



# SOCIAL PARTNERSHIP AS A CONDITION OF MODERN BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT PARADIGM FORMATION



**Zhdanov V.I.,**

Ph.D. in Economics, Associate Professor of the Department of Macroeconomics and Public Governance, SHEE «Kyiv National Economic University named after Vadym Hetman»

**Kulbako M.S.**

Student of the Faculty of International Economics and Management, SHEE «Kyiv National Economic University named after Vadym Hetman»

**A** The article presents a methodology of social partnership models differentiation, their general operation characteristics and basic development fundamentals. Their classification was based on the type of social program and business activity integration; the sources of organizations' income were analyzed for their ranging. Three models of social partnership were described and principles of hybrid organizations separation were explained. International experience of mutual activities between business and social programs was analyzed. Modern state of the social partnership in Ukraine and possibilities for applying it in social policy model were defined. Particularities of «social entrepreneurship» term usage in Ukrainian practice were emphasized. Main directions of social partnership stimulation in socio-economic conditions of Ukraine were defined, relying on the foreign experience of the public governance tools and techniques for the development of their impact. Conceptual proposals for its development management were presented.

**K** Social partnership, social program, social entrepreneurship, social policy.

## СОЦІАЛЬНЕ ПАРТНЕРСТВО ЯК УМОВА ФОРМУВАННЯ ПАРАДИГМИ РОЗВИТКУ СУЧАСНОГО БІЗНЕСУ

**Жданов В. І.,**

кандидат економічних наук, доцент кафедри макроекономіки та державного управління ДВНЗ «Київський національний економічний університет ім. В. Гетьмана»

**Кульбако М. С.**

студентка факультету міжнародної економіки і менеджменту

ДВНЗ «Київський національний економічний університет ім. В. Гетьмана»

**A** У статті подана методологія розмежування моделей соціального партнерства та загальна характеристика їх функціонування, виявлені основні закономірності їх розвитку. За основу класифікації взято тип інтеграції соціальної програми та бізнес-активності, для ранжування організацій здійснено аналіз джерел їх доходів. Описано три моделі соціального партнерства, а також пояснено принципи виділення гібридних організацій. Наголошено на особливостях застосування терміну «соціальне підприємництво» в українській практиці. Проаналізовано світовий досвід форм взаємодії бізнесу із соціальними програмами. Окреслено сучасний стан соціального партнерства в Україні та його потенціал для використання в моделі соціальної політики. Виявлені основні бар'єри для розвитку соціального партнерства та шляхи їх подолання. Із врахуванням зарубіжного досвіду застосування органами державного управління інструментів та методів впливу на розвиток соціального партнерства визначено основні напрями його стимулювання в соціально-економічних умовах України. Надані пропозиції для управління його розвитком.

**K** Соціальне партнерство, соціальна програма, соціальне підприємництво, соціальна політика.

## СОЦИАЛЬНОЕ ПАРТНЕРСТВО КАК УСЛОВИЕ ФОРМИРОВАНИЯ ПАРАДИГМЫ РАЗВИТИЯ СОВРЕМЕННОГО БИЗНЕСА

**Жданов В. И.**

кандидат экономических наук, доцент кафедры макроэкономики и государственного управления ГВУЗ «Киевский национальный экономический университет им. В. Гетьмана»

**Кульбако М. С.**

студентка факультета международной экономики и менеджмента

ГВУЗ «Киевский национальный экономический университет им. В. Гетьмана»

**A** В статье представлена методология разграничения моделей социального партнерства и общая характеристика их функционирования, выявлены основные закономерности их развития. За основу классификации взяты тип интеграции социальной программы и бизнес-активности, для ранжирования организаций проведен анализ источников их доходов. Описаны три модели социального партнерства, а также объяснен принцип выделения гибридных организаций. Подчеркнуты особенности применения термина «социальное предпринимательство» в украинской практике. Проанализирован мировой опыт форм взаимодействия бизнеса с социальными программами. Определено современное состояние социального партнерства в Украине и его потенциал для использования в модели социальной политики. Определены основные барьеры для развития социального партнерства и пути их преодоления. С учетом зарубежного опыта применения органами государственного управления инструментов и методов воздействия на развитие социального партнерства определены основные направления его стимулирования в социально-экономических условиях Украины. Представлены предложения для управления его развитием.

