

ANALYSIS OF EMPLOYMENT IN SOCIAL ENTERPRISES IN NORTHERN RUSSIA AND COMPARISON WITH SECTORS OF CANADIAN ECONOMY (RECENT SITUATION AND EVOLUTION)

UTYUSHEVA Larisa Dmitrievna,
TAKMASHEVA Irina Veniaminovna

Abstract. The main purpose of the paper is to analyze Canada's practices in social enterprise support in terms of relevance of their application in northern Russia. The topicality of the paper is determined by a need in new approaches and practices in solving the pending social and economic problems of the Russian territories in severe climatic conditions. Institutional and coevolutionary approaches used in the research were illustrated by the situation in Quebec province. At the first stage, four criteria of institutional approach were applied: state regulation, financial, educational, and infrastructural support. At the second stage, a developed system of support for socially oriented business in Quebec province was examined in terms of the coevolutionary model's principles relevant for the modern needs of northern Russia. The analysis showed that Quebec's policy assisting the social economy enterprises includes the measures with all parameters of coevolutionary model: acknowledgement of population's needs in social services, implementation of self-regulating principles for social entrepreneurs, delegation of some public services to the social entrepreneurs, a high level of interaction between the state institutes and social entrepreneurs.

Key words: institutional support, social entrepreneurship, coevolutionary development, northern regions.

JEL Classification: L26, L31.

1. Introduction

For hundreds of years, social entrepreneurship has acquired different forms. As this area of research is still being developed, social entrepreneurship has not seen any consensus in its definitions (*Conway Dato-on, M., & Kalakay, J., 2016*). Meanwhile, it continues to be of high interest in business communities, among scholars, politicians, and public figures. This process can be explained by the intensification of social, demographic, ecological, and economic problems both in developing and developed countries of the world.

Government and the public sector of different countries face a set of social challenges, such as a lack of proper education, poverty, and unemployment. If the government cannot handle the situation in any area, a private sector initiates the solutions for these social and economic tasks (*Engelke, H., Mauksch, S., Darkow, I. L., & Heiko, A., 2015*) and offers innovative, sustainable, and efficient solutions based on creative, innovative, and socially oriented activities (*Engelke, H., Mauksch, S., Darkow, I. L., & von der Gracht, H., 2016*).

UTYUSHEVA Larisa Dmitrievna, PhD (Economics), E-mail: utyusheva.usu@rambler.ru and TAKMASHEVA Irina Veniaminovna, PhD (Economics), takmasheva.usu@bk.ru. Yugra State University, 16, Chekhov Street, Khanty-Mansiysk, Russian Federation, 628012

Acknowledgement: The research is financed by Yugra State University under a grant # 13-01-20/41 of 22.01.2019.

At the same time, the social entrepreneurs' activities are mainly aimed at satisfying the needs of the society (*Carraher, S. M., Welsh, D. H., & Svikos, A., 2016*). The values created by the social entrepreneurs are not directly involved into the business deals, these values derive from creating positive external effects for the society (*Estrin, S., Mickiewicz, T., & Stephan, U., 2016*). Social entrepreneurship focuses on creating a social and ecological value which is embodied in positive changes at the social level (*Haugh, H. M., & Talwar, A., 2016; Stephan, U., Patterson, M., Kelly, C., & Mair, J., 2016*).

The main purpose of the paper is to analyze Canada's practices in supporting the social enterprises in the context of their applicability in the northern regions of Russia. The paper is relevant as there is a need in new approaches and practices to solve pending social and economic problems arisen in the Russian northern regions with an increasing role of social entrepreneurship. Compared with other regions, the North entrepreneurs work in socially and economically disadvantaged conditions, which are known for long-term capital turnover, low business mobility, difficulties in attracting and keeping human resources. Population who live in severe climate also need extra social measures of support which are provided as some privileges and compensations for different population categories.

A special attention should be paid to the social and economic development and support for the quality of life among indigenous scanty peoples of the North, with their traditional way of living being negatively affected during industrial progress. Development of a mining industry transformed the institute of tribal areas and established a nature management mode among aborigines. Social adaptation of the indigenous peoples becomes complicated due to worsen ecological conditions (*Loginov, V. G., Ignatyeva, M. N. & Balashenko, V. V., 2018*).

The above mentioned circumstances create the prerequisites to breach the social and economic balance of the northern regions, to increase the social tension, to reduce the overall investment potential of the territories. Meanwhile, social enterprises solve a wide range of problems in the modern society: they offer a set of social and domestic services for different categories of population, an innovative solution to the problems in ecology and cost-effective energy-saving, they employ people, those who need special social protection. The authors of the paper define social entrepreneurship as a hybrid altruistic commercial activity which is aimed to maximize the level of social satisfaction of the community and to develop the social innovations in contrast to the traditional businesses.

Presently, the regional authorities take efforts to stimulate the development of social entrepreneurship. However, this system of support and social business development is imposed from the top by bureaucratic and infrastructural organizations, which contradicts the nature of social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurship model in the northern region does not fully satisfy the interests and the needs of the citizens who truly lack the special social protection (the disabled, retirees, mothers of large families, veterans, children-orphans), as well as the interests of the social entrepreneurs (*Takmasheva, I.V. and L.L. Bogomolova, 2018*). Therefore, the opportunities for the social entrepreneurs in northern Russia should be expanded with new Canadian practice based tools of stimulating the entrepreneurs in the northern territories.

