



Organizações & Sociedade Journal
2021, 28(99), 757-785

© Authors 2021

DOI 10.1590/1984-92302021v28n9902EN

ISSN 1984-9230

www.revistaoes.ufba.br

NPGA, School of Management

Federal University of Bahia

Associate Editor:

Letícia Fantinel

Received: 02/26/2020

Accepted: 02/04/2021

Animal Welfare and Social Innovation: Evidence from a Case Study in Southern Brazil

Alexandre Zawaki Pazetto^a

Nei Antonio Nunes^a

André Luis da Silva Leite^b

^a University of Southern Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, Brazil

^b Federal University of Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, Brazil

Abstract

This study examined the *Cão Terapia* (Dog Therapy) project, developed by a civil society organization, in order to verify how it generates social innovation based on practices focused on animal welfare. It is a qualitative case study, with an exploratory and descriptive approach. It consists of literature review, documentary research, participant observation, and interviews with volunteers and managers of the Bem-Animal organization. Bem-Animal seeks to promote the welfare of animals rescued by the government after complaints of abuse, being run over, and other serious situations. We found that the initiatives of this organization result in social innovation, above all, by providing social actions contrary to the speciesist, instrumental, and consumerist mentalities. They contribute to an experience of ethical precepts and to the consolidation of rights for non-human animals within the society.

Keywords: civil society organizations; social innovation; ethical precepts; animal rights; animal geographies.

Introduction

The side effects from different human actions affect not only individuals of their own species, but also a large proportion of non-human animals (Menezes & Siena, 2010). Issues of this order are

sometimes disregarded by people, either by their essentially anthropocentric view, or for not knowing that society is responsible for its actions and that it can also be harmed as a result of them. In both situations, there are ethical implications.

At the same time, in today's society, diverse political, economic, and cultural factors provoke the overlapping of purely private interests with public values. As Arendt reminds us, such disinterest in public participation is related to the modernity and contemporaneity phenomena, among which we can mention the loss of the power of articulation in the social sphere and in the directions of the state, the pulverization of public values, the crisis of social ideals, as well as the overvaluation of individualism (Arendt, 1972; Arendt & Kohn, 2006; Lafer, 2003; Tenório, 2016). According to Simmel and Bauman, allied to the sophistication of technology and insensitivity and volatility in urban life, these phenomena lead to social action and ethical-political practice, which aim for the common good, too often disqualified in favor of exclusively private issues of individuals oriented by essentially instrumental and consumerist values (Bauman, 2005, 2007, 2010; Simmel, 1990).

Nonetheless, there is a growing concern within a part of civil society with issues surrounding the well-being and rights of humans and non-human animals, while the importance of the public dimension of rights is gaining ground in the global political debate. In the last decades, innovative experiences and social impact emerge, promoted by organized sectors of society, whose goals are to value life and legitimize rights. Specifically related to the theme researched here, there are organizations formed in civil society that propose overcoming the barrier of speciesism by acting in an innovative way for the welfare of animals that live in situations of vulnerability. These actions seek to guarantee some basic animal rights by protecting them from hunger, disease, and ill-treatment, providing responsible adoptions in the case of domestic animals, or minimizing the problems generated by their overpopulation (Anastacio, Cruz Filho, & Marins, 2018; Avelino, Dumitru, Cipolla, Kunze, & Wittmayer, 2019; Gonsalves & Andion, 2019; Manzini, 2014; Marquesan & Figueiredo, 2018; Santos, 2002; Singer, 2011; Vitale, Spécie, & Mendes, 2009).

In this context, we highlight the Organização Bem-Animal (OBA!), a civil society organization located in Florianópolis (SC). This entity acts through several projects, one of which stands out and is the focus of this research, named Dog Therapy. The objective of this project is to promote the interaction of community members with animals that have been rescued by the public power because they find themselves in a situation of maltreatment or abandonment. After being rescued, the animals are confined in pens during the week, without the possibility of running or playing outdoors. However, on Saturdays, the project allows animals to have moments of interaction with the volunteers who are members of the community, minimizing the animals' traumas and rehabilitating them so they are welcomed into a new home. The project, in addition to welcoming dogs and cats in situations of great vulnerability, promotes adoption. Therefore, community contact with animals is essential for conscious adoption to be successful (Organização Bem-Animal, 2018).

When studying the project, "new layers" were perceived. From the contact with the animals and their stories – almost always linked to violence, abuse and abandonment – arises the possibility of generating engaged and conscious actions that allow the participants of the project to counteract the excesses of certain anthropocentrism/speciesism (which may have the instrumental use of animals by humans, or to treat them as objects or things as an effect). This process of deconstruction that allows new ethical-social values can be considered, as will be shown, a social innovation made feasible through participation in the Dog Therapy project. This article analyzes an experience that

aims to go beyond the attitude of promoting palliative and superficial measures. These measures only generate momentary well-being for rescued animals without causing paradigmatic changes in the way people individually and collectively relate to life. From this perspective, it is a question of investigating whether the actions of the Dog Therapy project are constituted as a socially innovative tool capable of facing, for example, speciesism: a basis for violent behavior against non-human animals.

Through documentary research, interviews, and participant observation, this study investigates the Dog Therapy project, developed by OBA!. In this context, our analysis revolved around the following question: How does the Dog Therapy project generate social innovation?

The empirical elements that make up this study come from a single organization, which is a limiting factor. For future research, multiple case studies must be conducted to establish the interface with other experiences developed in civil society organizations.

Finally, this analysis on animal welfare practices developed by a civil society organization aims to contribute theoretically to organizational studies about the recognition of socially innovative actions committed to the full appreciation of life. In this way, the critical perspective proposed throughout the study can assist future analysis and actions in which social innovations are present, especially those that address the issue of non-human animals.

Literature review

The literature review initially addresses civil society organizations (CSO), which is the nature of our object. The intention here is to show that practices promoted by CSO such as OBA! correspond to a process of expansion and improvement in the actions of civil society. Next, social innovation-defining precepts are presented. Finally, in coherence with the purposes of analyzing the experience of a CSO, the ethical imperatives and the notion of animal rights are addressed.