**K** Социальное партнерство, социальная программа, социальное предпринимательство, социальная политика.

## Introduction

During recent decades, the tendency for business participation in social programs greatly increased in the whole world and it appears in different forms. Large corporations are engaged in corporate social responsibility, small and medium enterprises contribute directly to funding social initiatives, employment of disabled, homeless, etc. The distinction of models for mutual activities between business and social programs, their typology and analysis proved to be important steps towards the introduction of public policy instruments for influence this partnership development. Many countries have already used social partnership for solving social problems and, building economic and social public policy, they provide incentives for its development. In Ukraine, facing social problems rising and lack of public authorities' activities to resolve them, the issue of attracting businesses for social programs implementation appears.

### The level of the problem's research

World and Ukrainian science mainly deal with social entrepreneurship, however, there is no common approach to the essence of this category. Ukrainian economists did not conduct deep and systemic research in this field, just review articles occur. Foreign economists, who write about the interaction between the traditional business component and social programs, rely on such concepts as «social entrepreneurship», «social innovations», «hybrid organizations». There often take place descriptions of the models that have a dichotomy. They primarily include forms of «private» and «public» enterprises cooperation. Thus, L. Prefontaine, G. Bollecker, T. Nobre include in these business models public-private partnerships and the outsourcing of government functions. Such scientists as J.G. Dees, A. Ben-Ner, R. Dart, B.E. Landsberg, D.R. Young, A. Hoffman, K. Badiane, N. Haigh have limited their discussions of social enterprise to the field of non-profit management. In this case, dichotomy occurs between creation and redistribution of economic value. One of the most entrenched social dichotomies in the writings of R. Ramírez, L. Ple, X. Lecoq, J. Angot, M.E. Porter and M.R. Kramer – that of market participants being either consumers or producers (including intermediaries) – is breaking down as value co-creation allows consumers to participate in the production of their goods [1, p. 40]. Thus, the public authorities in

various countries base on the concept, which meets their economic realities in the best way.

### Statement of the problem

In order to maximize social result of business and social programs, affirmed by authorities, mutual activities, there is a necessity of methods and instruments of public governance and regulation governmental implementation. This causes an extreme importance of social partnership results and its priorities at national and municipal levels investigations and, consequently, working out of suggestions in order to implement them in government policy.

### Unsolved aspects of the general problem

For the moment, Ukraine needs to create national social partnership fundamentals and consideration its potential in social policy. There is a necessity of strict classification and differentiation, concerning types and methods, of mutual activities of business together with agents, responsible for social problems implementation and socially impressionable population groups' representatives. That is why the introduction in the article of the term "social partnership" is determining.

**The goal of this article** is to explain social partnership development principles in Ukraine and to suggest instruments of their public governance based on the analysis of their implementation results in international practice.

This research provided the execution of the following tasks: classification of social partnership models determining together with their functioning particularities analysis, methods and instruments of participation of business in social programs classification and differentiation, social partnership, as a component of social policy development fundamentals.

### Presentation of the basic material

For a long time the existence of organizations with commercial or social purposes was based on the assumption concerning independence between revenues and the social value creation. Accordingly, the necessity of business activities income creation could not significantly affect the improvement of social welfare. Most organizations, seeking to obtain social program and to receive commercial profit at the same time, had implemented a differentiated strategy. Nowadays we can be based

on the assumption that the vectors of social values and commercial revenue creation are not only opposite, but in some cases intensify each other.

A researcher K. Alter offers to apply the classification by type of social program and business activity integration for organizations that use business activities for social problems solving. The term «social program» identifies a system characterized by focus on solving particular social problem, with certain covered contingent, financial and organizational resources provision. The results of social programs mainly improve the level and quality of certain groups' life [3, p.70]. Based on these criteria, three models of interaction can be identified (Figure 1).



**Fig. 1. Classification models of social partnership**

Source: composed by the author by K. Alter [2, p.18]

Model 1, external – social partnership, in which economic activities of the entity are not directly related to social programs, but part of their income is directed to the implementation.

Model 2, integrated – social partnership, in which economic activities of the entity are based on the interaction with social program.