2. Literature review

Different definitions of social entrepreneurship, its mission, opportunities, and problems of development are analyzed in the works of many foreign authors (*Carraher, S. M., Welsh, D. H., & Sylokos, A., 2016; De Lange, D., & Dodds, R., 2017*). Different scholars define the characteristic features of social entrepreneurship: experience in socially oriented business; activities associated with caring about others, which is an altruistic action; an activity derived from the ethical principles of public benefit; a working space with inconsistencies between a social intention and a commercial activity; social changes; innovativeness; involvement of others, that is social entrepreneurship is not an individual practice, but a public process (*Douglas, H., 2015*). Social enterprises differ from commercial companies by developing their own solutions as professional services aimed to solve social challenges or to satisfy social needs (*Han, J., 2017*).

Differences of the social agents are described in the works of A. Rahdari, S. Sepasi, M. Moradi. The scientists classify the subjects of social entrepreneurship into three hierarchically interconnected groups: 1) social entrepreneurs who are not active at the administrative level; 2) social entrepreneurs who are active at the managerial level; 3) social enterprises governed by the social purposes (*Rahdari, A., Sepasi, S., & Moradi, M., 2016*). S. Grohs, K. Schneiders, R. Heinze look at the social innovations in the context of social entrepreneurship development. The scholars note that the terminological confusion and mixture of concepts are caused by different subject areas, motivations, underlying legislative documents, and institutional contexts (*Grohs, S., Schneiders, K., & Heinze, R. G., 2017*). The impact of the institutional environment on the development of different types of social entrepreneurship is described in some papers devoted to comparative analysis (*Terjesen, S., Bosma, N., & Stam, E., 2016*).

B. Hoogendoorn studies the value of the financial, social, and infrastructural support at the national level within the framework of the institutional approach (*Hoogendoorn, B., 2016*). Some foreign scholars focus on the social entrepreneurship development in the European countries (*Ahl, H., & Nelson, T., 2015; Sepulveda, L., 2015; Glänzel, G., & Scheuerle, T., 2016*). Other scientists examine the mechanisms of the state support for the social entrepreneurship in Asian countries (*Sengupta, U., Vieta, M., & McMurtry, J. J., 2015; Mody, M., & Day, J., 2017; Yoon, H., Yun, S., Lee, J., & Phillips, F., 2015*).

Many authors believe that a bottom-up approach applied for constructing a regional social and economic innovation-based system decreases the degree of the state intervention, increases the role of the universities, contributes into the cooperation between the investors and local entrepreneurs, into developing network business communities (*Wu, J., Zhuo, S., & Wu, Z., 2017*). Some economists concentrate on analyzing the position of the social enterprises in the regional context (*Mirvis, P., & Googins, B., 2018*). The nature of these relationships makes the scientists conclude that social entrepreneurship is a partner in regional development (*Barth, S., Barraket, J., Luke, B., & McLaughlin, J., 2015*).

The papers written by K. Hockerts deal with the territorial differences in behavior perception and possibilities for social entrepreneurs. The main idea of his works is that the countries with high welfare, rather than the developing countries, perceive social entrepreneurship as an efficient tool for positive social changes (*Hockerts, K., 2015; Hockerts, K., 2017*).

To achieve the purposes of the present study, a special attention was paid to the academic papers devoted to the condition and role of social entrepreneurship in Canada. The works by J. McMurtry, F. Brouard give comprehensive understanding of the national peculiarities of social enterprises in Canada determined by the cultural and geographic features of the country (*McMurtry, J. J., & Brouard, F., 2015*). These papers provide a detailed description of the measures implemented in Canada and aimed to stimulate social entrepreneurship at the national and regional levels (*McMurtry, J.J., Brouard, F., Elson, P. & etc., 2015*).

The articles describing theoretical and practical basis for the development of social enterprises among the indigenous peoples in Canada, including the ones living in the northern part of the country, are of particular interest (*Sengupta, U., Vieta, M., & McMurtry, J. J., 2015*). Many academicians think that social entrepreneurship has a positive impact on the sustainable development of industry, tourism, and local economy of Canada (*De Lange, D., & Dodds, R., 2017*).

Possibilities for the development of the North economy and indigenous peoples are a relevant area for analysis for the Russian scientists as well. R. K. Araslanov, L. L. Bogomolova describe the efficient exploration of the resource potential of the Russian North territories due to the development of the traditional crafts popular among indigenous scanty peoples (*Araslanov, R.K. and L.L. Bogomolova, 2016*). What is more, the key element in the studies of the Russian scholars is a challenge to preserve the social capital in northern Russia, which is exemplified by Obsk-Ugorsk culture (*Naumenko, O.N. and E.A. Naumenko, 2018*). I. V. Takmasheva, L. L. Bogomolova justify the need in the progressive development of social entrepreneurship based on the coevolutionary approach (*Takmasheva, I.V. and L.L. Bogomolova, 2018*).