Civil society organizations

One issue of major relevance to the contemporary world is the level of civil society's participation in the demands that involve social interests. Some theorists who warn that in the transience between modernity and contemporaneity, there is a growing disinterest with the political sphere of life, which can result in the overlapping of the private sphere values with those of the public sphere (Arendt, 1972, 2013; Arendt & Kohn, 2006; Béhar, 2019; Giaretta, Fernandes, & Philippi Jr., 2012). This is combined with insensitivity about the differences and difficulties of the other humans and of the other forms of life that inhabit our planet (Bauman, 2005, 2007, 2010, 2013; Simmel, 1990). However, while the pillars supporting traditional models of politics and democracy are questioned, collective/public action and the role of civil society are also reconfigured and resignified (Oliveira, Gómez, & Correia, 2018; Reale & Antiseri, 2018; Santos, 2019). From this perspective, Andion and Serva say:

This is because the privileged spaces . . . become those built by organized civil society, or rather the public spaces of proximity created by citizens, in which private issues are

confronted in the search for the common sense. From this perspective, the importance of civil society today is highlighted. (Andion & Serva, 2004, p. 4)

At least since Hegel's studies in the 19th century, often the understanding of what civil society understands has been tied to the dichotomy between society and the state (Hegel, 2011; Hyppolite, 1996; Timmermans, 2005). However, on the most active and engaged position of society, the distinction between civil society and the state offered by Gramsci in the 20th century stands out. For him, civil society corresponds to a stage of society without the conditioning presence of the state structure, or of market-imposed economics and large corporations (Gramsci, 1971, 1989, 2014). Gramsci believes that civil society is not reduced to the material basis of society. Diversely, it identifies itself with the sphere of the superstructure, in which there is the involvement of positive ideologies and public institutions, in an extremely dynamic relation with the state sphere (Alves, 2004; Baratta, 2004; Bobbio, Matteucci, & Pasquino, 2007; Coutinho, 2011). Regarding the active presence of the subjects in Gramscian civil society, Semeraro (1999) explains:

Civil society is the terrain where individuals "deprived" of their dignity and pulverized in their lives can find the conditions to construct a social subjectivity, can become subjects when, freely and creatively organized, they propose to develop, together with the individual potentialities, its public and collective dimensions. The path, in this sense, goes from being private to being social. (pp. 76-77)

Thus, the confrontation of social cleavages presupposes a unified action and the existence of public/private spaces where the political issues can be discussed by the social actors, in light of current urgencies. From this perspective, the citizen acts as a legitimate representative of the community in his role as an actor in civil society, articulating bottom-up initiatives to satisfy basic needs and access public policies. In addition, the community articulates itself to promote innovations in the society when it mobilizes other actors, in the scope of social movements and of civil society organizations (Andion et al., 2017; Anheier & Seibel, 2001; Correia, Oliveira, & Gomez, 2016; Klerkx & Aarts, 2013; Murray, Caulier-Grice, & Mulgan, 2010).

In this context, civil society organizations, especially those of a non-commercial nature, are characterized by a certain polysemy. Organized social action encompasses a vast field ranging from the most prosaic claims to the great social struggle and resistance movements involving education, health, social justice, violence, discrimination, democracy, ecology, the environment, among others. Civil society organizations are now considered a viable and feasible way to give satisfactory answers to social problems, such as the overpopulation of street animals or the proliferation of communicable diseases between non-humans and humans (zoonoses) (Crisp, Dall'Agnol, Savulescu, & Tonetto, 2018; Ferreira, 2002; Heck, 2011).

However, Bobbio et al. (2007) point out the fragility of the controversial idea that it is in organized civil society that the integral solution to all social problems is found. On the issues that involve the opposition between civil society and the state, they add:

The contrast between civil society and the state has often been used for polemical purposes, to say, for example, that civil society moves faster than the state, that the state is not sensitive enough to detect all the ferments that come from civil society, that a process of deterioration of legitimacy that the state does not always have the capacity to detain is continually forming in civil society. (pp. 1210-1211)

From this perspective, a major dilemma experienced by some civil society organizations today is highlighted: to influence the elaboration and execution of public policies, or directly assume certain roles of the state and become its extension? In many cases, it is a fine line, and the direct transfer of responsibilities from the state to civil society can often lead to precarious working conditions and become a perverse effect of changing the role of the state (Andion & Serva, 2004; Andion et al., 2017; Avritzer, Bignotto, Guimarães, & Starling, 2012; Baião, Peci, & Costa, 2015).

However, one solution for civil society organizations to continue is to become a partner of the state, not its substitute. Partnerships with the private sector can also be profitable. Civil society organizations and the state should not be seen as spheres that act in a totally isolated way, but something that, in so many moments, can be revitalized jointly in the superstructure and thus promote substantive social transformations, which is consistent with a more dynamic, political, critical, engaged, and supportive model of civil society (Assunção, Kuhn Jr., & Ashton, 2018; Bilbao & Vélez, 2015; Bobbio, 2000; Coutinho, 2011; Dagnino, 2014; Laville, 2016).

Having indicated the relationship between the development and improvement of civil society and the emergence of civil society organizations aiming at conscious participation and social transformation, and the possibilities of partnership with the state and private spheres, the notion of social innovation is discussed next.

Social innovation

Today's society poses challenges that point to a process of social transformation that requires profound changes in social structures and individual and collective behaviors (Bauman, 2010, 2013). In this context, social innovations are a chance to renew actions aimed at the well-being and solving of society's problems (Correia et al., 2016; Edwards-Schachter, Matti, & Alcántara, 2012; Hulgård & Ferrarini, 2010; Phillips, Lee, Ghobadian, O'Regan, & James, 2015).

Social innovations enable transformation processes by which subjects, individually and collectively, create new ways of relating not only to each other but also to the life that surrounds them (Brunstein, Rodrigues, & Kirschbaum, 2008; Cloutier, 2003; Gregoire, 2016; Mulgan, Tucker, Ali, & Sanders, 2007). From this perspective, it is possible to grant, for example, a pedagogical and innovative dimension of experiences that foster the ethical and social responsibility of humans towards other animals. Likewise, actions aimed at the well-being of non-human animals do more than just change their reality, as they can also contribute to the resolution of human problems.

Without disregarding the big picture, an expressive part of the research and experiences derived from social innovations have become notable for seeking to innovate concrete answers to the social problems of our time (Dagnino, 2008; Manzini, 2014; Rao-Nicholson, Vorley, & Khan, 2017; Rodrigues, 2007; Van Wijk, Zietsma, Dorado, de Bakker, & Martí, 2019; Varadarajan, 2014).

On that note, the study on social innovations can present three dimensions: individuals, organizations, and movements. The individual dimension refers to the social transformations promoted by the individual, which are often materialized through social entrepreneurship. When the activities are coordinated by two or more people, the focus is assigned to organizations, which can be private or social companies, or public institutions, among others. Finally, the focus on movements deals with non-institutionalized social relations, much like environmentalism, which emerged as an agent of radical social transformation. In addition, a social innovation should (a) aim at a solution for a particular social problem; (b) seek to include all the actors involved; and (c) make new and lasting solutions viable for the community (Assunção et al., 2018; Avelino et al., 2019; Bignetti, 2011; Nicholls, Simon, & Gabriel, 2015; Silva & Pacheco, 2018).

As will be shown, the presence of different dimensions and of the three points mentioned are observed in the Dog Therapy project. However, to better identify its innovative character, it is necessary to address the ethical precepts that constitute its action.

Ethical precepts

Bentham (2017) says that “ethics at large may be defined as the art of directing men’s actions to the production of the greatest possible quantity of happiness for those whose interests are in view” (p. 143). This utilitarian proposition is based on the thesis that only pain and pleasure can indicate satisfactorily how one can act morally (Carvalho, 2007; Huisman, 2011; Oliveira, 2014; Shafer-Landau, 2012).

By placing pain and pleasure as the sole factors when evaluating human conduct, Bentham (2017) defines the principle of utility as that which “approves or disapproves of every action according to the tendency it appears to have to increase or lessen – i. e. to promote or oppose – the happiness of the person or group whose interest is in question” (p. 7). The same principle is extended by the author to the community, that is, the interest becomes the sum of the interests of its various members. Thus, Jeremy Bentham erected the foundations of modern utilitarianism (Mill, 2015; Mora, 2001; Sidgwick, 2013; Vázquez, 2018).

