# Empirical Research of the Knowledge Degree of Social Economy Enterprises in Stable Micro-communities

Dan Popescu PhD, Cristina State[1] PhD, Valentina Nicolae[1] PhD Student, Ioana Pavel[1] PhD Student

**Abstract**

The social economy, as the correct solution to solving the problems of a community, tends to take shape in Romania too: an evidence of this, is the recently promulgation of the law regulating the activity of these economic entities, generically named social economy enterprises, or social enterprises, that work in this sector. The first research question that we intend to answer in the paper regarding on "Improving the management of social economy enterprises, an essential factor in sustainable and responsible development of local communities", relates to the definition of social economy concept, followed naturally by another one, in connection with the knowledge degree of the social economy sector.
Work methodology that we use consists in an exploratory research, based on a semi-structured questionnaire, directly administered, in a micro-stable community that we observe since 2002. Interpretation of responses received from participants in the study was performed using the IBM SPSS 20 application. The variables obtained were analysed both from the point of view of descriptive statistics and also, by the correlations that have been established between them. The results from testing hypotheses, confirms our assumptions, according to that, the subjects participating in the study had, at the time of performing the survey, very little information regarding to the social economy. Extensive research is ongoing, following that in the next period we will be able to present, new, additional information able to complete the overview on the field of study.

## 1. Introduction

Viewed from the perspective of the factors generating progress, the economic crises determines the involving of social actors in identifying solutions to economic, social, technological, moral, etc. favourable to the development. In this context, the social economy sector assumes an important role in identifying solutions adapted to each community, to solve economic, social or environmental problems that are ignored or cannot be adequately covered by the public or private sector.

At the conceptual doctrinal level, social economy is defined by a variety of terms such as: "*third sector*", "*non-profit sector*" or "*solidarity economy*", frequently used closely with the purpose of the research undertaken by various authors. Thereby, the **social economy** is defined as *"the expression used to indicate those activities in that the resources obtained are targeted for the social purpose and for the aid of the community in they were implemented"* (Alexandrescu et al., 2010, p.17).

| [1]Bucharest University of Economic Studies

The recently adopted law of **social economy**, by the Romanian Parliament, defines this sector as: "*all activities organized independently by the public sector, whose purpose is to serve the general interest, the interests of a community and / or personal patrimonial interests by increasing employment of persons belonging to the vulnerable group ... production and supply of goods, services and works,* characterized by *private initiative, voluntary and solidarity of members, with a high degree of autonomy and accountability, and restricted distribution of profits to shareholders*" .

Other approaches to definitions of **social economy** referring to organizational peculiarities of certain categories of businesses (Chaves et Campos, 2007, p. 23): *"The set of private enterprises, organized on official basis, with autonomy of decision and freedom of membership, created to meet the needs of their members on the market by producing goods and providing services, insurance and financial support, decision-making and, any distribution of profit or surpluses among the members, are not directly linked to the capital or the amounts contributed by each member, each having one vote".*

According to Barna Cristina (Barna, 2014, p.6) social economy represents, at European level, 2 million enterprises, about 10% of all European businesses, employing over 11 million workers (equivalent to 6% of the Union labour) of which 70% are employed in non-profit organizations, 26% in cooperative and 3% in mutuality.

Social economy sector is currently faced with unprecedented challenges due to, both, the economic crisis that we are going through and, social, political and moral crisis accompanying it. The economic results achieved in this sector facilitates solving social problems faced by the communities attracting increasingly more attention to the potential hold by **social economy enterprises**, as representative organizations.

Finally, by their specific shown in the Table no. 1, **social economy enterprises** provide viable solutions able to respond to the target goals set in the National Strategy for **Sustainable Development** of Romania, 2013-2020-2030, and European Union strategic guidelines, such as: climate change, clean energy, sustainable consumption and production, conservation and management of natural resources, public health, social inclusion, global poverty.