The authors of the present paper believe that, despite a high level of the academic research in social entrepreneurship, more attention should be paid to the existing best practices in supporting socially oriented business taken from the countries with a positive effect in this area and their application in the countries with no experience in this area. Success of social entrepreneurship mainly depends on the efforts taken by the government in the context of scarce resources and a need to consider the requests from the population. A need to preserve the balance between these two variables is associated with a need to regard social, demographic, economic, and geographic factors of territories. This can be vividly illustrated by the northern regions of Russia due to their specific role stated in the RF 2020 Strategy for Innovative Development. Social entrepreneurship development potential in the North mainly depends on finding new approaches aimed to solve pending social and economic challenges in severe nature and climatic conditions. Therefore, the analyses of social entrepreneurship support practices in Canadian northern regions located in the Arctic and Subarctic climatic zones is considered to be relevant.

3. Materials and Methods

A system of social entrepreneurship support in Quebec province in Canada was chosen to be the object of this study. The purpose of the study is to examine the practices of social entrepreneurship support in Canada (Quebec province) and to evaluate their potential to be applied for the social entrepreneurship development in the northern regions of Russia (e.g. in Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug – Yugra, Yamalo-Nenets

Autonomous Okrug, Murmansk Oblast, etc.). Canadian practice applicability was evaluated in two stages within the institutional and co-evolutionary approaches.

The institutional approach is applied as there is a need to examine the impact of the formal regulatory government measures, public institutes and initiatives represented by the subjects of non-governmental sector, as well as non-formal institutes embodied by socially oriented cultural norms, traditions, values shaping the basis for the local social capital, on the development of social entrepreneurship. These three blocks are supposed to provide an access to the material and non-material resources via official and non-official channels (*Stephan, U., Uhlaner, L. M., & Stride, C., 2015*).

The results of the studies carried out by some scholars show that the institutional approach covers two levels of analysis: national (macro) and enterprise (micro) level. For example, a national level provides the framework for additional infrastructure, including establishment of new organizations and promotion of the connections between all subjects to enhance their potential. Here are some micro level examples of support: helping social entrepreneurs in satisfying the needs of the rural population; using new technological platforms for distributing entrepreneurship skills and for improving the interaction with the community; establishing the connections with third organizations for resources (*Surie, G., 2017*).

The first stage in the institutional approach involved four criteria:

- 1) *government regulation* – a system of political measures in developing social entrepreneurship, which are legally approved and adopted by the government at all levels of national administration;
- 2) *financial support* – measures aimed to extend the access of the social enterprises to the financial resources for their business development;
- 3) *educational support* – it is supposed to provide a set of educational services and educational opportunities contributing into the improvement of competences in social entrepreneurship;
- 4) *infrastructural support* – measures and a network of institutions helping a community of social entrepreneurship, their interactions and communications between all participants of a community in terms of organizational and administrative provisions.

The second stage assesses the possibility to apply the *coevolutionary model* to the established system of social entrepreneurship in Canada in the context of model's four principles (*Takmasheva, I.V. and L.L. Bogomolova, 2018*):

- 1) acknowledgement of population's requests and needs in social services and goods;
- 2) implementation of self-regulating principles among social entrepreneurs;
- 3) delegation of some public services to social entrepreneurs, with the particular measures being financed via a self-regulating organization;
- 4) joint activities of the governmental bodies, institutes providing the support to the social business, social entrepreneurs.

Logical and historical methods were applied by the authors to identify the cause-and-effect relationships and dependencies, to analyze the regularities in development processes in the socially oriented business. What is more, the authors of this paper used other methods of research, such as modeling, statistical analysis methods.

This research was based on the secondary analysis of data of two categories: existing academic literature published in 2015-2019, as well as official documents and information from the websites of the governmental bodies and institutions in Canada and Quebec province somehow involved into social entrepreneurship. Google Scholar with advanced search was used to find academic literature. The key words and phrases were social entrepreneurship, region, country, Canada, institutional support, support for social entrepreneurship.

Arguments for Quebec province in Canada

Four critical factors determine the choice of Quebec province in Canada as a potential model for social entrepreneurship development in northern Russia.

First of all, Canada and Russia are close in their political structure. Similar to Russia, Canada is a federation with ten provinces (Quebec, Ontario, British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba, New Scotland, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Labrador) and three territories (Yukon, Nunavut, and Northwest Territories). Therefore, the analysis of Quebec province helps to apply a regional aspect in our work for studying the system of social entrepreneurship support.

Secondly, this is about the influence of the natural and geographical factors on social and economic development of the country and a particular region. Canada is a huge country located in the northern part of the Northern American continent. Yukon, Nunavut, and Northwest Territories are located in the northern part of the country, in permafrost regions and occupy 40 % of country's territory.

Thirdly, Canada practices are of interest for our study in terms of social, demographic and cultural factors, because the country is known to be a multinational and multi-religion state. The northern territories of Canada are traditionally occupied by local indigenous peoples - Inuits. Nunavut, Northwest Territories and Yukon are known to have the largest share of the indigenous peoples in Canada – 86%, 52%, and 23% respectively (*Sengu pta, U., Vieta, M., & McMurtry, J. J., 2015*). Indigenous peoples compose about 4 % of the population in Canada. Inclusion of the interests of the local indigenous peoples into the social and economic development of the territories is also typical for the Russian regions, especially in the context of social capital development.

Quebec is the largest province in Canada, excluding Nunavut, while it takes the second place in the number of population. Major part of population lives in the south, in the valley of St. Laurence river. Population density is about 4.9 people per square kilometer. Most part of Quebec territory is scarcely populated due to its natural and geographical peculiarities, because the province covers four climatic zones: arctic, subarctic, continental, and marine in the east of the province.