Model 3, embedded – social partnership in which the economic activities of the entity are implemented in the framework of social program.

The main features of the model №1 are commercialized business focus and the absence of the direct connection between the main business activities of the company and the social program for which it allocates funds. Cooperation based on this principle is carried out in different forms, which can be seen in the example of «Adidas». Funding of social programs can take place directly from the company's profits or by establishing charity funds. Thus, the Adidas Fund drives positive social changes by supporting organizations that connect children through sport programs. Additionally, forms of the model №1 represent products, which are sold to vulnerable groups at the cost value or are provided free, realization of additional activities (e.g. trainings, courses) within social program by company staff, sponsorship of social projects. «Reebok International» is the sponsor of the «Avon Walk»

action, aimed at overcoming breast cancer, «Adidas» exchange program facilitates the sharing of NGO's knowledge and opportunities in the field of sport; there are some projects, such as cleaning beaches, collecting shoes etc., in which Adidas employees take part as volunteers [4].

Common characteristics of companies, that deal at the model № 2, are: income from the production and sale of goods and services, that allows to cover the production costs (however, these enterprises can also raise grant funds); satisfaction of the disadvantaged groups' needs through direct use of their representatives in production or by selling them products (usually at a lower than market price). The main difference between the model № 1 and № 2 is that the enterprise in № 2 uses social resources in its business. Some enterprises may create social results by doing their business activities without having direct contact with groups that receive benefits from it (e.g., companies that recycle waste or produce clean energy). European business arranged in growing mushrooms on coffee waste, works within this model. «Chido's mushrooms» [5] is a social business in Berlin. Usage of raw material from coffee waste allows the German business to solve the problem of recycling and deforestation. In addition, it provides profits from the sale of mushrooms to restaurants.

All traditional businesses more or less demonstrate the social result as the useful result of any economic activity, which is reflected in the creation of conditions to meet basic social needs and goals of society. Companies that operate within the social partnership models create social benefits for such population groups or in such circumstances in which traditional companies are not interested to work.

Concerning the model № 3 we can achieve the functioning of social enterprises engaged in the activities within social programs. A strong network of either funding or otherwise contributing to their joint work and partnerships is the basis for their activities. The main activity of the companies in this model is manufacturing of social goods and services for target groups (e.g. microfinance of the low income population). And in this case it is the only non-profit. Costs of charity funds, governments, NGOs and private contributions usually are the sources of income for such enterprises.

«The Institute for One World Health» [6], the first nonprofit pharmaceutical company in the US, which had adapted entrepreneurial business model for delivering of drugs to the poorest population groups in developing countries proves the example of this model. They reformed the whole chain of medicines delivery, which before seemed to be unprofitable. The company's activities can not be called «business» in the Ukrainian classic sense of the word, because the company is not engaged in selling drugs. It has no income from the business, thereby has no profit and loss. It has only revenues and expenses. Thus, «The Institute for One World Health» is a social enterprise, but it cannot be called «social entrepreneurship» in Ukrainian. According to the most common definition, a social enterprise is an organization or initiative that marries the social mission of a non-profit or government program with the market-driven approach of a business [7].

The classification scheme proposed by K. Alter [2] can have ambiguous interpretation due to differences in the translation of the word «business». In English, it is possible to distinguish two main meanings: 1. An activity that someone is engaged in, Ukrainian synonym – «activities»; 2. Commercial activity [8]. It is difficult to identify which meaning the researcher referred to using that word. If the second meaning was used, the existence of such a model is not possible, and at the same time the term «social entrepreneurship» is not possible to use altogether. The terms «entrepreneurship» and «business» are the synonymous in Ukraine.

And the word «business» is treated as such, which necessarily means commercial activity [9, p.29; 10, p.103]. That is why business can not be social.

An alternative term, named «social partnership», is proposed. This means a wide range of methods and tools of business interaction included in the social programs, or with socially vulnerable and dependent groups and institutions based on the implementation of the mission, goals and motivation of businesses to participate in such programs.

In Ukraine the system of relations in social and labor sphere aimed at reconciliation and protection of employees' and employers' interests is called social partnership [11, p.457]. However, employees and employers have no partnership but already agreed economic activity and its results in their relations achieved by the so-called in Western literature, «social dialogue». As the partnership means mutually beneficial activities, the term «social partnership» corresponds to the nature of interaction models described above.