**Table no.1. The representative features of the economy sectors. Source: synthesis made by authors in the documentary research stage – 1st variant**

| 1. Public Sector | 2. Social Economy Sector | 3. Private Sector |
|---|---|---|
| The guarantor, according to the Constitution, of the equality of citizens before the law and public authorities | Entities created on reciprocity, solidarity and responsibility; | Companies owned by shareholders, constituted in order to generate profit and maximum efficiency |
| -Owned and managed by the State, local or/and central authorities, international bodies etc. | - The purpose of **social economy enterprises**: serving members and / or community; - They have autonomy of decision and freedom of membership; - The surplus resulting from their activities is allocated to social | Responsibility towards the individual and / or society exists as intention, but is manifested in the extent that : - contribute to the company's image; - exist and are enforced a well-structured regulatory |

| | objectives and / or **sustainable development**; | framework |
|---|---|---|
| Conducting economic activities of public utility (generating profit?) | - Catalyst of sources and resources of the **community**, integrator of the community values; | Responsibility for the use of resources is undertaken within the business profitability |
| | - Integrator for the values of volunteerism and philanthropy as a component of the welfare state paradigm;<br>- Generator of welfare, of responsible development at the local level; | |

Last but not least, it is important to mention that in the period 2011 - 2012 were developed within the project "Making Social Economy Visible in Romania", funded by the European Commission, the satellite accounts (SEC 95) on the social economy in Romania. Entities belonging to the social economy are found in three sectors: non-financial companies (S11); financial corporations (S12); non-profit institutions serving households which (S15). Apparently formal, this standardization is really of great importance, because it highlights the role and contribution of these businesses in achieving economic and social policy at the local community level.

The brief introduction that we have made, aims to highlight the role that social economy plays in present and, to outline, the specific topic of this paper.

We have listed here only a few of the arguments in favour of our research, this being the initial impulse for the survey subject, that we submit to Your attention.

## 2. Objectives, the assumptions and research methodology

The question that we try to answer, subsequently being the main objective of the paper, refers to the knowledge degree of the social economy sector by the permanent members of a micro-communities, which we observe since 2002.

For this purpose we have developed a set of questions with predetermined answer at which subjects, participating in the study, were asked to select the answer options that they know, as follows:

1. Is familiar to You the term "**social economy**"? With answers variants: "yes", "no", "I do not know".

2. Do You know an organization / **enterprise of social economy**? With answers variants: "yes", "no".

Additional to the two first questions, we enunciated a third, which lists the social economy entities most commonly found in the local communities, in order to complete our overview on the knowledge degree of the social economy sector.

*3. In Your community operates any of the following organizations (select the knowing variant)?* With answers variants: *"Mutuality", "Cooperative", "Church Social Centres", "NGO", "Rural Communities".*

*The working assumption* used in *empirical research* that we conduct, subsequently tested with the IBM SPSS Statistics 20, was formulated as follows:

*The null hypothesis (H0)*: subjects in the study don't know the social economy sector and nor the representative organizations of this sector.

*Alternative hypothesis (H1)*: the subjects, participating in the study, know very well the social economy sector, including representative organizations.

The variables under investigation are presented in Table 2.

**Table no. 2 Variable Information**

| Variable | Position | Label | Measurement Level | Type |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Education | 1 | Education | Ordinal | Independent |
| Age | 2 | Age | Ordinal | Independent |
| Gender | 3 | Gender | Ordinal | Independent |
| Social Economy Term Answer | 4 | SETermA | Nominal | Dependent |
| Social Enterprise Organization | 5 | SEOrgA | Nominal | Dependent |
| Active Social Enterprise | 6 | ActSE | Nominal | Dependent |

*Variables in the working file. Source: data entry collected by authors trough the questionnaire*

The working methodology consists of an investigation, conducted through questionnaire administered directly.

Interpretation of responses received from the subjects, participating in the study, was done by studying the frequency of responses (Affirmative / Negative / Don't know) completed - where necessary - to increase the accuracy of the interpretation, with χ2 test (coefficient of concordance, chi square) that assumes to compare the theoretical frequencies of occurrence of the response variable to those observed.

Simultaneously, under the assumption that people with high levels of education are generally better informed, we wished to find out whether the response received from the subjects participating in the study, is influenced by their level of instruction, reason for which we have formulated the following secondary hypothesis:

*The null hypothesis (H0)*: there is no significant relationship between the *level of education* of the subjects and their *answer variant*.

*Alternative hypothesis (H1)*: there is a significant relationship between the *level of education* of the subjects and their *answer variant*.

The variable "education" (level of instruction of the subjects participating in the study) is a scalar variable type, so that we calculated by using the IBM SPSS Statistics the contingency coefficient $\chi^2$, correlation coefficient γ Goodman - Kruskal (coefficient based on the number of inversions and proversions, what it means, on the concordant and discordant pairs number) (Opariuc-Dan, C. 2011, p. 48).

