Business, Arguing and Revolutions: Entrepreneurial Initiative as Social Innovation Tool

Jairo de Carvalho Guimarães¹

¹Universidade Federal do Piauí, UFPI, Brasil

Correspondência: Jairo de Carvalho Guimarães, Endereço: BR 343, KM 3,5, Meladão, CEP 64800000, Florianópolis, PI. Tel.: 55 89 3521-6780. Email: jairoguimaraes@ufpi.edu.br

Recebido: 11 de maio de 2016 Aceito: 05 de julho de 2017 Publicado: 31 de outubro de 2017

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21714/1679-18272016v14n2.p355-366>

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to discuss the conditions in which social innovation acquires actual contours and values that are reflected in certain territorial segments, whereas the accrued intentions idealized scope are linked to actors who hold well-defined entrepreneurial characteristics and that such purposes are settled in factors such as aesthetics – as element of perception of the beautiful nature that social action is – the argumentative discourse – as legitimate means to promote the involvement of new actors through the substantiation of a new mindset toward the common good – and the prestige designed to construct collaboration by such agents of change – as a result of overlap between the state of the art, due to the desire to change a situation which requires the intervention of holders agents of skills and knowledge, and intelligent argument use here defined as an effective tool to mobilize people and minds aiming at a consensus in favor of a specific community. Despite the literature focus their findings in social innovation processes arising from business initiatives – a fact that can not be ignored given the advancement of the relations established towards the balance of forces gravitating socioeconomic universe – the challenge of this test is to provoke reflection on the argument as an instrument to carry out the most urgent social innovations, whose domain is the responsibility of the entrepreneur. The work is supported in ideas Marcy (2015), CRISES, (2004), Perelman (2004), Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (2005), Herrera (2015) and Matei and Antonie (2015).

Keywords: Argumentation, Entrepreneurship, Social Innovation, Revolution.

Resumo

O objetivo deste trabalho é discutir as condições em que a inovação social adquire contornos e valores reais que se refletem em certos segmentos territoriais, enquanto que as intenções acumuladas, o escopo idealizado estão ligadas a atores que possuem características empresariais bem definidas e que tais fins são estabelecidos em fatores como a estética - como elemento de percepção da natureza bela que a ação social é - o discurso argumentativo - como legítimo significa promover o envolvimento de novos atores através da fundamentação de uma nova mentalidade em direção ao bem comum - e o prestígio projetado para construir colaboração por tais agentes de mudança - como resultado da sobreposição entre o estado da arte, devido ao desejo de mudar uma situação que requer a intervenção dos detentores de agentes de habilidades e conhecimentos, e o uso de argumentos inteligentes aqui definido como uma ferramenta efetiva para mobilizar pessoas e mentes visando um consenso a favor de uma comunidade específica. Apesar de a literatura abordar suas descobertas nos processos de inovação social decorrentes de iniciativas empresariais - um fato que não pode ser ignorado, dado o avanço das relações estabelecidas para o equilíbrio das forças que gravitam o universo socioeconômico - o desafio desse teste é provocar a reflexão sobre o argumento como um instrumento para realizar as inovações sociais mais urgentes, cujo domínio é a responsabilidade do empreendedor. O trabalho é apoiado nas ideias de Marcy (2015), CRISES, (2004), Perelman (2004), Perelman e Olbrechts-Tyteca (2005), Herrera (2015) e Matei e Antonie (2015).

Palavras-chave: Argumentação, Empreendedorismo, Inovação Social, Revolução.

Esta obra está licenciada sob uma Licença Creative Commons Attribution 3.0.

1. Introduction

The global socioeconomic scenario, well seated and increasingly adapted to the capitalist model, carreado by its known consequences, has provided recurring hints that urge immediate initiatives aimed at equalization of incompatibilities or even social imbalances – as well as economic, cultural, environmental, politicians - as well designed the set reality. The current socioeconomic conditions have designed sufficient indications for the

recognition that social positions have paid a high price for maintaining a model that is still not properly exhausted, shows that in our times there are no viable economic alternatives that can stop the dangerous interventions that society It has suffered, especially in peripheral countries, where social artifacts are being sprayed by unrestrained capitalist avalanche.

Furthermore, once the explicit breakdown of traditional values that a priori should guide social relations, became a significant number of unruly behavior and inconsistent with the standards necessary for the harmonious coexistence. This is true not only among many nations seeking to establish their interests through warlike interventions, economic, cultural, and corporate policies. But with large scale, it appears that even in smaller territories in areas where supposedly social relations should be adjusted because of the ease of dialogue, negotiation and subsequent consensus, the unpleasantness prevail, intrigue, conflict, ethics cracks and misconduct.

Currently live in a society where the social construction is part of a collective achievement is indeed a huge challenge. On the other hand, the formation of advanced social models and mature without the cooperation and participation of change agents is unsustainable seeking, even in initially isolated actions, which naturally tend to add new strength along the way, the equalization of adversity and social insecurity that pervade many of the prevailing socioeconomic relations. As stress Berger and Luckmann (2011, p. 28) “[...] only very few people are concerned with the theoretical interpretation of the world, but all live in a world of some kind”, that is, if you live in world without knowing really how to interpret it, diagnose it, so in order to contribute to its improvement. In the view of Drucker (2012), social problems are business opportunities generators. For him,

[...] the significant opportunities to convert social problems into opportunities may not be situated in new technologies or new products, or new services. It is possible consisting of the solution of the social problem, ie, social innovation, then, directly or indirectly, benefit and strengthen the company or the industry. The success of some of the most successful companies is largely the result of social innovation.