It should also be noted that hybrid forms may arise between the model №2 and №3.

K. Alter's suggests a range of different social enterprises as well as larger groups, «hybrid» organizations, classifications. It depends on the selected criteria and points of view. The main criteria that allows her to consider organization «hybrid» is a special mix of revenue (for-profit activities) and non-profit activities (non-profit activities). K. Alter separates companies within the group depending on the motive, accountability and use of income. The main criteria of «hybrid» group are a special mix of for-profit and non-profit activities. K. Alter organizes the companies in this group by degree of activity as it relates to: 1) motive, 2) accountability, and 3) use of income.

It is clear, that this classification is not correct. Clear criteria for hybridism nature and appropriateness of its use must be determined for adequate organizations differentiation. It is proposed to differentiate the organization based on the criteria discussed above - the degree of integration of social program and business activity. Thus, a source of income is more important than the ways of using it. Consequently, hybrid enterprise is, that combines features of the second and third models – specifically, the coincidence of business framework with the influence on social program and use of income from activities for its realization. An example is a zoo in Bangkok, that began production of high quality handmade paper and its products from elephant manure [2, p.17]. Thereby it can be seen that their work is based

on the interaction with social program (zoo cleaning, manure removal) and sale of products made from it generated income. Revenues are allocated for the implementation of social mission – funding of the Zoo development and the development of animal protection organizations. In this case, neither socially responsible business nor companies that practice social responsibility as «responsibility for their public benefit for all people and organizations» [11, p.54], nor non-profit organizations that have profitable activity will be hybrid organizations. Their business activity was not created for the implementation of social programs. For example, membership fees, sale of publications or products, advisory services, etc. can be a source of income for the NGOs, however, such activity does not involve the business approach and is not a form of enterprise.

#### CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SOCIAL PARTNERSHIP HYBRID ORGANIZATIONS PRINCIPLES [2, C. 14]

Table 1

TRADITIONAL NON-PROFIT	NONPROFIT WITH INCOME GENERATING ACTIVITIES	SOCIAL ENTERPRISE	SOCIALLY RESPONSIBLE BUSINESS	CORPORATION PRACTICING SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY	TRADITIONAL FOR-PROFIT
–	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mission Motive</li> <li>• Stakeholder Accountability</li> <li>• Income reinvested in social programs or operational costs</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Profit-making Motive</li> <li>• Shareholder Accountability</li> <li>• Profit redistributed to shareholders</li> </ul>		–

Fund activities aimed at achievement of economic and social results also may be described by the social partnership models. It is possible to determine, which model describes funds activities, based on the sources of funding. For example, «Acumen Fund, Inc.» invests in organizations creation that produce social goods and services. It works within the model № 2, because it has both commercial and non-commercial activities. The sources of funding for the Foundations usually are: private donations, free provided services, investment income, interest, dividends and income from investments connected with social program. Funds that works within the model № 3 are established only as a non-profit, for instance, Elena Pinchuk ANTIAIDS Foundation.

In many countries, the development of social partnership is hampered by a number of barriers, caused by not adapted of maintaining social programs enterprises legal frameworks and tax law, problems in rising of financial resources and access to markets existence, lack of understanding by agents involved in partnership, key economic and social benefits of such business. So, such enterprises' particularities, prove that implementation of social programs is not adapted for them. Therefore, an important task for governments is to arrange such business environment that will encourage business for participation in social programs (the model № 1 and № 2). Social partnership popularization among public administrators, business representatives, social enterprises' special legal forms and the

status of non-profit organizations, financial resources accumulation for enterprises in the different models are the key approaches to stimulate development. Accumulation of resources in the model № 2 is possible by creating investment funds and other mutual funding schemes that provide funds for social projects. Charities, cooperating by grant programs, etc. may help to raise the funds for the model № 3. Jeun'ESS initiative is an example of policy for the social partnership development. It was launched in France in June 2011 as a public-private partnership between a number of ministries and six enterprises and foundations from the social economy sector. It is based on three pillars: 1) the promotion of the social economy among young people, particularly through the education system; 2) initiatives for young people in the social economy; and 3) the integration of young people in the enterprises of the social economy [12].