## 3. Research results

Participants in the study are represented by 30 adults, 10 males (minimum score,

1) and 20 women (maximum score 2) involved at least from three years to achieve the objectives of the micro-community, aged between 18 (minimum score 7) and 75 years (maximum score 9) and an instruction level, represented by completed studies, from high school (minimum score 2) to postgraduate (maximum score 6), according to Table 3.

**Table no. 3 Statistics**

|  |  | Gender | Education | Age |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| N | Valid | 30 | 30 | 30 |
|  | Missing | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Minimum |  | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| Maximum |  | 2 | 6 | 9 |

*Source: data entry collected by authors trough the questionnaire*

**The main hypothesis testing**, regarding to the knowledge degree of social economy sector and its representative organizations, was achieved starting from analysis of responses frequency provided by the subjects participating in the study, on the following questions:

1. *Is familiar to You the term* "**social economy**"? With answers variants: "**yes**", "**no**", "**I do not know**".

2. *Do You know an organization / enterprise of social economy*? With answers variants: "**yes**", "**no**".

**The working assumption** was formulated as follows:

**The null hypothesis (H0):** subjects in the study don't know the social economy sector and nor the representative organizations of this sector.

**Alternative hypothesis (H1):** the subjects, participating in the study, know very well the social economy sector, including representative organizations.

Analysis of the recorded answers to the question: *Is familiar to You the term* "*social economy*"? started from the basic statistical inventory, presented in Table 4. Thus, analyzing the distribution of scores for the variable "*SETermA*", trichotomy variable, was done from a total of 30 subjects without any missing subject. The frequency of affirmative answer, "yes", is 43.3% of the total subjects, the frequency of negative response, "no" is 40% of the total subjects and the frequency of the answer "don't know" is 16.7% of the total subjects.

**Table no. 4. Statistics - Social Economy Term**

„SETermA"

| N | Valid | 30 |
|---|---|---|
|  | Missing | 0 |

**The response frequency of subjects, by type of response**

| „SETermAnswer" |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | Yes | 13 | 43.3 | 43.3 | 43.3 |
|  | No | 12 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 83.3 |

| I don' Know | 5 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 30 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

*Source: data processing, by authors, in SPSS*

The frequency of the positive and negative responses to this question is almost equal, reason for which, to increase the accuracy of the interpretation, we perform the χ² test in SPSS. Therefore, we analyse the response variant - "*Affirmative*" or "*negative*", without ruling out the third option, "*don't know*" - by comparing the theoretical frequencies of occurrence of them, with those observed.

For this purpose we formulated the **null hypothesis (H0)**: the three variants of the answer are equally marked by the subjects participating in the study and the **alternative hypothesis (H1):** some variant of the answer is mostly selected by the subjects participating in the study (Clocotici, V., Stan, A., 2000, p.192).

We consider the accepted materiality threshold, p = 0.05. The null hypothesis is rejected if the χ² calculated value is greater or equal to the tabular critical value.

**Table no. 5 SETermAnswer**  **Test Statistics**

| | Observed N | Expected N | Residual |
|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 13 | 10.0 | 3.0 |
| No | 12 | 10.0 | 2.0 |
| I don' Know | 5 | 10.0 | -5.0 |
| Total | 30 | | |

| | SETermA |
|---|---|
| Chi-Square | 3.800[a] |
| df | 2 |
| Asymp. Sig. | .150 |

*a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 10.0.*

*Source: data processing, by authors, in SPSS*

The formula to calculate χ² is given by:

where:   $O_i$ = observed frequency;
         $E_i$ = estimated frequency          (1)

The calculated χ² value (3.800), presented in the table no. 5, is compared to the χ2 tabular critical value (5.991) for the established decision criteria: p = 0.05 and number of freedom degrees, df = 2 (Clocotici, V., Stan, A., 2000, p.286). We find that the χ² calculated value (3.800), is much smaller than the tabular one (5.991) and therefore we can not reject the null hypothesis according to that, contrary to appearances, the subjects participating in the study are not familiar with the **concept "social economy"**.

Similarly, the statistical analysis on the recorded responses to the question: „Do You know an organization / enterprise of social economy?", starts from the basic statistical inventory, presented in the table no. 6. Thus, the analysis of the scores distribution for the variable "SEOrgAnswer" was made from a total of 30 subjects without missing any subject. The frequency of affirmative answer, "*yes*", is 26.7% of the total subjects, and the

frequency of occurrence of negative response, "*no*" is 73.3% of the total subjects.