In the last decades of the 20th century, Singer (2011) presented a principle similar to Bentham’s utilitarianism, but places equality as a determining factor: it is the principle of equal consideration of interests. Singer states that this principle requires that the same weight be assigned between the intended actions and the interests of all those affected by these actions (human and non-human). The reasons for choosing the principle of Singer’s equality as an ethical precept is that the practice of justice, understood as fairness, can be extended to non-human animals (Felipe, 2014; Garner, 2013; Heck, 2011).

In the principle of equality, an interest is always and only an interest, no matter who it is. Thus, equality can be considered as the desired consequence from equity, which should be the ethical basis that guides the decision-making process. Equity, in turn, is the recognition of different needs, of different subjects and lives, in order to achieve equal rights. This is, therefore, the path of “practical ethics” for the conquest of rights, including the right to life by non-human animals (Costa & Garrafa, 2000; Francione, 2013; Mackenzie, 2016; Sandel, 2010; Singer, 2009).

Singer (2011) justifies the importance of ethics when he states that it is related to most human decisions. The conception of life, according to his ethical values, is related to the right to conserve, in a sustainable way, the way of life of each community/subject/being. In this way, a partial ethical principle cannot be justified because ethics adopts a universal and egalitarian point of view for each existing unit. In practice, the principle of equality implies that the concern with “other beings” and the readiness to consider their interests and rights should not be conditioned by physical aspects or different capacities (physical, rational, intellectual, economic, etc.).

In summary, Singer defends the expansion of the moral community to non-human animals, in order to transpose the limits of the human species and overcome speciesism, just as it seeks to overcome sexism, racism, and misery (Canto-Sperber, 2013; Di Napoli, 2015; Felipe, 2019).

The ethical precepts sustained by Singer lead to critical reflection and moral action that question the instrumental treatment that humans can have with the others of their kind, as well as with other forms of life that inhabit our planet. Consistent with Singer’s assertions and with the innovative organizational experience analyzed in this study, the next section will introduce the precept of animal rights.

Animal rights

Several philosophers have defined the principle of equal consideration of interests as a fundamental moral orientation, but Bentham was one of the few to realize that ethical precepts can transcend the anthropocentric spectrum. The modern thinker will say (Bentham, 2017) “the question is not Can they reason?, nor Can they talk? but, Can they suffer?” (p. 144).

In this passage, Bentham points out that the capacity for suffering or feeling happiness is a vital characteristic that gives a being the right to equal consideration. In making this statement, the theorist does not arbitrarily exclude any interests of humans and non-humans, as do those who establish a frontier based on the possession of reason or capacity for language. Diametrically opposed to Benthamian ethics, the unequal treatment given to non-human animals may be related, to a certain extent, to the exaggerations of the anthropocentric view, which values living beings and natural resources for the usefulness they have in order to satisfy human wants, being dominated and used to meet their needs – an eminently instrumental vision (Felipe, 2009; Mulgan, 2014; Oliveira, 2014; Profice & Santos, 2017).

As said, a view that has a very significant connection with anthropocentrism is speciesism. As Singer (2009, 2011) and Kowalski (2012) explain, speciesism defends the highest value of the needs, interests, and attitudes of a species (in this case the human) to the detriment of the interests of other species, using certain biological differences and rationality as a legitimating argument for not applying the ethical principle of equality to non-human animals.

In short, the speciesist indicates that the inventiveness and language of humans guarantee their superiority, which would justify an unequal treatment towards other animals. Rouanet (2018) argues that speciesism “means indifference, or even deliberately cruel behavior towards other species” (p. 108). Regan (2006), in turn, asserts that, from a moral point of view, speciesism denotes a prejudice equivalent to racism and sexism.

There are several consequences of the denial of animal rights and speciesism, among which the animal trade through the exploitation of breeding stock, irresponsible adoption that culminates in abandonment, and, finally, other types of mistreatment such as physical aggression (Felipe, 2019). In the city of Florianópolis (Santa Catarina, Brazil) alone, according to official data, 382 animal rescues were carried out in 2019, based on 1,064 reports of mistreatment (Diretoria de Bem-Estar Animal, 2020). It does not seem an exaggeration to consider that insensitivity to violence against animals is also a speciesist practice. Therefore, silence before the vilification of animal life reveals the neglect of animal rights.

To avoid the harm of speciesism, Singer (2009) argues that it is necessary to understand that non-human animals have an equal right to life. The fight against speciesism involves ethical questioning about the dominant anthropocentric/speciesist paradigm, so that people reflect on the consequences of their actions and behaviors in daily life. Actions that seem harmless, such as buying a dog of a certain breed or attending a rodeo with the family, can sustain cruel practices against non-human animals, strengthening and camouflaging the most harmful effects of speciesism.

Another important issue concerns the view that part of society has on pets, such as dogs and cats, and farm animals, such as pigs, chickens, and cattle. Why are some species of non-human animals considered food and others not? Joy (2010), for example, states that the answer is a matter of perception. The author says: "We react differently to different types of meat not because there is a physical difference between them, but because our perception of them is different." (p. 12) Perceptions are formulated from a complex system of beliefs and experiences that determine, to a large extent, the understanding of reality. Whilst a good part of society has a close relationship with domestic animals (often inside their homes), it has little relationship with cows, pigs, and chickens during everyday life (often the only contact with these animals occurs when people eat them). In other words, due to a series of beliefs and experiences they have (or have not) had throughout their lives, people may not realize the moral transgression contained in the merely instrumental treatment usually offered to non-human animals (Joy).

Without exhausting the topic or denying the controversies surrounding it, it is worth highlighting the potential of the Dog Therapy project. Promoting the adoption of rescued animals and allowing them to leave their pens to run and interact in a healthy way with humans, can, at first sight, be confused with merely palliative measures, insufficient to counter speciesism. As indicated, the actions of the project can go further, since the interaction with those beings, so physically and psychologically marked by abandonment and violence, allows to build new ethical values as well as coexistence with non-human animals in general. As part of a pedagogical process that aims to overcome its own limits, the Dog Therapy project seeks to tear down the instrumental culture that marks the human relationship with other animals, domestic or not.

In order to ensure a more equal treatment between humans and non-humans, it is necessary to understand what animal rights are. Without delving into the theme as much as would be necessary, the divergent positions in the movement around the animal rights cause are highlighted as the welfare approach and the abolitionist approach (Felipe, 2019; Naconecy, 2009).

As seen, Singer (2011) defends the expansion of the moral community through the principle of equal consideration of interests in order to also include non-human animals. Singer's position repeats, to some extent, what other thinkers like Bentham had already done: condemning the act

of causing suffering to animals without, however, contesting its use as a means to meet human needs. In other words, from a utilitarian/welfare perspective, Singer admits the possibility of animal exploitation, as long as the welfare of those beings is safeguarded during the process. In contrast, the abolitionist argument says that the same fundamental rights that seek to ensure the physical, emotional, social, and environmental integrity of humans must also be respected in relation to non-human animals (Felipe, 2014, 2019; Regan, 2006).