In Brazil, the exposure of social fissures that historically go bewildered without a structured guideline to define the appropriate axis aimed at the deconstruction of the paradox – given the wealth that appropriate public bodies through excessive tax burden in step with the counterpart services public quality and durability – tend to park on the landing haunting and surprising: few actions are effective fact regarding the mitigation of the highlighted social problems, with special emphasis in times of economic crisis, in which the most vulnerable assume high share in global social burden.

Whereas it is possible to act successfully in a complex and problematic social environment, Drucker (2012, p. 283) states that “any company, and indeed, any institution must organize innovative efforts to convert social problems in performance opportunities and contributions”. Undoubtedly, many theories have contributed to the strengthening of social innovation, however, here it is intended to develop a reasoning which conceives entrepreneurship – and all the features of its surroundings – as effective to promote means a “meaningful work that aligns with their [entrepreneur] values”, as stated by Macdonald (2015, p. 39). In this sense, establish mutual relations between economic development and social development (CRISES, 2004) is the backdrop for the process of social innovation, whose spectrum based this work.

2. The Basics of Social Innovation

The world has various ideological hues, fortunately, and when one is facing scenarios that signal clear paradoxes – as an example, which means the loss that the social dimension, especially in peripheral countries, has suffered in the course of the capitalist model advancement – way out there than the seizure means responsible for pulling the brake of misunderstanding and constant cash flow, based on geographic loyalty of the country which already has won best conditions. While some groups have been successful in the position of investors and financial supporters, many others have maintained the distance of the wealth generated by the nation, which overhangs the balance of coherence to one side, to the detriment of the most vulnerable side.

Situations in various segments such as availability of health, social inclusion through education, access to micro-credit system, the most decent and safe working conditions, the expansion of employment opportunities, the reduction of social inequalities, the elimination the social vulnerability of those who rely on state support for their livelihood, have been directly affected by how the economic system has worked, the principle is the nurturer accelerated pursuit of profit at any cost. Organizations generally have an important role to play in finding social solutions. It is worth mentioning the perception of Drucker (2012, p. 280) for whom “social change and social innovation throughout the business history have been at least as important as technological change”.

Under this condition, often imbalances are revealed in its fullness by requiring agents to change the sensible pursuit of compensation alternatives. At this point, social innovation arises to promote the necessary adjustments in order to slow down so many imbalances and strengthen civil society in its binding aspect, it both has been

decomposed when it reveals abnormal conditions of satisfaction of their basic needs – education, health, transport infrastructure, security, as mentioned.

Although the concept of social innovation can be related to products, processes, projects, relationships between organizations, etc. it is understood as a social innovation every initiative or willing to relocate given situation – which under evaluation denotes a position that contradicts any social justice model – humanization levels, holism, psychological adjustment or truly embodied theory with the aim to produce an effective result, making an impact in a given space, time or means.

Innovate presupposes create, plan and, in fact, run a considered promising idea. Innovating socially is adopting concepts, proposals, behaviors, strategies, organizational models and assertiveness in order to solve social problems – work, education, health, security, infrastructure, etc. – in a given locality, community, city, region.

Social innovation in the design of Crises (2004, p. 1), is the “organizational and institutional new forms, new ways of doing things, new social practices, new mechanisms, new approaches and new concepts que give rise to concrete achievements and improvements”. For Herrera (2015, p. 1469), which analyzes the importance of the institutionalization of social innovation, “social innovation is a measureable, replicable initiative que uses a new concept or a new application of an existing concept to create shareholder and social value”. Thus, social innovation requires in its meritorious views an intention, a desire to promote the reversal of a bizarre and disproportionate situation or otherwise, the will to create new ways to promote the equalization of a condition that can be improved, improved in your current perspective, always seeking its consolidation and permanence, as the social demands are inexhaustible.

The central purpose of this paper advocates that social innovation is not housed in a reductionist rite, as can be seen in innovations developed in the organizational environment, but its modulation is imbrincada with the flexible nature of driving, since prioristicamente, the focus is human being, the person to whose proposal for transformation shall endeavor. Thus, from the identification of the problem to be attacked, the collective aspect should be considered, as these issues are not confined to individuals per se, but relate to a group of people involved in the problem of the structure and, therefore, have to be addressed with innovative social action, whether radical or incremental (MARCY, 2015).

From this perspective, it asserts that social innovation is a phenomenon that requires an interdisciplinary approach that can be understood, structured and practiced in all its variables, since it determines not only the managerial character and direction in progress but above all the sociological aspect that defines your surroundings. For example, the entrepreneurial initiative is built on aspects that combine various fields of knowledge, ranging from managerial factors, human resources, financial, marketing, logistics, but also in the field of aesthetic philosophical – whose founding apparatus the idea of contemplation beautiful, beauty, involved in understanding the ideas, concepts, judgments, values and emotions – of professional ethics, sociological interactivity, among other disciplines. As far as the efficient conduct of an organization that aims to profit, the orientation of actions involving social innovation need effectiveness, but in degree above the conventional, because it is related to factors and sensory nuances, as already mentioned.

At this point, the possible incongruity between emotion that guide the purposes and rationality so well outlined in the organizational environment seems to derail the innovation work. But this half truth does not survive the current indicative that organizations have thought of distinctive shape in relation to their economic plans. Some have already incorporated in its portfolio strategic social innovation actions in order to safeguard its continuity, in response to an avid company for compensation.