The final argument for Canada in our analysis is determined by the fact that social entrepreneurship in this country was shaped under the impact of the United States of America and the United Kingdom – the countries with long-standing tradition of support for the social enterprises (*McMurtry, J.J., Brouard, F., Elson, P. & etc., 2015*).

In the view of the above, the practices of social entrepreneurship development in Canada illustrated by Quebec province are unique, varied, and cause specific academic and practical interest for northern Russia. Political administration in Canada is exercised at four levels: federal, provincial (or territorial), municipal (or local) levels, as well as the level of indigenous peoples government. As for the purpose of our study,

the government administration of the social entrepreneurship is analyzed at federal and regional levels.

The possibility to apply Canada's practices in Russia should be looked upon in the context of historically determined differences between the two countries. First of all, one should consider the superior body institute in the governments of the countries. Formally, the head of Canada is the British Queen Elizabeth II. However, the Prime Minister of Canada is the superior official in the country. Russia is a typical president-parliament republic, the state power combines the features of presidential and parliamentary republic.

In the Canadian provinces, the legislative duties of different government levels can differ, which is connected with a long colonization and decolonization background of the country. For example, Newfoundland province was the last to join Canada in 1949, Quebec disintegrated with the federation twice, while many challenges of the interconnection between the government and the aborigines have not been solved yet. These problems cause mirroring, tension, and ambiguity between the governments of different levels and sometimes a direct conflict. A lack of unity in legislative governance at all power levels in the country leads to many obstacles for the institutional development of new sectors and institutions. This is true for social enterprises in Canada, because it is not quite clear what jurisdiction and what legal liability they belong to.

It should also be added that in terms of linguistics, Canada has two official languages: English and French. This also gives cultural peculiarities in understanding and development of social entrepreneurship in the country in comparison with Russia with only one official language (Russian). For example, French speakers mainly (85%) live in Quebec with a dominating theory of social economy, rather than a social enterprise. On the other hand, in British Columbia, a term "social enterprise" is officially used.

Therefore, the scholars J.J. McMurtry, F. Brouard, P. Elson, P. Hall, D. Lionais, and M. Vieta (2015) promote the idea of being cautious in generalizing the social entrepreneurship practices in Canada for different territories of the country. As far as the present analysis focuses on one Quebec province, the described differences between Canada and Russia cannot significantly affect the applicability of the results given here.

5. Results

Data published by Chantier de l'économie sociale, a partner for the Ministry of Economy, Science, and Innovations in Quebec, show that the province hosts more than 7,000 social enterprises, including 3,300 cooperatives and 3,700 non-profit organizations on the market. Social economy of Quebec is dynamically developing: in 2002, total annual turnover of the social enterprises was 17 billion dollars, while in 2017 it reached 40 billion dollars, which is higher than the overall figure for construction, aerospace, and mining industries. The number of the employed in social entrepreneurship in Quebec is more than 210 thousand people (Chantier de l'économie sociale, 2019).

1st stage – an institutional approach based research

Government regulation: Government regulation for social entrepreneurship in Canada at the national level is connected with tax legislation. For example, informative differences between the charitable and non-profit organizations are stated in the Income Tax Law (1985). Registered charitable organizations are welfare companies, public or private funds which are established and perform in Canada. These organizations must use their resources for charities and have charitable purposes, including poverty reduction, education development, and other purposes which benefit the society.

Non-profit organizations are associations, clubs or societies which are not charitable organizations and are driven by the purposes of social provision, improvement of civil society, sports, and recreation or any other purposes, except for profit. Under the Income Tax Law, the charitable and non-profit organizations are released from paying the income tax.

In Canada, the government singles out the cooperatives which are defined as an association of people or enterprises uniting their resources to satisfy the common needs. The cooperatives act under the democracy principles: each participant gets one vote. The Canadian cooperatives are typically involved into different areas of economy: agriculture, foodstuffs, health care, trade, fishing industry, energy industry, recreational and touristic services, financial services. Legislative grounds for the cooperatives are determined by a level (federal, provincial, or territorial) they perform their activities at.

In Canada, the Department for Innovation, Science and Economic Development deals with the issues of institutional and economic development of social entrepreneurship at the federal level. At the moment, Canada is implementing several government programs with some implemented measures of social entrepreneurship support.

Community Futures Program focuses on the support for the communities in the rural areas in Canada. Futurpreneur Canada program provides financial support for start-ups for 18-39-year-old citizens in Canada. Similar separate program for beginners, Futurpreneur Canada program, presupposes a financial support for start-ups for 18-39-year-old adults living in Canada for less than 60 months.

Official government regulation of the social enterprises in Quebec starts with the adoption of *Law on Social Policy in Quebec* (2013). This legislative document is valuable as by this the regional government recognizes the contribution of the social economy into the social and economic development of the province and defines the role of the state power in regulation of this area (Brouard, F., McMurtry, J. J., & Vieta, M., 2015).

The purpose of the law is to promote social economy, to contribute into its development by the appropriate tools and to provide the access for the social economy enterprises to the governmental programs. The Law introduces the definition for *the social economy enterprises*, which means collective enterprises manufacturing goods and services to satisfy the social needs, to create jobs, to support the services, to preserve the cultural life, as well as for the purposes of social and professional integration. Their business activity is not the only purpose, but rather a trigger to implement their social mission.

