

. . - Юлиан Нарлев



(2002; 2011).

2005; Brown 2010; Alter, Egan 2011).

1.

1.1.

(Spreckley 1981).

XIX (Perez 2009; Kyrö 2006).

(Dees, Emerson 2001; Varbanova 2009; 2014).

(Mair 2002; Smith 2000; Rogers 2013; Van de Ven 2011).

1)

... : , , , -
... , -
... .
... ,
... :
... -
... -
... , ...
... 2)
... -
... (2002).
... , -
... -
... ,
... -
... -
... ;
... ;
... ;
... ;
... ” -
... -
(2011).
... , , , , ,
... , , , , ,
... .

Bruder, 2015).

(Hulg rd 2010;

;

”

;

,

(European Communication Journal 2014).

,

)

”

” (http://www.webapi.eesc.uropa.eusocialenreprise.org.bg 2016).

”

1.3.

(www.ngobg.info 2015),

1885 .

1999

4000

(www.nsi.bg 2015).

1.1

2014 .

	3 282	16%
	1346	20%
	1312	10%
	1196	11%
	464	18%
	349	9%
	238	14%
	149	15%
	140	13%

: <http://www.ngobg.info>, , 2014.

1.2

2014 .

	(%)
	12%
	11%
	11%
,	8%
,	6%
	6%
	5%
	5%
	5%
	4%
	4%
	25%

: <http://www.ngobg.info>, , 2014.

() .

(www.usaid 2015) 2012 . , -

- , -

. 2

2010 – 2013 ., 7,8 2013

, 23% 2010 . -

35% 2013 . ,

- ,

(2014).

(www.ngobg.info, 2015)

10 000 . -

” ” -

(www.bcnl.org 2015) , 2012 . -

Timeheroes, -

2015 . -

300 (. ” ” -

2014 .) 6000 . -

2013 . -
 , , , , , -
 , . -
 , . -
 (www.usaid 2015) 2014 . -
 ” -
 ”, -
 . -
 2014 . -
 , ” -
 ” -
 . ” -
 ”, (www.unicef.bg
 2015).

Teahouse (www.indigogo.com/project/social-teahouse 2015). -
 , , , , , -
 , , , , , -
 . -
 (), -
 . -
 , ” -
 ”, -
 . -

() , 2013 2015 .
 2013 .
 2013 .
 2014 .
 EVN
 (www.ngobg 2015).
 2012 .
 : ,
 , ,

2012 年，
(www.cafonline.org 2015)。

145-

13%

150

5%

2014 年

60%

2013 年

30%

1.4.

(www.usaid.gov 2015) 1999

(1.3).

3

Society Capital 2013) (Alter, Egan 2011), Big Society Capital (Big
(),

2014 .

	2.3
	4.3
	4.4
	2.7
	3.2
	3.2
	3.3
	3.3

: <http://transition.usaid.gov/location/europe>, 2014.

,
 : ,
 , , , ,
 , .
 (1,0 3,0), (3,0 5,0) -
 (5,0 7,0).
 (). -
 ,
 : 2007 . -
 3,1 , 2014 . 3,3. -
 2011 . - 3,4 .
 , ,
 - , -
 , , -
 , , -
 .

(, ,)

“ ”

(, , , ,)

),


:

“ ”

:

:

(1.1).



. 1.1.

:

2014.

:

•

,

.

-

-

-

;

,

;

-

;

.

-

•

.

-

.

•

.

-

,

.

,

,

-

.

,

•

.

-

-

.

-

.

,

.

,

-

,

.

-

,

-

-

.

.
 ,
 - ,
 .
 (,
),
 , , ,
 , (. . .
).
 - ,
 . ,
 - ,
 ,
 . - ,
 , , ,
 , - ,
 , , ,
 .
 - ,
 .
 (,)
 , ,


2.

2.1.

4

.35, .9

()



. 2.1.

)

,

,

.

,

-

-

.

.

-

-

,

()

-

-

:

,

,

,

6

.

-

:

,

,

-

-

-

..”

”

:

-

-

.

,

7

.

6

-

,

-

-

7

,

,

()

-

-

:”

-

”

,

-

,

,

-

(),

-

,

– SPSS 16,0.

2013 – 2016 .


2.2.

80%

20%

(80%)

90%



.2.2.

(. ”)
”.

” ”
2.2.