The EU funds had played a key role in the development of social partnership in Poland in 2007-13, in particular, «The Human Capital Operational Programme», «The Operational Programme Fund for Civic Initiatives», which created start-up grants for entrepreneurs setting up social cooperatives and other non-financial support specifically aimed at social economy initiatives [12].

Governments strongly encourage investments in socially important business projects. In the UK, for example, companies that deal with socially useful activity can get Community Investment Tax Relief. This measure initiated to

encourage investment in socially disadvantaged areas. Up to 5% of the amount invested annually deducted from taxable income for up to 5 years [13].

The European Commission adopted the «Social Business Initiative» in 2011, with the aim of social partnership development. The Social Business Initiative set up a financial instrument of 90 million euros to improve social businesses' access to funding, introduced an investment priority for social enterprises in the regulations ERDF (European Regional Development Fund) and ESF (European Social Fund), as proposed in the regulatory package on the Structural Funds 2014-2020, simplified the implementation of rules concerning state aid to social and local services that would directly benefit a number of social businesses [14].

Ukrainian experience of social partnership is not as rich as the experience of European countries or the US, but every year a number of business initiatives that aimed at solving of social problems is increasing. Social partnership in Ukraine is represented in different models forms. For example, there are few number of small and medium-sized that operate within the model of «hybrid» by employing socially vulnerable people: enterprise «Vygodna» (Zhitomir), «Zlagoda» (Kramatorsk), Fund «The Way Home» (Odessa), social bakery «Horikhovyi Dim» [15]. However, the value added created by them in Ukraine is less than 1% of GDP.

Large national companies and branches of foreign multinational corporations implement social programs within the model №1. Thus, «DTEK» holding company uses various forms of social support, including financial, for those who are in difficult situations. However, the strategic priority for company is to support social projects and programs of local governments. The «DTEK» is forming relationships with local communities, involving local authorities and inhabitants in development of social programs and evaluation of their effectiveness. «DTEK» enterprises have their Social Partnership Declaration [16].

Large enterprises, especially of heavy industry, make a big emphasis on social programs for those regions, where they place the plants. Some companies implement social projects by providing free goods or services. Ukrainian postal service «Nova Poshta» gives volunteer organizations and initiative groups an opportunity to send and receive humanitarian cargoes free of charge in any branch of the company. More than

44 thousand parcels with a total weight of more than 7 thousand tones have been sent for the first year [17].

An analysis of the current situation shows that the model №1 in the form of social responsibility is most widespread. Despite the advantages, it has a significant weakness. Business, which directs a part of profits on social projects or programs in the form of charity often does so due to commercial interests (for example, to increase the population or the government loyalty). Social activity of the companies that allocate financial resources and have no responsibility for its usage does not lead to sustainable cooperation and durable connection between partners.

The model № 3 demonstrates the best social interaction. But «embedded» model do not raise the interest of agents that effect the funding of its activities. Accordingly, these agents do not have a confidence in the results of social projects and do not have ability to formulate expectations.

Dependence on external resources makes this model less stable in the case of the need to change strategy, makes long-term planning impossible. In Ukraine, these drawbacks are even more notable due to the lack of appropriate traditions and level of society development. It is too early to talk about such enterprises managing development. However, it's time to think about creating the conditions for such development.

A range of programs, concerning peoples' social providing and living level increasing in Ukraine realizes the Ministry of Social Policy. There is not foreseen private business participation within social partnership for social initiatives fulfillment in state programs for the moment. The Law of Ukraine «About state social standards and state social guarantees» also does not foresee such participation.

Encouraging private business into mutual activity, government might not only reduce weight of institutions, realizing social functions, but also achieve more efficient result in social programs implementation. For example, one of main directions in Ministry of Social Policy activities is disabled social, working and professional rehabilitation. Among instruments, central government is implementing for tasks solution in this direction, the most typical and widespread is pension's payments. But social policy arranged within such principles, can not cause long run social effect: firstly, money allowances do not stimulate disabled to develop and look for professional rehabilitation ways; secondly, the

economy loses a part of labor force and budget funds. The described model № 2, just a business, which might use labor of disabled, providing them with adequate conditions for socializing and professional realization together with salary, could be the base of policy, aimed at people with restricted opportunities social providing. Its social and economic effects are proven by worlds' experience [18].