2015-2020 Government Social Policy Action Plan (hereinafter Plan) which is a part of the economic development in Quebec was prepared in compliance with the law

for the development of social economy and social entrepreneurship institutes. The Plan was developed by about 20 Ministries and Agencies, which maintains an integrated approach in achieving the purpose. The document states that Quebec government invests 100 million dollars into the measures to support the social economy enterprises. These measures are determined by six purposes. The Table shows that the main part of investment goes to support the social economy enterprises - 83.6 million dollars. This money will be invested into the accessibility of the financial tools.

Table. Investments in 2015-2020 Government Social Policy Action Plan in Quebec

#	Description of Plan purposes	Investments, mln dollars
1	Support of the social economy enterprises at all stages of their development	83.6
2	Better accessibility to the markets and innovations in social economy	3.5
3	Evaluation of impact of the social economy enterprises on the challenges associated with population ageing	8.9
4	Contribution into professional integration within a social economy enterprise	0.8
5	Support of entrepreneurial collective activities and their solutions	1.0
6	Contribution into business development in social economy over the entire territory	8.7
Total		106.5

Sources: data taken from 2015-2020 Government Social Economy Action Plan and compiled by the authors.

By the end of the Plan in 2020, Quebec government is planning to evaluate the implementation of the provisions of the Law on Social Policy regarding the measures performed by the governmental bodies, as well as regarding the duties of the Ministries and Agencies involved into the social economy. Other legislative acts regulating the activities of the enterprises of social economy in Quebec also include the Law on companies, Law on cooperatives, Law on contribution into the development of cooperatives and non-profit legal entities.

The Canadian Agency for Economic Development of North handles the issues of stimulating the North economy in Canada and the development of economic opportunities for the communities and indigenous people of the North. Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada, as well as Indigenous Services Canada control the solution of the social problems and challenges by interacting with the indigenous peoples in Canada's North.

Financial support: 2015-2020 Government Social Economy Action Plan presupposes the financial support for the social enterprises in Quebec. The regional government applies its efforts mainly to the development of the financial tools adjusted to the needs of the social economy enterprises. The areas of the financial support were united in Purpose 1 in the Plan and include:

1. Assistance in capitalization of the enterprises of social economy for financing more than 300 projects for five years;

2. Support for capitalization and functioning of Quebec Social Investment Network (RISQ) and venture capital funds;
3. Support of the development of the enterprises' assets;
4. Development of cooperative movement;
5. Support of the Chantier de l'économie public fund providing the investments for enterprise establishment and development of new projects in social economy;
6. Development of new financing forms (crowdfunding, public obligations).

Most part of the financial support is spent on the capitalization of the social economy enterprises and equals 30 million dollars. This money is allocated for the investment into more than 300 projects within the whole period of the Plan implementation.

Educational support: Educational support for the social enterprises in Quebec is manifested in academic institutions, public and governmental organizations, as well as by particular measures which are implemented under 2015-2020 Government Social Economy Action Plan.

Many Canadian universities have Research Centers and Programs targeted at the social enterprises, social policy, cooperatives or non-profit organizations. Educational programs are implemented by the institutes and faculties in the area of business and entrepreneurship, state policy and administration, public sciences and environment (McMurtry, J.J., Brouard, F., Elson, P. & etc., 2015).

Quebec is known for the University of Quebec and Montreal (UQAM) to be the center attracting the research, knowledge, and experience in social innovations and social economy. In social entrepreneurship, educational infrastructure of the University is represented by Guy-Bernier Cooperation Department (Chaire de coopération Guy-Bernier), Service of Communities (Service aux collectivités), Institute of Female Studies (l'Institut de recherche et d'études féministes (IREF)).

The University organizes the educational programs "Administration of Social and Collective Enterprises" and "Corporate Social Responsibility". Guy-Bernier Cooperation Department offers different services in cooperation and human resource management for practitioners, students, and scholars. Main universities in Quebec are the members of the Center for Social Innovation Research, among them are UQAM, University of Quebec in Ottawa (UQO), Laval University, Sherbrooke University, Concordia University, etc.

L'Institut du Nouveau-Monde (INM), which focuses on the citizen involvement into the life of the society, trains practical skills necessary for solving the social and civil problems. This organization also holds the seminars, coaching sessions, practical events to share experience and knowledge. Social Enterprise Institute offers a wide range of different online fee-based courses for social entrepreneurs on the whole territory of Canada. An educational platform trains in different topics in marketing, investments, launch of a project, procurement procedures for social economy, etc.

A third area for analyzing the educational support for the social enterprises in Quebec province refers to the measures from 2015-2020 Government Social Economy Action Plan which are included into the Purpose "Assistance in professional integration within a social economy enterprise". Here the government of Quebec concentrates its efforts on the development of the professional skills among the people rejected by the employment market due to different difficulties, including physical disabilities.

Quebec's government allocates the money for creating a specialized Platform uniting different stakeholders involved into professional integration of people of high demand within social economy, but not being knowledgeable in labour market. The Plan also includes stimulating measures for the cooperatives to involve these people into educational and employment programs. Thus, the educational support of social enterprises in Quebec is seen to be quite varied. It includes the programs for the development of the academic research, training of the highly qualified specialists for the social economy, and the programs targeted at the development of particular practical skills and competences.