**Table no. 6 Statistics Social Enterprise Organization**

„SEOrgAnswer"

| N | Valid | 30 |
|---|---|---|
| | Missing | 0 |
| Minimum | | 1 |
| Maximum | | 2 |

**The response frequency of subjects, by type of response**

| „IESOrganizationA" | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | 8 | 26.7 | 26.7 | 26.7 |
| Valid | No | 22 | 73.3 | 73.3 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 30 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

*Source: data processing, by authors, in SPSS*

Reiterating the reasoning described above, we performed the $\chi^2$ test for the variable "*social economy organization*" (SEOrgAnswer), test conditions remaining unchanged.
***The null hypothesis (H0):*** both of answers variant are marked equally by subjects participating in the study.
***Alternative hypothesis (H1):*** some variant of answer is mostly selected from subjects enrolled in the study.
The $\chi^2$ critical tabular value for the materiality threshold $p = 0.05$ and number of freedom degrees, $df = 1$, is 3.841.
This time, we find that $\chi^2$ calculated value (6.533) is higher than the tabular one (3.841) and therefore, we reject the null hypothesis (table 7). Concluding, we may affirm that although the subjects participating in the study, are not familiar with the "social economy" concept and what perform this sector, they partially know the representative organizations.

**Table no. 7 SEOrgAnswer            Test Statistics**

| | Observed N | Expected N | Residual | | SETermA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 8 | 15.0 | -7.0 | Chi-Square | 6.533[a] |
| No | 22 | 15.0 | 7.0 | df | 1 |
| | | | | Asymp. Sig. | .011 |
| Total | 30 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 15.0.

*Source: data processing, by authors, in SPSS*

The analysis that we made to the recorded answers on the third question: In Your community operates any of the following organizations (select the knowing variant)? With answers variants: "Mutualities", "Cooperative", "Church social centers", "NGO", "Rural communities", completes the image shown above, according to that, although the subjects participating in the study, were not familiarised – on the date of the survey – with the concept of **"social economy"**, however 80% of them know about the existence of at least one such organization in their community (table 8). Analysis of scores distribution for this variable was performed from a total of 30 subjects without any subject missing. The frequency of occurrence of affirmative answer, "yes" is 80% of the total subjects, and the frequency of occurrence of negative response, "no", is 20% of the total subjects.

The results presented in Table 8 indicates that 40% of the subjects participating in the study, knew, at the time of the survey, at least a social economy organization that works in their community, 33.3% of which are NGOs.

We note that, from the social economy enterprises listed, the most known by the participants on the survey are NGOs, at a rate of 66.7%, Mutuality, at a rate of 39.7%, followed by cooperatives and social centers of the church.

**Table no. 8 Statistics of Active Social Enterprise Organization**

| N | Valid | 30 |
|---|---|---|
| | Missing | 0 |

**The response frequency of subjects, by type of response**

| „ActSE" | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | Mutuality | 2 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 6.7 |
| | Mutuality; Cooperative | 2 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 13.3 |
| | Mutuality; Cooperative; Church social centers; NGO | 3 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 23.3 |
| | Mutuality; Cooperative; NGO | 1 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 26.7 |
| | Mutuality; Church social centers; NGO | 2 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 33.3 |
| | Mutuality; NGO | 2 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 40.0 |
| | Church social centers; NGO | 2 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 46.7 |
| | NGO | 10 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 80.0 |
| | I don't know | 6 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 30 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

*Source: data processing, by authors, in SPSS*

**Testing the secondary hypothesis**, according to that the answer of the subjects participating in the study, is influenced by *their level of training*, started from:

**The null hypothesis (H0)**: there is no significant relationship between *the level of instruction* of the subjects and *their variant of answer*.

**The null hypothesis (H0)**: there is a significant relationship between *the level of instruction* of the subjects and *their variant of answer*.

The variable "education" (level of education of the subjects participating in the study) is a variable of scalar type that allows us to calculate, by using the IMB SPSS Statistics, the coefficient of contingency $\chi^2$ and coefficient of concordance $\gamma$ Goodman - Kruskal (coefficient is based concordant and discordant pairs number) (Opariuc-Dan, C. 2011, p. 48).
The calculation formula used for the coefficient of $\gamma$ Goodman and Kruskal:

$$\text{where, } n_{Mi} = \text{the highest frequency in row i;}$$
$$\text{Max}(C_j) = \text{the highest frequency of columns frequencies;} \quad (2)$$
$$n = \text{the number of study participants}$$

The decision criteria used is threshold of significance $p = 0.05$. Analysis of the results of the contingency table (9) were achieved from a total of 30 subjects without any missing subject.
Subjects who are faculty graduate are well above the expected frequency for the affirmative response. The standardized form of the residues indicate small deviations from the situation in which there would be no relationship between the two variables, which is why we could wrongly conclude that this group of subjects is well informed on the concept of social economy. High values of the thresholds of significance from the table 9 does not allow us to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore we can affirm that the preference of response of the subjects, at the time of the survey, is not influenced by their level of education.