Social partnership development in Ukraine governance has to be based on personal interest searching between key mutual activity agents – business and sociality. Their interest is based on activity results maximization and, speaking about their encouragement into mutual activity it is necessary to peak attention at development potential, which may increase all partners. But, the force of that interest (together with strength of such relations) varies in different models. In the first one the interest of business is no direct and weak. The search for such interest in the third one is hard to distinguish because of constant problem of external resources bringing in existence. Only the second model gives business an opportunity to receive additional profits, conducting direct interest in mutual activity within the social program. The most prospective in modern conditions of Ukraine's social and economic development is the second model, which functioning allows all social partners to gain. After achievement of both first models functioning satisfactory state the special attention may be paid to third one development.

Thus, in Ukraine enterprises and businessmen may include in expenditures eleemosynary payments to nonprofit organizations not more than 4% of gross profit for the previous year [19]. In other countries, such as the USA and Europe, it is allowed to finance charity up to 10% from gross profit (in Latvia even up to 20%) [20]. That is why an incensement of this share gives more opportunities for social partnership development. But, under Ukrainian circumstances we have to guarantee the target funds allocation, because it's extremely large share without adequate control may cause fictitious charity increase and tax payments deviation. For those means the legislation used to set a target or privileged charity funding recipients in the world practice. Usually they are institutions, financing from central or local budgets, together with charity funds. That is why it is worthwhile to increase maximal level of such payments up to 10-15% together with its simultaneous control of funding more then

modern 4% level in order to achieve social partnership development in Ukraine priorities. That one level is explained by average nominal profitability in Ukrainian economy. After changes to Ukrainian Tax Code in 2014 the limit of 4% of gross income was eliminated for eleemosynary payments for antiterrorist operation [21]. All enterprises without any limits may include in gross expenditures eleemosynary payments for needs of antiterrorist operation, Armed Forces of Ukraine, National Guard, National Safety Service, State Border Service, Internal Affairs Ministry and other institutions, financed for State budget.

The Ukrainian Tax Code does not provide for any other cases of expenditures level for charity, which may be included in enterprise gross expenditures. They have no opportunity to privileged payments as a share of gross profit. But such practice is introduced in many other countries. For example, Armenia allows to fund charity up to 0,25% of gross income, France and Germany up to 0,5%, Serbia up to 5% [20].

An opportunity to exclude from revenues social programs funding encourage social partnership. According to this we can increase the social effect from enterprises participation in social programs by means of public regulation and governance.

A lot of enterprises, functioning within the model №2 are rather efficient. But all of them meet with a problem of starting resources allocation at the first stage. This problem may be solved by investment in socially oriented business recourses of private pension funds. Thus, it is possible to suggest private pension funds sending for business projects realization, included in social programs activities. They may be: creation of enterprises for socially not protected population engagement, wastes processing business, alternative energy sources processing, and projects linked with food security, healthy fees and so on.

It is important to formulate social partnership interest among youth. For example, it is possible to suggest for main faculties students taking part in analysis and discussion of cases, concerning business participation in social programs. Their solving, taking into consideration foreign experience together with Ukrainian ones may give students understanding of social partnership models principles understand key differences between conditions of social business development in Ukraine and abroad, together with forecasting

of possible domestic social partnership development ways.

### Conclusions

Foreign experience may demonstrate the effectiveness of social partnership in social problems solutions. By means of inclusion of private business into implementation of social programs, governments may avoid general power overvaluation, which are responsible for specific social functions, more operative and persistently react at local problems of population, develop spheres and regions, remaining unprofitable for traditional business. For the moment, public governance institutions in Ukraine do not evaluate social partnership opportunities within those models of social policy implementation and economic policy as a whole. That is why fundamental tasks for the government we can state are next: firstly, social policy implementation principles overview and to arrange it

according to the economically developed countries trends, which ensure implementation of private business component for social programs implementation; secondly, to search for governmental policy, which may increase social partnership potential and to direct it to main tasks of social sphere solutions. In modern economic conditions according to formulated in our mentality reasons, the most prospective is the model № 2, giving an opportunity to private business to receive income within the framework of social problem solution. Its stimulation may cause issues for other social policy models development.