Infrastructural support: Infrastructure for the support of the social economy in Quebec province is a dense network of governmental and non-governmental institutions specializing in providing financial, educational, technological, law, consulting assistance to social non-profit enterprises, communities, young entrepreneurs, and the communities of indigenous peoples. Majority of the institutions and centers acts both locally and at the inter-regional, federal, and international networks of cooperation and partnership.

In the context of implementation of social economy in Quebec, the key body is the Ministry of Economy, Science and Innovations. However, the Ministry does this job together with a number of public and municipal associations:

- A non-profit organization Chantier de l'économie sociale;
- Quebec Council for Cooperation and Mutual Help (Conseil québécois de la coopération et de la mutualité);
- Regional Centers for Social Economy (Pôles régionaux d'économie sociale);
- Cooperatives of regional development (Coopératives de développement régional);
- Federation of Quebec Municipalities (Fédération québécoise des municipalités);
- Union of Quebec Municipalities (Union des municipalités du Québec).

Chantier de l'économie sociale, a non-profit organization, is the largest association of the stakeholders in the social economy in the province. The corporation covers different associations of the social economy enterprises, groups and associations of the organizations for the support of the social economy development, territory centers of social and regional economy, large trade union centers, social and public movements.

L'Esplanade, a space in Montreal, is an example of the Center for Social Entrepreneurship, including co-working, incubator of the social enterprises and an accelerator. The Center serves to be the perfect place for meetings, discussions of business-projects and acquaintance with social entrepreneurship.

Quebec Council for Cooperation and Mutual Help is an association of cooperatives in the province to develop a profitable partnership, exchange of skills and experience. The Federation of Quebec Municipalities focuses on the protection of the interests of the municipal self-administration in terms of the development of human capital, cooperation, and innovations. The Federation consists of about 1,000 municipalities. The Union of Quebec Municipalities is one of the oldest associations in the province founded in 1919. The Union comprises of the municipalities from all regions of Quebec and represents more than 85 % of population and territories of the province.

2nd stage – a coevolutionary approach based research

Once an institutional approach based analysis is performed, the support system for the social enterprises in Quebec province (Canada) in terms of system compliance with four principles of a coevolutionary model is examined.

1) Acknowledgement of population's requests and needs in social services and goods: The social enterprises in Quebec are in many aspects supported under the Law on Social Policy. One of Law's purposes is to assist in the development of the social economy by designing or adapting the response tools in terms of consistency and transparency. This provision excludes any possibility for unilateral political decision making with no appropriate grounds. This purpose is manifested in three measures from 2015-2020 Government Social Economy Action Plan.

Firstly, this is the identification of the key partners in developing and implementing the Plan (Non-profit organization Chantier de l'économie sociale, Quebec Council for Cooperation and Mutual Help, Regional Center for Social Economy, Cooperatives of Regional Development, Federation of Quebec Municipalities) headed by the Ministry of Economy, Science and Innovation for the province. This wide partnership provides the interests of all subjects of social economy, including different territories and population groups.

Secondly, 2015-2020 Government Social Economy Action Plan is implemented together with the Interministry Committee for Social Economy with the representatives from twenty ministries and agencies. The Committee is designed to harmonize the state intervention into the economy of the province, as well as to assist in experience and knowledge exchange.

Thirdly, the Plan presupposes a monitoring of implementation and efficiency of the planned measures. The monitoring results in annual reports about the achieved results, and the changes, if any, are introduced into the Plan.

2) Implementation of self-regulating principles among entrepreneurs: Provisions for self-regulation among social entrepreneurs are described in the Law on Cooperatives which defines a cooperative as a legal entity uniting people or companies with common economic, social, and cultural needs. To satisfy their needs, they are united to perform business under the rules of cooperative activities. One of the fundamental principles of the cooperatives is a democratic distribution of power manifested in a "one member – one vote" principle.

3) Delegation of some public services to social entrepreneurs, with the particular measures being financed via a self-regulating organization: The status of the social enterprises in Quebec province was originally stated in the practices of the local Procurement policy which says that some supplies for the governmental and municipal bodies must be provided by the social enterprises. For example, in 2012-2013 the governmental bodies of the province signed the agreements with the social economy enterprises for the total sum of 5 billion dollars, excluding the municipal contracts. Quebec government encourages the participation of the social policy enterprises in the governmental tenders and includes similar measures into Quebec strategies and projects in economic development. The social economy enterprises are predicted to be included into the development and implementation of the measures aimed to support the digital transformation.

4) *Joint activities of the governmental bodies, institutes providing the support to the social business, social entrepreneurs:* Quebec is known for its varied and extensive experience in uniting the efforts from the government, public organizations, and the enterprises of social economy. State bodies stimulate such a cooperation, especially in rural area, where some life-saving services and goods for the population are not easily accessible. A project of the Center for Social Economy for First Nations is an example of joint activities of the government, institutes for the social business, and social entrepreneurs. This project was implemented in partnership with the Indigenous Peoples' Secretariat, First Nations of Quebec and Labrador Health and Social Services Commission (FNQLHSSC), First Nations of Quebec and Labrador Economic Development Commission (FNQLEDC), and the Quebec Association of Native Friendship Centers (RCAAQ). The government allocated 500 thousand dollars on this project.