**Table no. 9. Case Processing Summary**

|  | Cases | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
|  | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Study * SETermA | 30 | 100.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 30 | 100.0% |

**a) Study * SETermA Crosstabulation**

|  |  |  | SETermA | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  | Yes | No | I don' Know |  |
| Study | High school | Count | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
|  |  | Expected Count | 1.3 | 1.2 | .5 | 3.0 |
|  |  | Std. Residual | .6 | -.2 | -.7 |  |
|  |  | Adjusted Residual | .9 | -.2 | -.8 |  |
|  | Post high school | Count | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  | Expected Count | .4 | .4 | .2 | 1.0 |
|  |  | Std. Residual | .9 | -.6 | -.4 |  |
|  |  | Adjusted Residual | 1.2 | -.8 | -.5 |  |
|  | Faculty | Count | 7 | 11 | 4 | 22 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Expected Count | 9.5 | 8.8 | 3.7 | 22.0 |
| | | Std. Residual | -.8 | .7 | .2 | |
| | | Adjusted Residual | -2.1 | 1.9 | .4 | |
| | Postgraduate | Count | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| | | Expected Count | 1.7 | 1.6 | .7 | 4.0 |
| | | Std. Residual | 1.0 | -1.3 | .4 | |
| | | Adjusted Residual | 1.4 | -1.8 | .5 | |
| Total | | Count | 13 | 12 | 5 | 30 |
| | | Expected Count | 13.0 | 12.0 | 5.0 | 30.0 |

**b) Chi-Square Tests**

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 6.164[a] | 6 | .405 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 8.414 | 6 | .209 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .101 | 1 | .750 |
| N of Valid Cases | 30 | | |

a. 10 cells (83.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .17.

**c) Directional Measures**

| | | | Value | Asymp. Std. Error[a] | Approx. T[b] | Approx. Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nominal by Nominal | Lambda | Symmetric | .160 | .156 | .957 | .339 |
| | | Study Dependent | .000 | .000 | [c] | [c] |
| | | SETermA Dependent | .235 | .218 | .957 | .339 |
| | Goodman and Kruskal tau | Study Dependent | .109 | .069 | | .150[d] |
| | | SETermA Dependent | .126 | .059 | | .295[d] |
| | Uncertainty Coefficient | Symmetric | .150 | .053 | 2.502 | .209[e] |
| | | Study Dependent | .167 | .053 | 2.502 | .209[e] |
| | | SETermA Dependent | .136 | .055 | 2.502 | .209[e] |
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Somers' d | Symmetric | .063 | .187 | .335 | .738 |
| | | Study Dependent | .053 | .159 | .335 | .738 |
| | | SETermA Dependent | .077 | .229 | .335 | .738 |

*a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.*
*b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.*
*c. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.*
*d. Based on chi-square approximation*
*e. Likelihood ratio chi-square probability.*

**d) Symmetric Measures**

|  |  | Value | Asymp. Std. Error[a] | Approx. T[b] | Approx. Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nominal by Nominal | Phi | .453 |  |  | .405 |
|  | Cramer's V | .321 |  |  | .405 |
|  | Contingency Coefficient | .413 |  |  | .405 |
| Ordinal by Ordinal | Kendall's tau-b | .064 | .191 | .335 | .738 |
|  | Kendall's tau-c | .050 | .149 | .335 | .738 |
|  | Gamma | .118 | .349 | .335 | .738 |
| N of Valid Cases |  | 30 |  |  |  |

*a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.*
*b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.*

*Source: data processing, by authors, in SPSS*

The graphical representation of the investigation, presented in Figure 1, shows the fact the educational level of the participants in the study, at the time of the survey, has nothing to do with the degree to which they know the social economy sector. The chart show-us only the predominance of a particular type of response (yes / no / do not know) of the subjects.