For Regan (2006), the fact that animals have rights or not depends on the answer to the following question: Are animals a subject-of-a-life? And he adds:

Among the billions of nonhuman animals in the world, are there any that are aware of the world and aware of what happens to them? If there are, does what happens to them matter to them, whether anyone else cares about this or not? If any animals satisfy these requirements, they are subjects-of-a-life. And if they are subjects-of-a-life, then they have rights just as we do. (p. 65)

Thus, Regan advocates the protection of animals based on an egalitarian and rights theory. It includes animals in the moral community by asserting that all those who are subject-of-a-life have inherent value, that is, an intrinsic value. Both humans and non-humans who have sensory organs and are therefore sentient hold in their lives the same value. This equity, by itself, generates the responsibility of humans for their actions that affect non-human animals. Therefore, this capacity to suffer or to experience pleasure or happiness (sentience) is enough for a living being to be treated in an egalitarian manner (Felipe, 2006b; Garner, 2013; Regan, 2004).

Regan (2006) emphasizes that moral rights should be treated as barriers of protection in order to repress the disregard of interests by creating a condition of ethical unity governed by respect and equality. Thus, respect becomes the most essential right guaranteed to a being, whether human or non-human. The right to life, freedom, physical integrity, etc. is bound by the acceptance of that principle.

Despite the divergences between those with the welfare approach and abolitionists, Naconecy (2009) notes that they could work in harmony. For example, animal welfare propositions can create a favorable environment for changing values and behavior, maturing moral ideals in favor of replacing animal use with other means that also meet human needs. In short, welfare propositions can be the first step towards an abolitionist position.

In summary, the ethical precepts and legitimacy of rights presented in the reflexive journey pursued by Bentham, Singer, and Regan claim that the ethical relation between pleasure and pain, affirmation of equality as equity, and recognition of the condition of subjects-of-a-life transcends the specular values and instrumental logic that subjects and neglects the lives of non-human beings. It is possible to infer that the ethical and legal perspective proposed by them can be associated with the community, the public, and ethical-political values and practices that lead to social action guided by a conscious rupture of paradigm, which aims to operate social displacements by creating alternatives in relation to the instrumental vision of human and non-human life (Canto-Sperber, 2013; De Lazari-Radek & Singer, 2017; Di Napoli, 2015; Huisman, 2011; Nicholson & Kurucz, 2019).

The issue of animal rights is linked to the consolidation of a culture of integration and respect for life, that is, an ethical-political culture of inclusion, where ethics are justified in the values of the democratic community to the detriment of exclusively discriminatory, selfish, and consumerist ideals and agendas (Dortier, 2010; Felipe, 2019; Francione, 2013; Mackenzie, 2016; Oliveira, 2014; Reale & Antiseri, 2018; Sidgwick, 2013). From this perspective, the socially innovative nature of the Dog Therapy project is to raise awareness of the best coexistence between people and animals, which can greatly assist in guaranteeing rights and, thus, animal welfare.

In order to understand some characteristics of the various relationships existing between humans and other animals within a spatial formation, the following discuss some assumptions of animal geographies.

Animal geographies

As the literature shows, for the benefit of humans, the lives of billions of other animals are vilified every year through poisoning, dissection, confinement, and slaughter. This poses serious risks to biodiversity and thus to the balance of the planet.

The impact of human exploitation of animals has generated numerous ethical issues, which makes it clear that this relationship should be taken seriously. In order to analyze human-animal relationships in a spatial formation, animal geography seeks proposals to reconstruct this interaction on more ethical and sustainable bases (Fletcher & Platt, 2018; Wolch & Emel, 1998).

Animal geography presupposes an ethical effort to recognize that the human-animal relationship has consequences. Part of society extends this ethical attitude to politics, whether through individual commitment or engaged activism (for example, not using animal products, not going to zoos, adopting pets instead of buying them etc.). These examples may be individual choices, but they reflect more broadly on social life and on the recognition of animals as corresponding subjects. With this logic, research in animal geography offers non-humans a moral position, pointing to expanded and inclusive ethics within society (Buller, 2016).

Linking animal company to social and personal identity, Sanders (2010) used detailed ethnographic data to visualize human and animal efforts to understand, manipulate, care for, and interact with each other. The author observes how dogs serve not only as social facilitators, but also as supports for social identity. Although efforts are often made to teach and shape the behavior of dogs, they are the ones who often teach people to more consciously appreciate the experiences of everyday life, such as a nutritious meal, physical heat, a walk in the forest, and the simple joys of the immediate moment.

Fletcher & Platt (2018) argue that walking dogs may not be as simple as it seems at first. For the authors, walking with these animals represents a potentially important space to resignify the connections between humans and non-humans, in order to shape the existing bond and mediate the different power relationships between them.

In this sense, Serpell's analysis (2015) shows that the human-animal relationship must be mutual: both human and non-human are benefited. For humans, animal company promotes social engagement and mitigates the psychological effects caused, for example, by stress (Serpell, 1991, 2015). For animals, especially domestic animals, the benefits from bonding with humans refer in

particular to a certain level of safety that allowed considerable increases in the size of their populations.

At the same time, the human-animal relationship raises a series of concerns related to animal welfare, public health, and environmental impact.

While species such as dogs and cats have undoubtedly benefited numerically from their association with humans, many individual animals pay a significant price in terms of compromised health and welfare. Failed human-animal bonds result in millions of pets being abandoned, relinquished to shelters, and/or euthanized prematurely each year, and many thousands are abused, neglected, or mistreated by their owners for various reasons, ranging from ignorance to deliberate cruelty. Many purebred dog breeds are afflicted with painful and debilitating health problems either due to inbreeding or line breeding or selection for extreme standards of physical conformation. Commercial pet “farming” is on the rise as the demand for some pets exceeds the supply, while the exotic pet trade causes widespread suffering and death among wild animals during capture, transport, and subsequent acquisition by owners with little knowledge of proper husbandry and care. Even the most affectionate and caring human-animal bonds may cause unnecessary animal suffering when, for example, an overly attached owner insists on futile veterinary interventions to keep his or her terminally ill pet alive at all costs. All of these negative aspects of the human-animal bond raise important ethical dimensions that need to be considered when weighing the benefits of our relations with companion animals against the perceived costs. (Serpell, 2015, p. 12)

Among the various implications raised in the inferences of Serpell (2015), the violence suffered by domestic animals stands out. Hostile acts against animals by their respective guardians can result in serious injuries, psychological trauma, and even death, especially when there is no engagement by civil society and public authorities to report cases and legally hold aggressors responsible. Such cruelty can sometimes have consequences not only for animals, but for society itself. The study by Arluke, Levin, Luke, and Ascione (1999) showed that animal abuse can be associated with a variety of antisocial, pathological, and even violent interpersonal behaviors. These and other diverse ethical issues addressed by animal geography, point to the need to confront the instrumental mentality with which humans interact with other animals. In this sense, animals, especially pets, assist society in changing behavior. In other words, when people raise the status of pets to the level of social partners, they undermine the most harmful effects of the distinction between humans and non-humans (Serpell, 1996).