5. Discussion

The results of this paper shape several questions for thinking over the relevance of the practices in the area of the support of social entrepreneurship in Canada for northern Russia. In terms of the institutional approach, the area of the social economy enterprises in Canada at the regional level is seen to be mature and quite developed in comparison with the Russian regions. This is evidenced by the Law on Social Economy in Quebec adopted in 2013, as well as the recorded intentions of the authorities in 2015-2020 Government Social Economy Action Plan. By comparison, today the social enterprises in the northern regions of Russia are not looked upon as the crucial institute for solving social and economic problems and as a separate object for a regional policy.

Therefore, it is necessary to emphasize that the results of the present work should be considered in terms of applicability of Canada's practices in the northern regions of Russia. It is clear that social entrepreneurship in the territories in question is at different institutional levels, so our task is not to compare two countries.

Presently, Quebec can be characterized by varied practices in supporting the social economy enterprises, along with that, the local government applies its efforts to maintain balance and transparency in implementing the additional and stimulating measures. Therefore, some tools applied in Quebec can be the sources for new approaches in solving the problems in the Russian practices of social entrepreneurship development, including no consideration of the interest of the population and social enterprises; an inconsistent supporting system with the main focus on educational services; a failure to use the educational potential of the local academic environment as the center for developing the competencies in social entrepreneurship; a priority given to the improvement of the state governance methods instead innovation development.

The coevolutionary approach applied in our analysis shows the possibilities to apply Canada's practices in developing and implementing the policy of support for the social entrepreneurship in northern Russia. This statement is evidenced by the practicability of four principles of the coevolutionary model, including acknowledgement of the population's requests and needs in social services and goods, implementation of self-regulating principles among social entrepreneurs, delegation of some public services to social entrepreneurs, and joint activities of the governmental bodies and social entrepreneurs. Quebec's Policy for Social Enterprise Support includes the measures with regard to all parameters of the coevolutionary model.

At the same time, several factors should be taken into account when transferring Canada's practices into the northern regions of Russia. First of all, our analysis shows that in Canada social entrepreneurship is supported more at the province level rather than at the federal level. Secondly, Canada has no common approach to state what social entrepreneurship means. For example, federal government has no official definition of social enterprises, except for cooperatives and charitable organizations. On the other hand, Quebec province introduces its own official concept: "social economy enterprises". Thirdly, historic, social and cultural background connected with colonization and decolonization of the state territory should be taken into account when applying social entrepreneurship practices from Canada's regions, including its northern part.

6. Conclusion

Canada's regions are characterized by institutionally developed system of support for social entrepreneurship, which is evidenced by the adopted legislative acts and special government action plans with an allocated investment sum. Practices from Quebec could become the source for alternative approaches to solving the issues of social entrepreneurship development in Russia. This assumption is backed by the practicability of four principles of the coevolutionary model. However, the overall nature of social entrepreneurship support in Canada, its role for the country and a region, cultural and historic factors of state development should be taken into account.

The present study was limited by the data from the empirical database compiled from the figures in financial support for Quebec province and taken from 2015-2020 Government Social Economy Action Plan. Public information does not contain information about the programs and performance of the national funds providing additional resources for the province's social enterprises. Collection of this information and its analysis will require particular methodological instruments which are outside the scope of the present work. Meanwhile, this research can be interesting from the perspective of federal government participation in social entrepreneurship development in the regions.

Future researchers express a theoretical and practical interest towards the mechanisms of application and introduction of social innovations in Canada's northern regions and their possible adaptation for social and economic development of Russia's territory. Therefore, a special attention should be paid to the instruments of their support and criteria-based selection system for the innovative projects, including in terms of social, demographic, economic, and geographic factors. The findings of this research could become the grounds to develop additional alternative approaches to a policy for stimulating social enterprises and dynamic application of social innovations in everyday practices of enterprises and inhabitants of the northern regions.

References

- Ahl, H., & Nelson, T. (2015). How policy positions women entrepreneurs: A comparative analysis of state discourse in Sweden and the United States. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 30(2), 273-291.
- Araslanov, R.K. and L.L. Bogomolova (2016). Economic assessment of resource potential of traditional crafts in Northern regions under crisis conditions: basis and

