: An emerging area of innovation studies? *Research Policy*, 45(9), 1923–1935.

Veiga, J. E. da. (2005). *Desenvolvimento sustentável : o desafio do século XXI*. Rio de Janeiro: Garamond,

Yunus, M., Moingeon, B., & Lehmann-Ortega, L. (2010). Building Social Businesses Models: Lessons from the Grameen Experience. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2-3), 309–325.