	-
,	
-	
-	

: .
 - , -
 -
 ” ”
 - . -
 - ,
 -
 , (-
), ,
 : 90% -
 70% , -
 , ,
 , ,
 . ,

2.5.

2.5

()

		-	-		
	2 (10%)	4 (20%)	3 (15%)	3 (15%)	8 (40%)
	7 (35%)	6 (30%)	1 (5%)	2 (10%)	4 (20%)
	5 (25%)	3 (15%)	1 (5%)	3 (15%)	8 (40%)
	5 (25%)	5 (25%)	2 (10%)	2 (10%)	6 (30%)
	3 (15%)	8 (40%)	1 (5%)	.	8 (40%)
()	8 (40%)	7 (35%)	1 (5%)	.	4 (40%)
	6 (30%)	7 (35%)	1 (5%)	.	6 (30%)
	5 (25%)	4 (20%)	1 (5%)	2 (10%)	8 (40%)
	4 (20%)	6 (30%)	3 (15%)	1 (5%)	6 (30%)

:

(

).

2/3

(2.6).

2.6

	()
()	
, ()	
/ ()	
() -	
) ,	
()	

(-0,88, -0,78).

2.8). (2.7,

2.7

		17	3	0
		2	0	0
		1	0	0

(P - -0,00; V - -0,78).

10 %

70%
30% -

(2.10).

2.10

” ”

	9	45,0	47,4	73,7
-	5	25,0	26,3	26,3
-	4	20,0	21,1	94,7
	1	5,0	5,3	100,0
	19	95,0	100,0	
	1	5,0		

:

-

,

,

,

,

-

-

-

-

-

		-	-		
	8 (40%)	8 (40%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	2 10%
-	7 (35%)	10 (50%)	1 (5%)	·	2 (10%)
-	6 (30%)	11 (55%)	2 (10%)	·	1 (5%)
-	9 (45%)	7 (35%)	3 (15%)	·	1 (5%)
-	10 (50%)	5 (25%)	4 (20%)	·	1 (5%)
	2 (10%)	11 (55%)	3 (15%)	1 (5%)	3 (15%)
	8 (40%)	9 (45%)	·	2 (10%)	1 (5%)
	2 (10%)	3 (15%)	6 (30%)	7 (35%)	2 (10%)
	·	2 (10%)	7 (35%)	3 (40%)	8 (15%)

:

” ” -
 , - :
 -
 -
 , -
 9. 10% , -
 -
 (2.12.).
 2.12

	8	40,0	53,3	53,3
-	5	25,0	33,3	86,7
-	1	5,0	6,7	93,3
	1	5,0	6,7	100,0
	15	75,0	100,0	
	5	25,0		
	20	100,0		

:

 9
), () (-

，
-
，
()
-
”
”
；
；
-
-
，
，
，
90%
-
，
，
，
-
-
，
，
，
-
-
，
”

2.4.

40%

.

-

,

-

.

,

(

-

-

)

,

.

,

-

,

”

”

-

”

”

-

,

,

;

-

,

-

,

,

.

,

,

,

(

)

-

,

.

-

.

.

-

,

-

,

-

-

,

,

,

,

,

-

.

,

,

-

,

,

,

-

.

. 70%

-

,

-

.

():

(),

, . . .

.

.

,

,

,

,

.

.

,

,

.

. ()

(

),

(

: -

),

.

-

,

.

,

,

,

.

- , -

,

,

,

” ”

—

,

,

,

,

(,)

,

,

,

,

” ”

—

,

,

” ”

,

,

,

,

“ ”
 () - -
 () .
 , ,
 ,
 , -
 ; -
 , .
 , -
 . -
 , -
 , , . -
 , , , -
 , , -
 , , -
 , , -
 , , -
 , . -
 , , -
 , , -
 , , -
 , , -
 , . -
 , , -
 , , -
 . , . -
 , , . -
 .