Under explicit condition, social innovation terminology it's does not fit for something just meaning, since its production is related to the involvement of the agent which aims to bring about a change - sometimes radical – in a given situation, that is, that in fact social innovation freak out the desired effect is necessary before any assumption that well – designed meta compose the scope of the initiative is intended to implement. In this regard and considered the aesthetic rigor, innovate socially is to spread some knowledge held by the processing agent on behalf of a collective. Under this banner, Gherardi and Strati (2014, p. Xvii) mention that

[...] knowledge does not reside in the minds of people or in a commodity, but an activity located in social, labor and organizational practices. Therefore, it is held in changing knowledge (object) to know (activity) something that people 'do' together, collectively and socially.

Social innovation is then preceded by intentionality (SEARLE, 2002), which defines mental bases of the desire to reverse a given situation. Indeed, structured means aimed at decision-making and action, the applicability of the strategies becomes imperative for the scope of the proposal. From the junction of these three elements – create, plan, execute – not the least important fator – manage – begins to emerge as amalgam element in the construction of a new paradigm that undo the dichotomy between the production of wealth and its poor distribution, explicit example of Brazil. As well noted Searle (2002, p. 149), “satisfaction of the conditions of a

prior intention is, in fact, the performance of an action, but not all actions are performed as a result of previous intentions”.

As stated by Berger and Luckmann (2011, p. 37) “consciousness is always intentional”. The subject is not only prepared to intervene in a reality that goes to appropriate or that was already “ready” waiting for your arrival but as a member of a collective, which actively participates in this reality and exercise the prerogative to relate directly to the purpose of make it more just and united. This is because the reality is intersubjective and therefore does not obviate groups to make it healthy female. In Macdonald's view (2015, p. 39) “being a humanitarian aid worker is a lifestyle (the calling, if you will), not just a job”.

Develop a social innovation behavior is to set parameters to guide the creative, revolutionary action, developed in new visions and paradigms, unfavorable to any status quo that features a maintenance situation or establishment, in terms of social incongruity. Indeed, when someone or organization innovates socially is because it is allegedly acting at the root of a particular problem, in his analysis, means an imbalance in the economic context in perspective, driven by mirroring an incompatible social situation with the production of goods and wealth given territory.

Incidentally, in this aspect, the cover innovation not only territorial changes, but in labor relations, education, health, housing and therefore the quality of life of the people who inhabit a geographic area defined, this is because the primary objective of a social innovation initiative is to reflect the actions that stimulated the engagement of processing agents, is changing the way people live and it is because you understand that all is not lost and that any action needs to be sent. As stated by Macdonald (2015), who promote self-reflection and engage in actions positivist does well you and makes the difference,

on a good day, it can be the best job in the world. Really. I can not imagine anything else being the interesting, challenging, exhilarating, and rewarding the some of the jobs I have had. Plus, every now and again, things go right, and you walk away feeling que, for some people, in some places, the world is a better place because of something you did. That is tremendously powerful and motivating, and it is what keeps many people doing this (MACDONALD, 2015, p. 39).

This is a significant mark of social innovation, the scope of which is home to the answer that is given to a scenario – said desultory than expected from a given reality – that raises awareness, which requires resolution, which urges the mind, the soul and the collective for a responsive action. Who innovates socially feel the need to deconstruct a given pillar holding up a composition where few part, where many see the margin, in a state of distress and injustice, and in which many simply disclaim any responsibility or obligation to assume a role of reversibility. It operates a latent desire to find new alternatives in put relations, which should be based on the balance of forces and the equanimity of the interests and opportunities.

The social innovator is someone who goes against all the command center, breaks natural mechanisms of action, breaking barriers, produces powerful reflexes and faces. In the view of Searle (2002, p. 148), “an action is an entity made up of which one component is an intention in action”. The social innovator is someone who is with the exact notion of social justice, economic balance and clarity of purpose with a view to include other individuals in the world of wealth of a country. Under this sign, Matei and Antonie (2015, p. 66) state that “changes are often non-linear being. So, this brings us to the first feature of intentional change theory as a complex system”. The purpose of this work is to prove that someone who delves into the entrepreneurial universe is, in fact, exercising an initiative for social innovation, in that the intention behind the central idea is to cause enormous repercussions in the region where it intends to implement the deal. For this reason, businesses, arguments and repercussions are imbricated, always having as end point the conviction of a socially innovative response.

In designing Alonso López and Castrucci (2012, p. 191), organizations can be for-profit companies or not, these being “[...] associations, movements, groups, formal or informal, state and private, as well as government entities”. In general, CRISES (2004, p. 2) chooses “to distinguish between organizational innovation, which involves management and organization methods, and institutional innovation, which concerns a political system's methods for managing conflict and for defining the laws, rights and responsibilities affecting social actors”.

In this direction, we seek the entrepreneurial initiative of the alternatives to promote social innovation, intending to build new social levels from the innovative mediation mastermind agent that using the argumentative discourse tool, is not exempt from social actor role. From the point of view of CRISES (2004), it has that entrepreneurial intention is a forms of work and new skills.

3. Entrepreneurial Initiative: Social Construction of Instrument

Undoubtedly, the promotion of social innovation is unthinkable without establishing appropriate means and coherently structured to make viable its effectiveness. To fly the new procedures that aim to reform certain socioeconomic status, the processing agente – entrepreneur – can not do without certain skills that will support

due to its innovative proposal. For the success of social innovation, the entrepreneur must be: persuasive, self-confident, independent, persistent, aggregator, curious, determined, focused, goal, proactive, assertive, challenging, averse to conventional, restrained the adventures, perfectionist, efficient, fast, listener, eloquent, intuitive, among other qualities.