Finally, as society changes, the way humans think about animals and the interaction with them also inevitably changes (Sanders & Arluke, 1996). In line with this proposition, the Dog Therapy project seeks a paradigmatic change, transforming modes of human-animal interaction that better guarantee rights and well-being for non-humans. The social innovation carried out by this project from a civil society organization lies precisely in the effort for cultural change to best guarantee animal welfare.

Methodological procedures

The study was carried out using the inductive method of research with a qualitative approach, and it sought to identify and explain subjective aspects from the data collected. The qualitative approach makes it possible to evaluate the subjective issues, with strategies of categorization of motivations, values, and aspirations (Minayo, 2014; Prodanov & Freitas, 2013; Triviños, 2009).

This research is exploratory and descriptive. It describes the social innovation phenomenon from the exposition of its defining characteristics (Andrade, 2000). As for the procedures, it can be framed as a case study and investigates a certain phenomenon in depth (Yin, 2017). Regarding the time horizon, it is classified as transversal. It happens in a single moment in time, with data collected only once in a short period, being then analyzed and reported (Collis & Hussey, 2005).

In order for the research problem to be adequately answered, secondary and primary data were collected. Secondary data were collected through documentary research. The primary data were ascertained from the application of semi-structured interviews, as well as participant observation. Firstly, secondary data were collected to characterize the organization, through documentary research that includes, in addition to internal institution documents, photos, videos, and other digital media, such as publications on social networks (Boni & Quaresma, 2005; Martins & Theóphilo, 2009; Richardson, 2011). In order to initiate the collection of primary data, semi-structured interviews were conducted face-to-face with the director of OBA! and one of the coordinators of the Dog Therapy project, and thirteen semi-structured interviews with participating volunteers. The interviews took place during four meetings, in person, and were recorded with permission from the OBA!'s management.

Both interviews had no time limit and had their contents recorded with the interviewees' permission. Later, they were digitally transcribed in full. The informed consent form was used to guarantee the interviewees' understanding of the purposes of the research, besides ensuring their anonymity. It is also worth mentioning that the field research was limited to one of the main projects of OBA!: Dog Therapy. In addition, we decided not to identify the interviewees. In this way, the two managers of OBA! are cited as M1 and M2, while the volunteers are cited as V1, V2, V3, V4, V5, V6, V7, V8, V9, V10, and V11.

Primary data were also obtained through participant observation. After data collection, the content analysis strategy was used, a characteristic procedure in the investigation from textual material. Firstly, the interviews were digitally transcribed in full, for later analysis by reading the material (Bardin, 2009; Flick, 2009).

Finally, to ensure that the propositions did not become mere subjectivism, the methodological procedures and validation criteria adopted were based on authenticity, plausibility, criticism, and reflexivity (Chizzotti, 2010; Pozzebon, 2004).

Presentation and discussion of results

As indicated by theoretical references and results obtained from data collection, one of the current social challenges concerns the change of mentality regarding the instrumental use of non-

human animals, which are, in many ways, constantly subjugated and used as means of satisfying the interests and consumption needs of human beings. The interviewee V9 addresses the pet trade:

There are people who buy a breed dog and do not think about what's behind it. While he pays for the dog, there is one person who is exploiting a helpless being to produce more and more puppies. All this revolves around money. (V9, 2018)

However, problems with the instrumental use of dogs and cats are not limited to exploitation for financial gain or to satisfy the consumption needs of those who wish to be breeders. According to M1 (2018), this practice has other serious consequences, such as abandonment, an increase in the number of animals on the street, the diseases that can accompany them, and the ill-treatment they suffer. The reports presented here go back to some of the problems pointed out as effects of the human-animal relationship that compromise the health and well-being of many non-human animals (Fletcher & Platt, 2018; Sanders, 2010; Serpell, 2015; Wolch & Emel, 1998). It is noteworthy that for Felipe (2019) these consequences result from the denial of animal rights and the practicing or acceptance of speciesism by society.

According to M1, the initial goal of the Dog Therapy project in 2005 was to join forces with the Municipal Government of Florianópolis to promote the responsible adoption of dogs and cats rescued from maltreatment that were sent to the municipal kennel, at the time rented by the City Hall of Florianópolis in the Municipality of São José (Santa Catarina, Brazil).

M1 adds that, for different reasons, the City Hall alone could not offer the necessary services to the maintenance and referral of the animals for adoption. That is when the Dog Therapy project was conceived with the objective of supporting the Florianópolis City Hall with actions that aim to offer welfare to animals trapped in the municipal shelter. The partnership between the civil society organization and the public power can be seen as a living example of new arrangements in civil society, guided by participation, engagement, and social dynamism (Andion & Serva, 2004; Andion et al., 2017; Avritzer et al., 2012; Henriques, 2014; Silva, Tait, Novaes, & Fraga, 2018).

The Dog Therapy project, through the participation of volunteers, allows the dogs to leave the kennel and have moments of interaction, according to V2 (2018). This shows the importance of this action for the welfare of animals, since, if it did not exist, these beings would be “caged in a deposit” (M2, 2018). In addition, M2 (2018) asks: “If not us, who is going to do it?”. This question seems to reveal a sense of responsibility, in the sense that someone needs to intervene socially so that the suffering of dogs and cats is mitigated. The speeches of V2 and M2 reveal both the direct presence of individuals and organization in a social movement with impacts on the conditions of non-human animals, as well as the existence of ethical awareness and duty in relation to their lives. Likewise, as animal geography presupposes, there is a certain ethical effort towards recognizing the consequences of the human-animal relationship (Buller, 2016). In fact, the three dimensions and three points of social innovation, previously mentioned, appear in the discourses of V2 and M2 (Bignetti, 2011; Cloutier, 2003; Hulgård & Ferrarini, 2010; Regan, 2004; Singer, 2011).

Dog Therapy also plays an important role in the development of the community in which it operates and offers an opportunity to act for the promotion of morally valid attitudes (Anheier & Seibel, 2001; Correia et al., 2016; Dagnino, 2014; Murray et al., 2010). In addition, the act of walking

with rescued animals potentially resignifies the human-animal relationship (Fletcher & Platt, 2018). The project's ability to raise people's awareness of the misfortunes of non-human animals focuses on educational bias, as highlighted by M1 (2018), which fosters the change of values in the community (Felipe, 2009; Mulgan, 2014; Profice & Santos, 2017; Sanders, 2010; Singer, 2009). The action of the project is propositive, in the sense that it seeks answers to the problems faced, and it is inventive and creative, insofar as it establishes a pedagogical process as a way for new and lasting solutions generated with the social actors (Assunção et al., 2018; Avelino et al., 2019; Mello, 2018; Nicholls et al., 2015). According to M1, *"Dog Therapy also has an educational purpose because it draws the attention of volunteers and people interested in the project to the importance of responsible adoption, animal identification, vaccination and castration for disease control, and overpopulation of animals."*

This role is developed from the intensive use of networks and relationships – a trait of social innovation (Dagnino, 2008; Klerkx & Aarts, 2013; Mehmood & Constanza, 2013; Nicholls & Murdock, 2012; Silva & Pacheco, 2018; Varadarajan, 2014). For M1, the local and national media considered the importance of the Dog Therapy project from its inception and publicized the benefits of the project to the humans involved, especially to non-human animals. According to M1, the use of social networks was decisive, in 2015, to make feasible the reform and expansion of the municipal cattery. As it did not find another alternative, OBA! made the commitment and sought partnerships with university students to enable a solution, which culminated in the construction of a new cattery. OBA! also has other forms of support through its volunteers. As an example, V4 (2018) acts professionally as a photographer and collaborates voluntarily, capturing and disclosing the project. These experiences are rooted in the innovative character of the project by revealing the wide participation and involvement of different actors in the actions promoted by it.