That is why further developments, concerning relations between government institutions, business and socially dependent population parts is needed to be based on social programs effectiveness, in order to conduct different instruments of public governance concerning forecasting their value for Ukraine.

1. Grassl W. Business Models of Social Enterprise: A Design Approach to Hybridity / Wolfgang Grassl // ACRN Journal of Entrepreneurship Perspectives, 2012, p. 37–60.
2. Alter S. K. Social Enterprise Typology. Virtue Ventures LLC. Nov. 27, 2007, p. 124.
3. Makarova O. V. Social policy in Ukraine: Monograph / O. V. Makarova; Institute of Demography and Social Studies. Ptukha MV NAS of Ukraine. – K., 2015. – 244 p.
4. «Adidas Group» official website [electronic resource] – Access: <http://www.adidas-group.com/en/sustainability/community-engagement/projects/>
5. «Chido's mushrooms» official website [electronic resource] – Access: <http://chidos.eu/>
6. PATH [electronic resource] – Access: <http://www.path.org/>
7. What is Social Enterprise? [electronic resource] – Access: <https://socialenterprise.us/about/social-enterprise/>
8. Oxford dictionaries [electronic resource] – Access: <http://www.oxford-dictionaries.com/definition/english/business>.
9. Osovska G. V. Fundamentals of Management: Textbook. 3rd Edition, revised and enlarged. / G. V Osovska, O. A Osovskyy – K.: «Condor», 2006. – 664 p.
10. Ivanilov O. S. Enterprise economy: textbook. [For the studio. HI. teach. bookmark.] / O. S Ivanilov – K.: Center of educational literature, 2009. – 728 p.
11. Social Responsibility: Theory and Practice Development: Monograph / [A. M. Kolot, O. A. Grishnova et al.] by scientific editorship of Doctor of Economic Sciences A. M. Kolot. – K.: KNEU, 2012. – 457 s.
12. Policy Brief on Social Entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurial Activities in Europe [electronic resource] – Access: [http://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/Social%20entrepreneurship%20policy%20brief%20EN\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/Social%20entrepreneurship%20policy%20brief%20EN_FINAL.pdf).
13. Social Investment Tax Relief (SITR) [electronic resource] – Access: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/298220/Social\\_investment\\_tax\\_relief\\_SITR\\_draft\\_guidance.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/298220/Social_investment_tax_relief_SITR_draft_guidance.pdf).
14. Unlocking the Potential of Social Enterprise & Entrepreneurship [electronic resource] – Access: [http://www.socialenterprise.ie/gfx/uploads/textbox/SEETF\\_Submission\\_to\\_Forfas.pdf](http://www.socialenterprise.ie/gfx/uploads/textbox/SEETF_Submission_to_Forfas.pdf).
15. Social Entrepreneurship in Ukraine [electronic resource] – Access: <http://socialbusiness.in.ua/>
16. Social Partnership Declaration of DTEK [electronic resource] – Access: [http://www.dtek.com/library/file/deklaratsija-sotsialjnogo-partnerstva-ukr-2013-06-19\\_1.pdf](http://www.dtek.com/library/file/deklaratsija-sotsialjnogo-partnerstva-ukr-2013-06-19_1.pdf).
17. «Nova Poshta» [electronic resource] – Access: [https://novaposhta.ua/humanitarian\\_post](https://novaposhta.ua/humanitarian_post).
18. The State of Social Entrepreneurship – Impact of Social Enterprises [electronic resource] – Access: [http://www.seforis.eu/upload/reports/6\\_Impact\\_of\\_Social\\_Enterprises.pdf](http://www.seforis.eu/upload/reports/6_Impact_of_Social_Enterprises.pdf).
19. Tax Code of Ukraine [electronic resource] – Access: <http://zakon3.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2755-17/page>.
20. New Tax Code reduced the charges for benefactors [electronic resource] – Access: [http://www.ukrrudprom.ua/digest/Noviy\\_Nalogoviy\\_kodeks\\_umenshil\\_otchisleniya\\_dlya\\_blagotvoriteley.html](http://www.ukrrudprom.ua/digest/Noviy_Nalogoviy_kodeks_umenshil_otchisleniya_dlya_blagotvoriteley.html).
21. Law of Ukraine «On Amendments to the Tax Code of Ukraine on some issues of charitable assistance taxation» from 02.09.2014 [electronic resource] – Access: <http://zakon5.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1668-18>.