In addition to the factors mentioned, it is inevitable the resources of creativity, engagement and inspiration as a guide for the social innovation process and, therefore, the search for new stratagems with the aim of protecting the action range due success is as it becomes crucial in the context of entrepreneurship. In fact, authors such as Dornelas (2008), Salim and Silva (2010), Bessant and Tidd (2009), Hisrich, Peters and Shepherd (2014) and Sarkar (2008) emphasize that the success of the venture depends on some basic features like the aforementioned factors.

The premise is that revolutionary creations – or as notes Marcy (2015), “leaders of radical social innovations” – emerge to generate wealth and make the capitalist wheel spinning at high speed. However, the capitalist machinery mentioned here is intended to remain attached to aspects of social reach. Bill Gates (SPILLET, 2010, p 217) calls “creative capitalismo” to every initiative that “[...] argues that businesses can – and should – benefit society.” That is, you are not here defenestrar the current economic model, but indicate that there is concurrent actions that can be promoted in order to mitigate the damage that are naturally produced by the random and rampant condition that many corporations tend to adopt in order to maximize profit.

A priori ideas that are not for the actual provision to society are seen as mere creations meaningless, because it is unusual for anyone to address a specific problem, seek the solution of an issue that afflicts many or try new performances in situations where can get another type of processing but to satisfy the foregoing demands or to foster demands yet unsubstantiated, that is, the ideas come to demonstrate that the product, process, concept, design, initiative or service that was supposedly essential was entered in the list obsolescence due to innovative new element that appears to overcome an earlier need.

Remember that social innovation will always require new ways of thinking to solve the problems generated by the system, since technological innovation, a constant, is crucial to produce new social demands. About the expression “problems”, it is relevant to point out what you think Woodell (2015, p. 47):

Every minute of every day, our world gets more complex. The social and economic problems that we face seem to grow ever more complicated. People at universities are good at complicated problems, but they are finding that have to do things in new ways – collaboratively, across disciplines – in order to tackle today’s level of complex problems. Solving problems is rewarding in and of itself, of course, but also because it can result in real improvement in people’s lives. Finding these solutions helps individuals see the value and relevance of their work. At the same time, ever more complex problems press the limits of the resources available.

Those people who identify, in the way they engage and resolve the problems of others, a peculiar style of personal satisfaction is, without doubt, a hallmark of entrepreneurs. Dolabella (1999) uses the entrepreneur expression for the individual who makes every effort aimed at wealth creation, is the transformation of knowledge into products and services, is the formation of knowledge itself, is in the implementation of innovation in processes, products, services and the relationship between people, and at this particular point we have that entrepreneurial behavior can contribute strongly in addressing social dilemmas.

Entrepreneurs change or transform values, disrupt and disorganize, destroy creatively, see the change as normal and as healthy, they are put to work and do not expect a brilliant idea arises from nothing or take the jackpot (HSM MANAGEMENT, 2010). The entrepreneurial action, so it is a phenomenon that is the breaking of a static stage, stimulating certain contexts and positions. In the view of Matei and Antonie (2015, p. 66) “when we encounter organized change, accompanied by the defined framework, we may have innovative aspects and therefore evolution”, suggesting that social innovation through entrepreneurship presupposes a single model reference. However, social innovation is not based on standardization, because every problem to be worked requires specific tools for addressing them.

The fact is that social innovations generally not stem from great ideas, but the commitment of transforming agent in aim to redefine a new way to treat a problem – new or old. As social problems are diffuse and therefore require different treatment models, many innovations allow not be replicated, which makes the task of innovative agente – and his team – even more arduous. As mentioned Drucker (2011, p. 188), some

[...] innovations can not be played. They can not be taught, and can not be learned. There is no way to teach someone to be a genius. But also, contrary to popular belief in the novel invention and innovation, the 'flashes of genius' are unusually rare. Worse, I know of no 'flash of genius' that had resulted in innovation. All remained as ideas light.

Recurrently, the proposal is behind an innovative approach relates to a perceived chance. By bringing the issue of innovation in the social environment, it remains evident that the opportunity – key parameter for a successful entrepreneurial process – is still there, only it does not have the aim to meet the need of the creator, but the needs of those who are the focus of intention, whose socioeconomic revolution is housed in a commitment that is not subject to monetary compensation, but rewards and psychological motivations, because this is, in fact, the motto

of any entrepreneurial thinking back to an explicit desire you want to review a social issue. Finnis (2012, p. 13) reveals that “[...] a desire is correct when he get a real good and good is a real good when your object is a desire that is not just a want, but a need”. This need, perceived by the innovative genius, is the starting point – and finish – the entrepreneurial attitude, whose conduct involving social innovation often “goes against the current”(MARCY, 2015, p. 370) than is commonly realize sedimented in the corporate fabric.

To mention the demographic changes, Drucker (2011, p. 190) details the their understanding of the degree of importance of knowledge – which in his opinion is relative – when it comes to assessing the congruence relevant to a social approach. For the author “[...] the knowledge may have very little relevance to someone who is creating a new social instrument to satisfy a need caused by demographic changes”. It should highlight the idea Goergen (2011, p. 99), for whom

[...] the economic system, for example, interests have a competent individual, skilled in the management of knowledge and techniques, flexible and adaptable to the capital intents. Citizenship, on the other hand, requires an autonomous, independent and critical, able to decide, on their own, the fate of his life within a project of social responsibility.