On the involvement of social actors in the project, the bonds developed by the volunteers are also highlighted, and contribute to the transformation in the lives of these people (Bignetti, 2011; Gregoire, 2016; Montgomery, 2016; Piccoli & Godoi, 2012; Rao-Nicholson et al., 2017; Santos, 2002). This shows that actions benefit not only non-human animals but also people who experience the project day-to-day, corroborating the idea that the human-animal relationship can be considered mutualistic (Serpell, 2015). According to M1 (2018), the participants create bonds of friendship and begin to have a coexistence outside OBA!. Still according to M1, *"these new friends become part of your life, much more than a meeting on Saturday afternoons."* V11 (2018) states that he has friendship with several volunteers, while V7 (2018) considers the contact between the volunteers relevant for his participation. It can be observed, therefore, that this integrating character among the volunteers themselves is an incentive to participate in the project. In this sense, V3 points out that the Therapy Dog *"is a social event"* because it brings people that are sensitive to animal welfare closer, and highlights: *"The same interest brings people here."* (V3, 2018)

Given that, the actions that involve the well-being of the animals, verified in the project, also cover the lives of the people, individually and as a community. This is what the interaction and the creation of new links between the participants of Dog Therapy shows. Moreover, intersubjective relations are marked by the sharing of ethical precepts of integral defense of life. In addition, since the Dog Therapy project seeks a more harmonious and committed coexistence of humans with other species, it can be said that its social action expresses the public and political intention to contribute to the consolidation of the best possible life for the living on the planet (Bentham, 2017;

Costa & Garrafa, 2000; De Lazari-Radek & Singer, 2017; Regan, 2004; Sandel, 2010; Serpell, 2015; Singer, 2011).

In its relationship with the spheres of the state (City Hall) and the private sector (for example, broadcasting by radio stations), OBA! ratifies the belief that civil society organizations play a significant role in society's directions and in solving its problems (Andion & Serva, 2004; Gonsalves & Andion, 2019; Semeraro, 1999). In this case, actions aimed at the defense and promotion of rights of non-human animals are needed, so they are not treated badly, abandoned, or used as objects (Felipe, 2006b, 2014; Regan, 2005, 2006; Shafer-Landau, 2012).

As indicated, the action of OBA! in facing a certain social cleavage becomes feasible because there is a joint action with the City Hall. State participation, as well as the participation of civil society actors, can be seen in the actions of the OBA! project. State, organizations, and volunteers experience a social action oriented to the common good (Avritzer et al., 2012; Bobbio, 2000; Edwards-Schachter & Wallace, 2017; Hulgård & Ferrarini, 2010; Miguel, 2018; Phillips et al., 2015). In other words, what happens in the Dog Therapy project is the union of forces between different social actors, so that a common social goal is achieved, the tangential individual benefits notwithstanding.

In this sense, M2 (2018) says that he *“works all week and gives up everything for them”* (the animals). V11 states that he does it for the animals: *“It is not for me, it is really because of them.”* Meanwhile, V5 (2018) highlights the volunteers' participation in favor of something that goes beyond themselves: *“It's nice to see that a lot of people give up doing other things to come and spend some time with them.”* Thus, volunteers choose to devote part of their time to promoting the well-being and rights of non-human animals, rather than engaging in other activities, such as leisure, where the benefit could be strictly personal. From this perspective, the support of civil society, through the volunteers and sympathizers of the animal cause, stands out: *“The Dog Therapy project is formed of people of various ages and different social levels, who collaborate to improve the daily lives of animals, helping directly in various aspects,”* says M1 (2018). The conscious self-denial indicates the experience and sharing of ethical precepts by the project participants, as well as the ethical recognition of the consequences of the relationship between humans and non-humans, often based on a speciesist and instrumental view (Buller, 2016; Felipe, 2019; Francione, 2013; Reale & Antiseri, 2018; Regan, 2005; Singer, 2009; Vázquez, 2018; Vitale et al., 2009).

As indicated, through the practices of the project, joint actions between civil society organizations and other social spheres are consolidated, such as partnerships with the state, with other organizations, and with individuals. In this sense, as M1 affirms, one can understand the Dog Therapy project as the result of the union of forces between the public power and organized civil society. This union of forces culminates in actions that stimulate social practice, since it repositions the actors as active agents, in the pursuit of an inclusive and non-specific or instrumental social goal, through contact and interaction with dogs and cats for adoption. The ethical precept that culminates in the dedication to dogs and cats and the search for conditions that guarantee the right to a better life unite the volunteers and generate awareness of the real condition of these animals and their demands from the relationship with human beings (De Lazari-Radek & Singer, 2017; Felipe, 2006a; Heck, 2011; Kowalski, 2012; Mulgan, 2014; Oliveira, 2014; Sanders, 2010; Serpell, 2015).

It appears that the social actions of the Dog Therapy project contribute to the change in worldview. The reality that the collaborators come to know leads them to reflect critically on the values and practices of our anthropocentric and utilitarian/instrumental culture of life. Hence its innovative character for society (Buller, 2016; Canto-Sperber, 2013; Correia et al., 2016; Di Napoli, 2015; Felipe, 2014; Fletcher & Platt, 2018; Sanders, 2010; Vázquez, 2018). As V10 observes:

I got to know about the project through my girlfriend, who was already participating, but I ended up coming without much expectation, because I did not give much thought to the animals. But when I left here for the first time, I think I was different. I left here very happy to be able to help those animals that needed so much, and now I already think differently. It is as if this has made me open my eyes to what happens to animals. (V10, 2018)

This report reveals the self-criticism generated by a participant in the project's actions. The project's capacity to generate ethical awareness in relation to the consequences of the human-animal relationship and, consequently, to the intrinsic value of the life of non-human animals is observed (Bentham, 2017; Buller, 2016; Fletcher & Platt, 2018; Regan, 2006; Sanders, 2010; Singer, 2011). In the same direction, M1 reports his experience:

In these years of involvement with animal rights, I have witnessed many people become vegetarian (my case), vegan, or restrict clothing to synthetic fabrics to avoid animal suffering. Many began to understand that circuses, vaquejadas, rodeo, and farra do boi are torture for the animals involved. (M1, 2018)

This testimony refers to another relevant point in the Dog Therapy project, in the sense of collaborating for a change in the lives of non-human animals (Joy, 2010). That is, participation in the project can be a determining experience for the volunteers to perceive certain immoralities regarding the merely instrumental treatment given by humans to other animals, whether they are "in company" or "in production." It is clear from M1's report that volunteers often change some of their habits when they perceive, from contact with rescued animals, animal suffering and moral transgression contained in people's daily attitudes, which are often considered harmless. In summary, the interaction with "companion" animals, promoted in a socially innovative way by the Dog Therapy project, sometimes encourages volunteers to start considering the suffering of all animals.