XX

XXI

•

•

•

•

()

1. , . - , (). // , 1, 2000.
2. , . : - , 2011.
3. , . : . , 2010.
4. , . : , 2002.
5. , . : , 2001.
6. // , 81, 2000.
7. -
8. , „ . : , 2014. -
9. : , 2005. -

9. , „ . , . . : , 2014.
10. . : 2014.
11. , . : , 2016.
12. , . // , 5, , 2006.
13. , . : „ , , - ”. : - , 2014.
14. Alter, C., Egan, M. Logic modeling: A tool for critical thinking in social work practice. // *Journal of Social Work Education*. Vol. 33, 1, 2011.
15. Big Society Capital. Mapping Outcomes for Social Investment. // *The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, Vol. 1, 1, 2013.
16. Bruder, O. The four Lenses Strategic Framework: Toward an integrated Social Enterprise Methodology. // *Social Policy and Administration Journal*, Vol. 22, 87, 2015.
17. Drayton, B. The Citizen Sector: Becoming as Competitive and Entrepreneurial Business. // *California Management Journal*, Vol. 2, 3, 1982.
18. Brown, M. Keeping scope: using the right metrics to drive world class performance. New York: Quality Resources, 2010.
19. Dees, G. Social Enterprise: Private initiatives for the common good. Working Paper Series No. 9-395-116, Harvard Business School, 1994.
20. European Commission Communication Journal, Vol. 690, 2014.
21. Hulgård, L. Discourses of Social Entrepreneurship. // European Research Network, 2010, base.socioeco.org/docs/wp_10-01_hulg_rd_web_.pdf
22. Kyrö, P. Entrepreneurships Paradigm Building – towards a discipline. (http://www.uta.fi/entrenet/hankerekisteri/hanke2_paradigm.htm).
23. Mair, J. Entrepreneurial Behavior in a Large Traditional Firms: Exploring Key Drivers. IESE Business School, University of Navarra. Research Paper 466, 2002.
24. Perez, C. The double bubble at the turn of the century: technological roots and structural implications. // *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, Vol. 33, 2009.
25. Rogers, E. Diffusion of Social Innovation. New York: Free Press, 2013.
26. Sen, A. Social Entrepreneurship as a performance landscape. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

27. Smith, A. The Theory of Moral Sentiments. New York: Prometheus Books, 2000.
28. Spreckley, F. Social Enterprise Planning Toolkit. British Council, 1981.
29. Varbanova, L. Social Entrepreneurship (<http://www.labforculture.org/en/resourses-for-research/contens/research-in-focus/social>).
30. Van de Ven, A. Central Problems in the Management of Social Innovation. // Management Science Journal, Vol.32, 5, 2011.
31. Westley, F. The Social Innovation Dynamic and Social Innovation Generation. // The Innovation Journal, Vol. 308, 12, 2012.

32. <http://www.bcnl.org>
33. <http://www.nsi.bg>
34. <http://www.ngobg.info>
35. <http://www.eescuropa.eusocialentreprise.org.bg>
36. <http://www.webapi.escuropa>
37. <http://usaid.gov>
38. <http://www.developmentgoals.org>
39. <http://www.cafonline.org>
40. <http://www.eufunds.bg>

A STUDY OF SOCIAL ENTERPRISES AND SOCIAL INNOVATION IN THE NON-COMMERCIAL SECTOR

Chief Assist. Prof. Dr Yuliyan Narlev

Abstract

The social enterprises and social innovation in the non-commercial sector have a substantial contribution to the affirmation of democratic values in our society, to the formation of public social policies of the state and the municipalities, to the active participation of Bulgarian citizens in the solving of their social problems. In a narrower sense, the non-commercial sector has a significant role in the sphere of coordination, freedom of information, sharing of knowledge. As a result of this, the present study has as its goal to study, analyse and assess applied aspects of social enterprises and social innovation in the non-commercial sector of Republic of Bulgaria, and on that basis to draw and systematize their contributions, as well as the guidelines for their improvement, for the purpose of developing social enterprises and the social environment.

The applied study of social enterprises and social innovation includes a wide range of methods and tools. Initially the research strategy is focused on the study, analysis and assessment of the categories we are interested in on the basis of secondary research. In a more detailed study of social innovation in the non-commercial sector there is used the so-called "content analysis". In the study of the systems for monitoring and evaluation of the contributions of social enterprises and social innovation in the non-commercial sector there are also used case studies.

As a result of the conducted research there are found important issues concerning the formation and realization of social enterprises and innovations in the non-commercial sector of this country. There is proven the lack of systematized, statistical information on the implemented innovations and contributions in the non-commercial sector of Republic of Bulgaria; the multiple registers for recording the non-profit structures in this country, respectively the various institutions responsible for their monitoring control. The established weaknesses lead to the formulation of guidelines for improving the social enterprises and innovations in the non-commercial sector of this country.

1.	354
1.1.	359
1.2.	359
1.3.	365
1.4.	367
2.	378
2.1.	384
2.2.	384
2.3.	388
2.4.	398
	403
	408
	412
	415