The practice, or performing a reflective intention, is thought by Schön (2000, p. 32), who “know suggests the dynamic quality of knowing-in-action, which, when described, converted into knowledge-in-action”. In this line, Charles Sanders Peirce (1939) states, mentioned by Abbagnano (2012, p. 920) that “the trial is part of the determination of any justified proposition”. For Schön (2000, p. 64), “[...] experience is to take action to see what comes from the action” and to act, the individual perceives, absorbing and experiencing the lessons arising from it, because by promoting action or face certain challenge humans recognize their own weaknesses and uncertainties.

To put an end to his determination to produce new horizons in the corporate context, the entrepreneur brings together some universal values, such as “happiness, freedom, fullness, excellence, autonomy, independence, achievement and sense of recognition” (MENDES, 2009, p. 39- 40). These are values that come from a structured process of knowledge, whose fate lies in that for which faces the will to transform. Gherardi (2014, p. 8) points out that “[...] the most significant innovation of ethnomethodology in relation to traditional sociology is the replacement of cognitive categories by categories of action and the consequent view of creation and transmission of knowledge as a socially important practice”.

The socialization of knowledge and consequent practice are therefore prerequisites for the achievement of citizenship. For Rios (2011, p. 96) “citizenship implies [...] one consciousness of belonging to a community and shared responsibility. It gains its meaning in a space of democratic participation, which respects the ethical principle of solidarity”. Citizenship is a precondition for the satisfaction of social innovation and the involvement of agents in situations where clear remains the social vulnerability appears to be a point of convergence, consensus, becoming thus a thesis accepted by the whole of society, the auditorium to whom is the intention of persuasion aimed at resolving the already qualified social problem. Auditorium is a category used by the rhetoric scholars to designate the target audience to which a certain discourse intended.

In other words, the audience in the context outlined here is composed of people who have the perception, but in need of a process of substantial conviction by the speaker – entrepreneur – through the coalition of speech of that particular social demand requires participation in particular, to actually reach the first aim, which is to be the solving of the problem identified that generated the need for engagement.

4. When The Ethos, The Logos and Pathos Have Signed Convictions

Any social innovation attitude is defined by some prerequisites and, in effect, given the cyclical and relational character that social practice requires the integration of several fronts in the process requires more than simple intentions – which clearly are essential for policy the methodology of structuring path. The idea that certain changes in the social fabric will require high levels of commitment and collaboration of various actors, preconcebem that efforts will be many, especially regarding actions to segments of recognized social vulnerability, which are clearly possible identification and characterization in Brazilian territory.

Regarding the need for collaboration to make the implementation process of social innovation, Berger and Luckmann (2011, p 73) made the following comment: “Just as it is impossible for man to develop as a man in isolation, it is equally impossible to isolated man produces a human environment. The solitary human being is a being in the animal level [...]. The Homo sapiens is always, and to the same extent, homo socius”. As a main cog in the wheel of social relations, man must gather argumentative skills to ensure a balanced participation in the struggle of the forces that distort interests.

To enlist all kinds of resources – human, financial, material, spiritual, emotional – argumentative discourse becomes fundamental to coopt new agents of change, urging them to join the speech primary provider of innovative initiative. As mentioned Abbagnano (2012, p. 89) Taking the term *argomentazione*, the Encyclopedia Einaudi (1977) as a reference “[...] the reasons for accepting or rejecting a thesis can be the most disparate; the

truth or falsity of this thesis is only one reason to join it or disprove it, to be or not timely, socially useful, fair, balanced". To better understand the aspect that involves the argument as a ground for entrepreneurial initiative and its close relationship to the idea and the action, is sought in Perelman (2004) understanding of the topic:

Every argument seeks, in fact, a change in the minds of listeners, be it to modify their own theses to which they belong or simply the intensity of that adherence, measured by the later consequences it tends to produce the action. The prospect of argument does not, as the demonstration entirely separate thought from action, and it is understood that the exercise of the argument is, now favored, now prevented, and often regulated by those in society have the power or authority (PERELMAN, 2004, p. 304).

In order to build the relevance of the argument for mitigation discursive reveries, so shaken by the particular interventions without the least welcoming counterpoint released by the party to be persuaded, emotion today it is inseparable from the process that links reason versus cognition versus feeling. For Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (2005) some argumentative tools can be applied, as Table 1:

Table 1: Argumentative Tools

PURPOSE	FORM	CONTENT
Immediate result	Persuasion	Emotional
Accession	Convincing	Rational-inductive
Mark position	Debate	Goal
Truth of fact	Discussion	Rational-cyclical

Source: Perelman; Olbrechts-Tyteca (2005) – with the author's adaptation

Indeed, an issue that does not seem to take off the shares designating a social innovation is the inseparability of the founding elements of argumentative discourse – ethos, logos and pathos – seen in the context of formation of the innovative spirit from the entrepreneurial perspective. Table 2 shows the unfolding of social innovation from the implementation of argumentative discourse as minds mobilization instrument, desires, intelligence and affectivity.

Table 2: Mobilization elements of social innovation

Element	Meaning	Reach social innovation initiative
<i>Ethos</i>	Integrity; honesty; responsibility; commitment; respect and ethics of the precursor of the initiative.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Objectives frank and explicit ○ Coordination of social innovation process ○ Strengthening of otherness ○ Seizure of collective sense
<i>Logos</i>	Argumentative reasons; stylistic resources to steer the proposal nexus; direction and sought direction from the definition of objectives; defense of the ideas and expectations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Use intelligent of resources (human, material, financial) ○ Chaining the central idea with the resources necessary to implement ○ Reasoning centered on a perspective of shared results
<i>Pathos</i>	Perception; intuition; awareness strategies and the appointment of new actors to the cause; structuring of emotional means to be defended in order to achieve the objectives of the initiative; engaging speech, assertive and captivating.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Engagement of new actors ○ Colaborativity ○ Commitment to social purpose ○ Expansion and strengthening of the initiative because of the impact of the results ○ Speech engaging with the aim of strengthening the affective link towards social innovation proposal

Source: Prepared by the author, 2016.