- development prospects. *International journal of economic research*, 13 (8), 3397-3411.
- Barth, S., Barraket, J., Luke, B., & McLaughlin, J. (2015). Acquaintance or partner? Social economy organizations, institutional logics and regional development in Australia. *Entrepreneurship & regional development*, 27(3-4), 219-254.
- Brouard, F., McMurtry, J. J., & Vieta, M. (2015). Social Enterprises Models in Canada: Ontario. *Canadian journal of nonprofit and social economy research*, 6(1).
- Chantier de l'économie sociale. [Electronic recourse]. URL. <https://chantier.qc.ca/decouvrez-leconomie-sociale/>. (View date: 18.03.2019).
- Carraher, S. M., Welsh, D. H., & Svilokos, A. (2016). Validation of a measure of social entrepreneurship. *European Journal of International Management*, 10(4), 386-402.
- Conway Dato-on, M., & Kalakay, J. (2016). The winding road of social entrepreneurship definitions: a systematic literature review. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 12(2), 131-160.
- De Lange, D., & Dodds, R. (2017). Increasing sustainable tourism through social entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(7), 1977-2002.
- Douglas, H. (2015). Embracing hybridity: A review of social entrepreneurship and enterprise in Australia and New Zealand. *Third Sector Review*, 21(1)
- Engelke, H., Mauksch, S., Darkow, I. L., & Heiko, A. (2015). Opportunities for social enterprise in Germany—Evidence from an expert survey. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 90, 635-646.
- Engelke, H., Mauksch, S., Darkow, I. L., & von der Gracht, H. (2016). Heading toward a more social future? Scenarios for social enterprises in Germany. *Business & Society*, 55(1), 56-89.
- Estrin, S., Mickiewicz, T., & Stephan, U. (2016). Human capital in social and commercial entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 31(4), 449-467.
- Glänzel, G., & Scheuerle, T. (2016). Social impact investing in Germany: Current impediments from investors' and social entrepreneurs' perspectives. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 27(4), 1638-1668.
- Grohs, S., Schneiders, K., & Heinze, R. G. (2017). Outsiders and Intrapreneurs: The Institutional Embeddedness of Social Entrepreneurship in Germany. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 28(6), 2569-2591.
- Han, J. (2017). Social marketisation and policy influence of third sector organisations: Evidence from the UK. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 28(3), 1209-1225.
- Haugh, H. M., & Talwar, A. (2016). Linking social entrepreneurship and social change: The mediating role of empowerment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 133(4), 643-658.
- Hockerts, K. (2015). The social entrepreneurial antecedents scale (SEAS): a validation study. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 11(3), 260-280.
- Hockerts, K. (2017). Determinants of social entrepreneurial intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 41(1), 105-130.
- Hoogendoorn, B. (2016). The prevalence and determinants of social entrepreneurship at the macro level. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 54, 278-296.
- Loginov, V. G., Ignatyeva, M. N. & Balashenko, V. V. (2018). Ethnic Social and Ecosystem Approach to the Evaluation of the Lifelihoods of Small Indigenous Peoples of the North. *Ekonomika regiona [Economy of Region]*, 14(3), 896-913.
- McMurtry, J. J., & Brouard, F. (2015). Social enterprises in Canada: An introduction. *Canadian journal of nonprofit and social economy research*, 6(1).

- McMurtry, J.J., Brouard, F., Elson, P., Hall, P., Lionais, D., & Vieta, M. (2015). Social Entrepreneurship in Canada: Context, Models, and Institutions (# 04). ICSEM working papers.
- Mirvis, P., & Googins, B. (2018). Catalyzing Social Entrepreneurship in Africa: Roles for Western Universities, NGOs and Corporations. *Africa Journal of Management*, 4(1), 57-83.
- Mody, M., & Day, J. (2017). Heroic Messiahs or Everyday Businessmen? The Rhetoric and the Reality of Social Entrepreneurship in India. In *Social Entrepreneurship and Tourism* (pp. 207-220). Springer, Cham.
- Naumenko, O.N. and E.A. Naumenko (2018). The Ob Ugrians-Muslims: Historical and Psychological Factors of the Islam Penetration in the Traditional Culture. *Bylye Gody*, 49 (3), 931-939.
- Plan d'action gouvernemental en économie sociale 2015-2020. Gouvernement du Québec. [Electronic resource]. URL. <https://www.economie.gouv.qc.ca/bibliotheques/plan-action/plan-daction-gouvernemental-en-economie-sociale-2015-2020/>. (View date: 18.03.2019).
- Rahdari, A., Sepasi, S., & Moradi, M. (2016). Achieving sustainability through Schumpeterian social entrepreneurship: The role of social enterprises. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 137, 347-360.
- Sengu pta, U., Vieta, M., & McMurtry, J. J. (2015). Indigenous Communities and Social Enterprise in Canada: Incorporating Culture as an Essential Ingredient of Entrepreneurship. *Canadian journal of nonprofit and social economy research*, 6(1).
- Sepulveda, L. (2015). Social enterprise—a new phenomenon in the field of economic and social welfare? *Social Policy & Administration*, 49(7), 842-861.
- Stephan, U., Patterson, M., Kelly, C., & Mair, J. (2016). Organizations driving positive social change: A review and an integrative framework of change processes. *Journal of Management*, 42(5), 1250-1281.
- Stephan, U., Uhlaner, L. M., & Stride, C. (2015). Institutions and social entrepreneurship: The role of institutional voids, institutional support, and institutional configurations. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 46(3), 308-331.
- Surie, G. (2017). Creating the innovation ecosystem for renewable energy via social entrepreneurship: Insights from India. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 121, 184-195.
- Takmasheva, I.V. and L.L. Bogomolova (2018). Social entrepreneurship in northern Russia: new opportunities for development // *Amazonia Investiga*, vol. 7, no. 17, 2018, p. 253-260. (Web of Science).
- Terjesen, S., Bosma, N., & Stam, E. (2016). Advancing public policy for high-growth, female, and social entrepreneurs. *Public Administration Review*, 76(2), 230-239.
- Wu, J., Zhuo, S., & Wu, Z. (2017). National innovation system, social entrepreneurship, and rural economic growth in China. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 121, 238-250.
- Yoon, H., Yun, S., Lee, J., & Phillips, F. (2015). Entrepreneurship in East Asian regional innovation systems: role of social capital. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 100, 83-95.