Social innovation is precisely the paradigmatic change – creation of ethical-political values that generate reflection and new behaviors based on the full respect of the different manifestations of life – that the different actors that participate in the project experience. And this tends to positively impact on their actions in the social environment. For example, it is evident from the report that V10 and M1 gather elements to think beyond their private interests as an individual, consumer, owner, and so on (Felipe, 2009; Garner, 2013; Mill, 2015; Santos, 2019; Vázquez, 2018).

V1 (2018) states that she started participating in the project through the invitation of a friend and currently encourages other people. In the same way, V3 (2018) believes that "a person who

comes by invitation from another person can change their mindset.” Here is another important element. Subjects convey their experiences and values acquired to others, which contributes to the spread of a more engaged and inclusive culture. In other words, this pedagogical practice is also the promoter of solidarity actions that are shared among the project participants in different social spaces. This pedagogical practice and the promotion of a non-specific culture and an advocate of equity can be considered social innovation (Carvalho, 2007; Crisp et al., 2018; Dagnino, 2014; Murray et al., 2010; Singer, 2011).

M1 declares that contributing to social transformation through local actions is one of the principles responsible for the success of the Dog Therapy project. She adds: *“A project that happens in a municipal shelter, next to animals rescued from such difficult situations, brings out the best of what human beings have to offer. It stimulates solidarity, charity, and thinking of others”* (M1, 2018). This report reveals the desire to solve a social problem, the participation of social actors and the protagonism and novelty of promoting ethical values, rights, and social commitment articulated to the purpose of generating a more dignified life for humans and non-human animals. The three points of social innovation – aiming for a solution to a social problem, participation of the actors involved, and enabling new and lasting solutions for the community – are also contemplated in the testimony of M1 (Assunção et al., 2018; Avelino et al., 2019; Bignetti, 2011; Silva & Pacheco, 2018).

As stated by M1, social innovation is revealed in the stimulus given in the social actions/experiences of the project that encourage the ethical commitment to non-human animals among participants. Thus, we can infer that the ethical dimension of the relationship between volunteers and animals in the Dog Therapy project collaborates with the awareness and the expansion of the common good and mutual care, to be experienced as community constructions (Correia et al., 2016; Costa & Garrafa, 2000; Dortier, 2010; Garner, 2013).

The biggest beneficiaries of the project are the animals, which gain the opportunity to maintain contact with humans, the possibility of getting out of the kennel confinement, and, above all, the visibility and the increased chances of adoption. But affection exchange also brings countless benefits to people, including children and adolescents, who learn from an early age to respect and care for animals. (M1, 2018)

In this sense, V8 (2018) claims that by participating in the Dog Therapy project and donating to the welfare of the animals, the volunteer benefits as much as the dogs and cats themselves, since they are *“enriched by contact with animals and other volunteers.”* The project *“is a chance for people too,”* says V1, who leaves happily after participating in the project’s actions, as well as miss it when he does not have the opportunity to go. It is worth emphasizing the subjective gains of volunteers, such as experience and knowledge, again corroborating with the mutualistic perception of the human-animal relationship defended by Serpell (2015). For example, many of them, only from participating in the project, reflect on the ethical principle of life without suffering, as well as on speciesism and the consequences of the instrumental relationship imprinted by humans on non-human animals – with those that have the instrumental mindset denying that non-humans can be subject-of-a-life (Buller, 2016; Felipe, 2014; Francione, 2013; Regan, 2006; Singer, 2011).

The extension of the Dog Therapy project to personal life is also highlighted by V9 (2018). He says he has become more proactive in other social activities and therefore has been much more committed to activities in the neighborhood where he lives. It is a practical example of how the paradigm shift with respect to non-human animals can reflect on the intersubjective and social relation among humans themselves. Thus, V9 claims to act more actively in favor of his community, after understanding non-human animals as subjects that must have their rights respected (Santos, 2014; Semeraro, 1999; Serpell, 2015; Silva et al., 2018). In the same way, M1 (2018) emphasizes: *“I believe that everyone who disposes themselves to go to an animal shelter, donate their time on a day of rest, is a conscious and supportive person.”* In a similar fashion, V6 (2018) highlights: *“I think it is very important to have projects like this, not only for animals, but also for people. They begin to see things differently, and to think of others instead of thinking only about themselves,”* which is a living example of paradigmatic change (Felipe, 2009; Reale & Antiseri, 2018; Santos, 2019; Vitale et al., 2009).

These quotes suggest a transformation coming from the quality of acquaintanceship between volunteers and animals. Through contact with the dogs and cats of the project and learning their stories, affection and empathy is created, and the volunteer recognizes the subject-of-a-life in the non-human being. That is to say, experiences are created for which humans and non-humans are recognized and valued as subjects-of-a-life. It is, therefore, about fostering practices and reflections directed to animal welfare that leads the subjects to live the inclusive ethical-social values that are opposed to the instrumental and consumer exploitation of life at various levels (Buller, 2016; Fletcher & Platt, 2018; Regan, 2004, 2006; Singer, 2011). It is in this pedagogical perspective of paradigmatic change that the social innovation resides as a social practice fulfilled in the OBA! project (Dagnino, 2008; Gregoire, 2016; Hulgård & Ferrarini, 2010; Murray et al., 2010; Santos, 2002; Varadarajan, 2014).

In this regard, through various social interventions, OBA! collaborates to increase public awareness of systematic cruelty to non-humans in laboratories, circuses, and zoos, as well as neglect and domestic abuse. In addition, it awakens social actors to a more social, communitarian, critical, and engaged view (Dortier, 2010; Felipe, 2006a, 2009, 2019; Oliveira, 2014; Sandel, 2010; Serpell, 2015). It can be seen – as indicated in this topic – that in OBA! social innovation is effective as a social action (paradigmatic change, generation of values, criticism of the instrumental and consumerist view of life) in the practices aimed at the welfare of animals by the Dog Therapy project.

Final considerations

As shown by the data and analysis of the research results, the constitutive practices of the Dog Therapy project go far beyond the experience of the attitude of compassion towards animals. It is, above all, a project to carry out a social action by generating new mentality and values based on ethical precepts and the universalization of rights, overcoming speciesism. The social innovation carried out by the OBA! project resides, therefore, in generating subsidies for a paradigm shift from practices focused on the well-being of non-human animals.

As indicated in the literature review, the spectrum of social innovations is broad. Despite this, the research emphasized the following traits of social innovation: (a) it should seek a solution

to a particular social problem; (b) it must count on the participation of all the actors involved; and (c) it needs to generate new and lasting solutions for the community.