No action that is linked to a social purpose would be reasonable to thrive if some important foundations were not imbrincadas and pelleted by arguments that involve the sense of achievement, the reason this issue with social responsibility elements and aesthetics, through a set of factors that make emotional belt of any attempt to seek rationalist make a social problem.

Social inclusion – and, in particular, entrepreneurial initiative tends to contribute to the formation of a new spirit of reversal of social paradoxes – is considered crucial point in the context of the construction of social innovation. No social innovation, from the point of view of entrepreneurial performance, is characterized only by the clear conviction that the conduct of the social actor is coated reverberant nature of measures, ie that its intervention has strengthened the relationship between the social and economic dimensions, offsetting the almost natural outcome of dysplasias that regularly involve such relationships today. More than a mere desire to do social innovation is guided by the certainty of conduct, without which the tensions thrive in scale without control. It is not therefore an episodic predisposition, but an initiative that aims at perpetuating its consequences.

To facilitate the understanding of achievement, it resorts to thinking Searle (2002, p. 120), for whom “[...] if we break the causal connection between intention and action, we no longer have a case of carrying out the intent” and in this case, what is expected of a social innovation initiative is lost in the mere desire for reflection without action, not in terms Schön (2000) when triggers the reflection-in-action devices, which refers to a practice that in the course of realization requires the firing of the reflection process. In designing Schön (2000) to “reflective practice” presupposes the search of the solution of real problems, noting that the notions of “reflection-in-action” and “reflection on action” means the following: the first is made in course of activity (action) and the second after the activity has been performed. That said, the reflexive process is the core element for building an innovative behavior, which rests on cognitive, emotional, sociological.

In this context, Drucker (2011, p. 190) states that “successful innovators use both the right side and the left side of his brain”, steadying conviction of the interdependence between the hemispheres that constitute the brain of the individual nature, guided by reason and emotion. For this example prospers, one factor is essentially important that the individual has: competence. According Hengemühle (2014, p. 23) “competence is the ability to well perform a certain task, solve a complex and ever new problem, that is, the creative and reflective subject before the new problems that today appear constantly”.

Reflection is therefore a competence that constitutes critical thinking, ideation, innovation and the desire for transformation. Being reflective is to stop the ability to understand and diagnose a particular problem. A creative person is one who has the vision to innovate. The aggregation of creativity with reflection results in the innovation process, which allows the entrepreneur enverede social harvest in order to understand and face problems and tensions, trying to find the best solutions.

Reflect is to know, and reciprocally. Knowledge retained extends the intellectual capital of the individual, but deviates from its diffusing function, whose first task is to spread among those who ignore the reflection because unaware of what they might think from certain cognitive assumptions. Retain knowledge is limited ignorance. Who does not calls for the dissemination of knowledge in active practice, rebels against the progress of humanity and thus reinforces the disconnect between social and economic constructs.

Social innovation requires not only zeal, but above all sensitivity to deal with the incongruities of modern society, liquified in their hopes and lost in their emotionality. The colaborativity – meaning collaboration complemented by assertiveness – should guide the prerogatives designating social innovation. Collaborate can not be separated from assertiveness, since the desire to transform has a positivist character, yes, no and is in line with specific interests, seasonal or sporadic.

Social innovation tends to require the agent that performs the bringing change a single engagement because the claims are not adstritas only the space, but essentially the time because innovate socially has continuity character, permanence, perseverance, commitment. This is what gives consistency and reach the proposed social innovation, not those liquified actions, empty temporal sense. Thus, as pointed out Hengemühle (2014, p. 29), “[...] to train competent and enterprising people will also help to reduce the social consequences that separate rich and poor”.

It is important to note that the collaboration of new agents entering the context of the initiative in order to contribute from their perception that driving is appropriate to seminal purposes sometimes happens after the innovation process be installed when there is an ongoing implementation of the measures for a given segment. Moreover, many initiatives have begun with a group of people engaged by a consensus given for the purpose to be achieved. Marcy (2015, p. 371) studied the engagement of leaders in social innovation processes, “while collaboration often occurred in later phases of the engagement cycle, typically when social status and power began to shift, this took place well after the implementation phase of the innovation had begun”. Undeniably, there is a strong link between the desire for transformation, engagement and assertiveness.

As for the liquid modernity Bauman (2001) reports, it has been raising the level of care for those who intend to promote radical changes in the way social relations are being formed. In the midst of this concern, Bauman (2001, p. 14) points out that at such individuality and selfishness, “it came to the liquefaction of dependence and interaction patterns”, that is, in times in which should prevail integration, reborn rupture and disintegration, obvious signs that new paradigms are required.

Argyris (2010), researching the organizational traps, identifies that there is need for new forms of organization, which aims to lessen the feeling centrally rationalist – the pursuit of profit – in the relationship between economy, business and society. Argyris suggests that aimed to mitigate social tensions, collaborative community is an interesting way, given the current state of imbalance between the dimensions under analysis. In the opinion of Argyris (2010, p. 166) “is necessary if trust is to be reconstructed in the modern world. The values of the community are collaborative contribution, concern, honesty, congeniality. There is an emphasis on high collectivism and individualism as well as high particularism and universalism”.