1. Grassl W. Business Models of Social Enterprise: A Design Approach to Hybridity / Wolfgang Grassl // ACRN Journal of Entrepreneurship Perspectives, 2012, p. 37–60.
2. Alter S. K. Social Enterprise Typology. Virtue Ventures LLC. Nov. 27, 2007, p. 124.
3. Макарова О. В. Соціальна політика в Україні: Монографія / О. В. Макарова; Ін-т демографії та соціальних досліджень ім. М. В. Птухи НАН України. — К., 2015. — 244 с.
4. Офіційний сайт «Adidas Group» [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <http://www.adidas-group.com/en/sustainability/community-engagement/projects/>
5. Офіційний сайт «Chido's mushrooms» [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <http://chidos.eu/>
6. PATH [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <http://www.path.org/>
7. What is Social Enterprise? [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <https://socialenterprise.us/about/social-enterprise/>
8. Oxford dictionaries [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/business>.
9. Осовська Г. В. Основи менеджменту: Підручник. Видання 3-є, перероблене і доповнене. / Г. В. Осовська, О. А. Осовський – К.: «Кондор», 2006. – 664 с.
10. Іванілов О. С. Економіка підприємства: підруч. [для студ. вищ. навч. закл.] / О. С. Іванілов — К.: Центр учбової літератури, 2009. – 728 с.
11. Соціальна відповідальність: теорія і практика розвитку: монографія / [А. М. Колот, О. А. Грішнова та ін.]; за наук. ред. д-ра екон. наук, проф. А. М. Колота. – К.: КНЕУ, 2012. – 457с.
12. Policy Brief on Social Entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurial Activities in Europe [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: [http://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/Social%20entrepreneurship%20policy%20brief%20EN\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/Social%20entrepreneurship%20policy%20brief%20EN_FINAL.pdf).
13. Social Investment Tax Relief (SITR) [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/298220/Social\\_investment\\_tax\\_relief\\_\\_SITR\\_\\_draft\\_guidance.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/298220/Social_investment_tax_relief__SITR__draft_guidance.pdf).
14. Unlocking the Potential of Social Enterprise & Entrepreneurship [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: [http://www.socialenterprise.ie/gfx/uploads/textbox/SEETF\\_Submission\\_to\\_Forfas.pdf](http://www.socialenterprise.ie/gfx/uploads/textbox/SEETF_Submission_to_Forfas.pdf).
15. Соціальне підприємництво в Україні [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <http://socialbusiness.in.ua/>
16. Декларація соціального партнерства компанії ДТЕК [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: [http://www.dtek.com/library/file/deklaratsija-sotsialjnogo-partnerstva-ukr-2013-06-19\\_1.pdf](http://www.dtek.com/library/file/deklaratsija-sotsialjnogo-partnerstva-ukr-2013-06-19_1.pdf).
17. Сайт компанії «Нова пошта» [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: [https://novaposhta.ua/humanitarian\\_post](https://novaposhta.ua/humanitarian_post).
18. The State of Social Entrepreneurship – Impact of Social Enterprises [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: [http://www.seforis.eu/upload/reports/6\\_Impact\\_of\\_Social\\_Enterprises.pdf](http://www.seforis.eu/upload/reports/6_Impact_of_Social_Enterprises.pdf).
19. Податковий кодекс України [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <http://zakon3.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2755-17/page>.
20. Новый Налоговый кодекс уменьшил отчисления для благотворителей [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: [http://www.ukrtdprom.ua/digest/Noviy\\_Nalogoviy\\_kodeks\\_umenshil\\_otchisleniya\\_dlya\\_blagotvorateley.html](http://www.ukrtdprom.ua/digest/Noviy_Nalogoviy_kodeks_umenshil_otchisleniya_dlya_blagotvorateley.html).
21. Закон України «Про внесення змін до Податкового кодексу України щодо деяких питань оподаткування благодійної допомоги» від 02.09.2014 р. [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <http://zakon5.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1668-18>.

Submitted: 25.11.2015