*Figure no. 1. The predominance of answers given by subjects, by category of response*
*Source: data processing, by authors, in SPSS*

### Conclusions

The results that we present in this paper are part of a larger study, which is ongoing, in order to identify new solutions adapted to social economy enterprises, that

ultimately leading to improve the management of this category of enterprises so that by positioning them in the local communities, they can favourably respond to the current needs of sustainable and responsible development of these communities.

After testing hypothesis, we received the statistical confirmation of the fact that, the social economy sector (including **social economy enterprises**, as representative organizations) was little known by the subjects participating in the study - from the investigated micro-community - at the time of the survey. After testing the working assumptions, we received the statistic confirmation according to that the social **economy concept is not known**. However, the subjects participants to the study, knew, at the time of the survey, a number of organizations representing the social economy sector, without knowing that these organizations belong of this sector. The fragmented manner, in which the subjects are informed, reveals that the field of study on the social economy is not known in the investigated micro-community.

In addition, testing of the secondary assumption, according to that, the degree of knowledge   of the social economy could be influenced by the level of instruction of the subjects participating in the study, confirmed that there is no significant relationship between the level of education of the subjects and their answer preference. In other words, the concept of social economy, at the time of the survey, was little known by the participants of the study, regardless of their level of education.

The method of direct administration of the questionnaire, where we decided at the time of the study in the selected micro-community, has allowed us to interact with the subjects and thereby gain some valuable information which were subsequently used to finalize the questionnaire and to the selection of the best channels of distribution. The questionnaire    is    now    available    online    and    can    be    accessed    at: *http://goo.gl/forms/Br3jBnNxVh*. The information that we collect using this tool allow us to make a more depth and nuanced interpretation about the field of study, that will provide us additional information regarding to the methods of management (known and used) by the social economy enterprises, the benefits of volunteering, how is perceived the relationship between individual and community etc.

The research we conduct is of the maximum actuality in the context in that it is clear that the public sector is becoming increasingly overcome by the problems facing communities and the private sector is not charged with punctual responsibilities in this regard. **Social economy enterprises** thus become the local communities resources catalyst and engine of social innovation, sustainable growth, inclusive, in the generic se nse of change and progress.

The above statement is confirmed by the results presented in the most recent summary report about the role played by European foundations (specific social economy organizations) in supporting research and innovation, in all sectoral categories. Foundations for Research and Innovation study, to be presented to the public on December 14, 2015, highlights the contribution of European foundations to support research and innovation. According to that study, in the last 25 years European foundations supported the research with at least € 5 Billion per year, an amount that represents approximately half of the annual budget that the European Union allocates to the research (Synthesis Report, 2015, p.5).

Finally, by the completion of the research that we have initiated, **management** as a

science and its formative-applicative component, is facing on the new challenges, which ultimately lead to the identification of methods, techniques and tools adapted on the *social economy enterprises* and increase the level of knowledge in the field.

### References

Barna, C., 2014, "Atlas of Social Economy in Romania", Bucharest, Social Economy Institute Publishing

Campos, J. L. M., Chaves, R., Demoustier, D., Spear, R., Frobel, L., 2007, "Social Economy in European Union", Brussels, CIRIEC

Clocotici, V., Stan. A., 2000, "Applied Statistics in Psychology", Iași, Polirom.

Alexandrescu, F., Arpinte D., Scoican, A.-S., Cace, S., 2010, "Social Economy in Romania: Two Regional Profiles", Bucharest, Expert

Monzón, J.L., Chaves, R., 2012, "Social Economy in European Union", Brussels, CIRIEC

Opariuc-Dan, C., 2011, "Applied statistics in the social and human sciences - the associations analysis and statistical differences", Constanța, ASGR Publishing

Stănescu, S.M., 2011, "Demand for social economy in development regions Bucharest-Ilfov and South-East", Revista de Economie Socială, Vol. V, nr.1 / 2015, pp.146-149, Bucharest

Voicu, B. (2013) "The social economy: conceptualization in the context of social changes", article used with written consent from the author

National Strategy for Sustainable Development of Romania, Horizons 2013-2020-2030, retrieved 22.12.2015 from www.insse.ro/cms/files/.../sndd-final-en.pdf

Social Economy Law, no. 219/2015, Official Gazette, Part I, no. 561 of July 28, 2015

Statistics of social economy in Romania: Public policy proposals, Presented within the National Conference of Social Economy, 05.06.2014, Bucharest

Synthesis Report, 2015, "European Foundations for Research and Innovation", European Union, doi: 10.2777/13420