From the point of view of intangibility, which is a hallmark of social innovation process, to the extent that its premise, in the genesis of intent provides for the formation of intangible arches because of the symbolic, ethical and sensory effects that generate, the collaborative aspect emerges as an amalgam in the constitution of social innovation. For Ulrich and Smallwood (2006, p. 201) “collaboration refers to different parties working together toward a common purpose”. In this perspective, entrepreneurial action is coated not only factors involving credibility, style, reliability and reputation (ethos) of the protagonist, but also elements that, together, format the process, as the impacts social and emotional, discussion of real stories of the individuals involved, the impressions that can foster collaboration and understanding the dynamics of situated relations (pathos), beyond the facts, connections and logic that support the will to make it happen (logos).

Indeed, the collection of possible alternatives with a view to developing social innovation mechanisms is not always favorable, requiring guided decisions in reduced options. In view of Peter Drucker (2012, p. 90), “decisions always involve risk. And effective decisions require time and attention. So, do not make unnecessary decisions”. In this regard, there is sense in the statement that, in action in the field of analysis – social – decisions require a logical and intuitive apprehension further substantiated, while considering the aspect that relates the size pathos.

5. Modernity and The Urgency of Social Innovation

It is widely understood that the social innovation underlies the emotional dimension, since such element remains highlighted in the context of the formation of the proposal which aims to alleviate the reality of certain communities. Considering the idea of Goleman (2007, p. 30) about the process of human evolution, “the importance of the emotional repertoire used to ensure the survival of our species” came from the fixation of this compound in the nervous system as a result of emotional inclinations, overcome that they were the rational logic. For this reason, long man also uses emotion to ensure their survival, as well as to address the social problems involved in its sensitivity as part of harmonious coexistence process between fellow human beings, but not indifferent to issues that afflict many.

Every social action is supported by an emotional ballast. Regardless of the scale of the proposal, the emotional aspect drives much of the proceedings, because it is appropriating “third-party assets” under achiever action domain. The intangibility can be “measured and played” from the symbolic results, materials and aesthetic achieved. A social innovation should provide consequences that produce real changes in the original state, otherwise consign an unnecessary effort and energy expenditure, resulting in frustrated expectations.

Living in an era where individual interests undermine the collective demands, born, even if incipient, interest in compensatory measures, whose central purpose is to mitigate the imbalances that the capitalist system determines in its journey towards the infinite boundless. Modernity this Bauman (2001) defines as capable enough space to deter and persuade people to think of insensitive way, as if it were possible to separate the sensitivity of the material interests that guide the human desire to compensate to the aesthetic losses and losses cognitive carrying.

Materialism is sustained by the systematic need to offset the deficits of symbolic logic and a belief submissive to the dictates of a society that imposes regramentos irreconcilable, but they make the tenuous social relationships and whitened by the pallor of coldness. So Bauman points to modernity:

[...] Modernity means many things, and your arrival and progress can be measured using many different markers. A feature of modern life and its modern surroundings is necessary, however, perhaps as a “difference that makes the difference”; as the crucial attribute that all other characteristics follow. This attribute is the changing relationship between space and time. Modernity begins when space and time are separated from the practice of life and each other [...] (BAUMAN, 2001, p. 15).

Goergen (2011, p. 106) points individualism as “[...] that direction of thinking, feeling and willing to judge the individual an end in itself and see the individual happiness and development of the personality the highest sense of aspiration human, placing their service to society (the other) and the State”, that is, the subject appropriates space and time supposedly in solidarity with a view to ensuring private interests. This tends to mystify the simplistic character reprehensibly guides the behavior of individuals unrelated to social problems, whose outline is in the environment of everyday life. This evidence contradicts the latent desire of society to promote the meeting of strangers and it is for this reason that the argument has the authority to bring them. As Perelman alert (2004, p. 360) “what is clear is imposed as true to our thinking, not through the evidence of the subjective aspect of an objective truth. Thus it is found the method to well lead to our reason”.

Given the above, to act with the intention to seek to serve their personal interests, the individual evades and disclaims involvement with community-related problems, as if isolating the universe in which inhabits. However, composed of social and legal rules that have the scope to stop it, which invariably are intended to

prevent the individual comet arbitrariness they reach the remaining social fabric, the social world charges these people more effective action as the group interests imposing scenarios that do reflect and act, not necessarily in that order, as urgent referral in trying to establish the balance of power among the factors that give out the economic dimension and those that are generally social consequences of the actions promoted by the leaders the capitalist system. After all, as stated by Matei and Antonie (2015, p. 66) “innovation can be managed, supported and nurtured. Innovation can be managed, supported and nurtured. And anyone, if they want, can become part of it”.

6. Final Considerations

The implementation of any new procedure involved from the perspective of social innovation is complex and produces tensions. Of course, every initiative that has in its structure people who expect solutions to their troubles and needs tends to generate ambiguities, doubts and suspicions, breakdowns, this because the role of who is responsible for forwarding these issues can focus too much responsibility. In this sense, not just simply hold the individual entrepreneurial characteristics to succeed in their journey to the changes that society demands. It is also important to consider that his speech through elaborate argumentative process is aligned with the most genuine desires of the actors who are waiting for the solution of the present and impending problems.

Then to resort to the three foundational elements of argumentative discourse – ethos, logos and pathos – makes the journey in building the innovative spirit, directly imbricated with social demands, an unquestionable point of support to ensure a less arduous journey. The use of entrepreneurship, using as support a well structured argumentative framework and a framework set, basted with the founding elements of the speech becomes more affirmative the possibility of advances in the field, reinforcing the need for prioritizing organizations in their strategies issues involving the most urgent social demands, which are present in any environmental context.

¹ Greek source expression (Aisthesis), meaning perception, sensation, sensitivity, which responds to external stimuli.

References

- ABBAGNANO, Nicola. **Dicionário de filosofia**. 6. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2012.
- ALONSO, Félix R.; LÓPEZ, Francisco G.; CASTRUCCI, Plínio L. **Curso de ética em administração: empresarial e pública**. 3. ed. São Paulo: Atlas, 2012.
- ARGYRIS, Chris. **Organizational traps: leadership, culture, organizational design**. New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2010.
- BAUMAN, Zygmunt. **Modernidade líquida**. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2001.
- BERGER, Peter L.; LUCKMANN, Thomas. **A construção social da realidade: tratado de sociologia do conhecimento**. 33. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2011.
- BESSANT, John; TIDD, Joe. **Inovação e empreendedorismo**. Porto Alegre: Bookman, 2009.
- CRISES. An introduction to crisis. 2004. Available at: <http://crises.uqam.ca/upload/files/presentation/P_CRISES_ang.pdf> Access: March 9. 2016.
- DOLABELA, Fernando. **Oficina do empreendedor**. São Paulo: Cultura Editores Associados, 1999.
- DORNELAS, José C. A. **Empreendedorismo: transformando ideias em negócios**. 3. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier, 2008.
- DRUCKER, Peter F. **Inovação e espírito empreendedor: práticas e princípios**. São Paulo: Cengage Learning, 2011.
- _____. **Pessoas e desempenhos**. Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier, 2012.
- FINNIS, John. **Fundamentos de ética**. Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier, 2012.
- GHERARDI, Silvia. Conhecimento situado e ação situada: o que os estudos baseados em prática prometem? In.:

GHERARDI, Silvia; STRATI, Antonio. **Administração e aprendizagem na prática**. Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier, 2014.

_____; STRATI, Antonio. Segundo momento: sobre a prática na pesquisa organizacional. In.: GHERARDI, Silvia; STRATI, Antonio. **Administração e aprendizagem na prática**. Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier, 2014.

GOERGEN, Pedro. Educação para a responsabilidade social: pontos de partida para uma nova ética. In: SEVERINO, Antônio. J. *et al.* **Ética e formação de professores**: política, responsabilidade e autoridade em questão. São Paulo: Cortez, 2011.

GOLEMAN, Daniel. **Inteligência emocional**: a teoria revolucionária que define o que é ser inteligente. Rio de Janeiro: Objetiva, 2007.

HENGEMÜHLE, Adelar. **Desafios educacionais na formação de empreendedores**. Porto Alegre: Penso, 2014.

HERRERA, Maria Elena B. Creating competitive advantage by institutionalizing corporate social innovation. **Journal of Business Research**, Pequim, v. 68, i. 7, p. 1468-1474, July 2015.

HISRIC, Robert D. PETERS, Michael P.; SHEPHERD, Dean A. **Empreendedorismo**. 9. ed. Porto Alegre: AMGH, 2014.

HSM MANAGEMENT. São Paulo: Edição Book Summary 10. jul/ago. 2010, p. 23-25.

MACDONALD, Nick. Why you might want to work in relief and development (and why you might not). In.: MEHTA, Khanjan. **Solving problems that matter and getting paid for it**: STEM careers is social innovation and global sustainable development. State College, PA: Khanjan Mehta, 2015.

MARCY, Richard T. Breaking mental models as a form of creative destruction: the role of leader cognition in radical social innovations. **The Leadership Quarterly**, Texas, v. 26, i. 3, p. 370-385, Jun. 2015.

MATEI, Ani; ANTONIE, Catalina. Complexity theory and the development of the social innovation. **Procedia – Social And Behavioral Sciences**, Izmir, v. 185, p. 61-66, May, 2015.

MENDES, Jerônimo. **Manual do empreendedor**: como construir um empreendimento de sucesso. São Paulo: Atlas, 2009.

PERELMAN, Chaïm. **Retóricas**. 2. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2004.

_____; OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, Lucie. **Tratado da argumentação**: a nova retórica. 2. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2005.

RIOS, Terezinha A. **Ética e competência**. 20. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2011.

SALIM, Cesar S.; SILVA, Nelson C. **Introdução ao empreendedorismo**: despertando a atitude empreendedora. Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier, 2010.

SARKAR, Soumodip. **O empreendedor inovador**: faça diferente e conquista seu espaço no mercado. Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier, 2008.

SCHÖN, Donald A. **Educando o profissional reflexivo**: um novo design para o ensino e a aprendizagem. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2000.

SEARLE, John R. **Intencionalidade**. 2. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2002.

SILLET, Roxanne. Três desafios que se colocam para as organizações sem fins lucrativos do futuro: pessoas, recursos financeiros e estratégia. In.: GOLDSMITH, Marshall; HESSELBEIN, Frances. **A nova organização do futuro**: visões e insights dos maiores líderes do pensamento estratégico. Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier, 2010.

ULRICH, Dave; SMALLWOOD, Norm. **How leaders build value**: using people, organization, and other intangibles to get bottom-line results. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2006.

WOODELL, James K. The secret life of universities as economic and social development hubs. In.: MEHTA, Khanjan. **Solving problems that matter and getting paid for it**: STEM careers is social innovation and global

sustainable development. State College, PA: Khanjan Mehta, 2015.