We verified that the Dog Therapy project seeks to solve a social problem. That is, it has as its main objective the welfare of the animals that are for adoption in the municipal kennel: dogs and cats victims of mistreatment and/or abandonment. OBA! seeks, above all, to solve this social demand by generating awareness in people of the harm caused by human insensitivity and meanness in the human-animal relationship. Contact with the animals generates empathy and ethical commitment of the actors involved with the project, both in relation to pets such as dogs and cats, as well as farm animals such as cows, pigs, and chickens.

As for the second point, we observed there is the clear involvement of several social actors in the Dog Therapy project. This was evidenced by the active participation of the members of the civil society organization, of the volunteers, of the presence of the public power, etc. In fact, the whole context that facilitates the interaction between volunteers and animals is through the efforts of representatives of the various sectors of society (CSO, public power, and private initiative) for the project to take place and to thrive. In this case, OBA!, as a civil society organization, works together with the Municipal Government of Florianópolis to improve animal welfare services. The private initiative is also made in the actions developed by OBA!.

The increase in the quality of life of the animals that are taken from the streets and enter OBA! is visible. The animals enjoy the benefits immensely, as their own condition before the humans is valued from the sensitization of the volunteers. Moreover, through the awareness of people, the number of occurrences of neglect and abuse of animals can be reduced, while impacts by their instrumental use are also minimized. At the same time, volunteers and society in general can enjoy a better coexistence due to the affective response offered by the animals. This may contribute, among other aspects, to a more harmonious relationship between humans and other species.

The third trait was evidenced in the change of mentality of many volunteers in the project. As the data reveals in coherence with the literature, through interaction with the dogs and cats of the municipal kennel, people can review their values and practices and thus awaken to a greater sensitivity as to the interests of beings of other species, beyond the interests of the human species itself. The social action made feasible in the project generates greater ethical commitment to relationships with living beings – human and non-human – and the development of a sense of community through participation and engagement in social causes oriented by the wide appreciation of life.

Thus, by becoming legitimate agents of social change, people transgress the limits of their perception of themselves and the world, and, from there, they can generate more reflective and transformative practices. These seeds planted by projects such as Dog Therapy can, in the long run, contribute to new and innovative actions that replace the instrumental treatment of life (through which humans and non-humans are treated as objects, means, instruments, things) with ethical and sustainable ways of preserving existence. The experience of precepts such as equity, solidarity, and inclusion can contribute substantially to a paradigm shift aimed at the integral value of life.

It is evident that the practices of the project generate social innovation. Thus, in response to the research question, we concluded that the Dog Therapy project, developed by OBA!, is a social innovation because it carries out a social action through practices aimed at the welfare of dogs and

cats that have had their lives vilified, generating changes of values, mentality, and attitudes in the different actors that participate in it.

It is seen, therefore, that the purpose of the study was met, as well as the research question. Thus, the critical analysis proposed in this research allows, to some extent, understanding how social innovation can be generated from actions aimed at animal welfare. Thus, this investigation can theoretically contribute to research on innovative social actions, and, more specifically, to studies that analyze other actions related to guaranteeing the rights of non-human animals in different social organizations and movements.

Therefore, to deepen the discussion proposed in the research, it is necessary to advance the theoretical research as well as to analyze more initiatives such as the proposal from OBA!. In order for more social, environmental, and ethical-political issues to be discussed within organizations, more studies of this nature must be produced, so perhaps animal rights and the integral value of life can be even more important issues in the scientific debate of the organizational field.

References

- Alves, M. A. (2004). O conceito de sociedade civil: Em busca de uma repolitização. *Organizações & Sociedade*, 11(Spe.), 141-154. doi:10.1590/1984-9110010
- Anastacio, M. R., Cruz Filho, P., & Marins, J. (2018). *Empreendedorismo social e inovação social no contexto brasileiro*. Curitiba, PR: PUCPRESS.
- Andion, C., & Serva, M. (2004). Por uma visão positiva da sociedade civil: uma análise histórica da sociedade civil organizada no Brasil. *Cayapa. Revista Venezolana de Economía Social*, 4(7), 7-24. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3c02z14>
- Andion, C., Ronconi, L., Moraes, R. L., Gonsalves, A. K. R., Serafim, D., & Brum, L. (2017). Civil society and social innovation in the public sphere: A pragmatic perspective. *RAP: Revista Brasileira de Administração Pública*, 51(3). doi:10.1590/0034-7612143195
- Andrade, M. M. (2000). *Como preparar trabalhos para cursos de pós-graduação: Noções práticas*. São Paulo, SP: Atlas.
- Anheier, H. K., & Seibel, W. (2001). *The nonprofit sector in Germany: Between state, economy, and society* (Vol. 9). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Arendt, H. (1972). *Crises of the republic: Lying in politics, civil disobedience on violence, thoughts on politics, and revolution* (Vol. 219). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Arendt, H. (2013). *The human condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Arendt, H., & Kohn, J. (2006). *Between past and future*. London: Penguin.
- Arluke, A., Levin, J., Luke, C., & Ascione, F. (1999). The relationship of animal abuse to violence and other forms of antisocial behavior. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 14(9), 963-975. doi:10.1177/088626099014009004

- Assunção, D. M., Kuhn Junior, N., & Ashton, M. S. G. (2018). Cidades criativas e Vila Flores: Convergências e semelhanças no modelo de gestão para a inovação social. *Desenvolvimento em Questão*, 16(43), 291-321. doi:10.21527/2237-6453.2018.43.291-321
- Avelino, F., Dumitru, A., Cipolla, C., Kunze, I., & Wittmayer, J. (2019). Translocal empowerment in transformative social innovation networks. *European Planning Studies*, 28(5), 955-977. doi:10.1080/09654313.2019.1578339
- Avritzer, L., Bignotto, N., Guimarães, J., & Starling, H. M. M. (Orgs.). (2012). *Corrupção: Ensaios e críticas*. Belo Horizonte, MG: Editora UFMG.
- Baião, A. L., Peci, A., & Costa, C. C. D. M. (2015). Parcerias entre Estado e sociedade civil na perspectiva do capital social. *Organizações & Sociedade*, 22(74), 345-365. doi:10.1590/1984-9230743
- Baratta, G. (2004). *As rosas e os cadernos: O pensamento dialógico de Antonio Gramsci*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: DP&A.
- Bardin, L. (2009). *Análise de conteúdo*. Lisboa: Edições 70.
- Bauman, Z. (2005). *Liquid life*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2007). *Consuming life*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2010). *Living on borrowed time: Conversations with Citlali Rovirosa-Madrazo*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2013). *Community: Seeking safety in an insecure world (themes for the 21st century)*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Béhar, A. H. (2019). Meritocracy as a tool of managerial ideology in the capture of subjectivity and individualization of labor relations: A critical reflection. *Organizações & Sociedade*, 26(89), 249-268. doi:10.1590/1984-9260893
- Bentham, J. (2017). *An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation*. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3p0y3ck>
- Bignetti, L. P. (2011). As inovações sociais: Uma incursão por ideias, tendências e focos de pesquisa. *Ciências Sociais Unisinos*, 47(1), 3-14. doi:10.4013/1040
- Bilbao, N. S., & Vélez, A. L. L. (2015). Las competencias de emprendimiento social, COEMS: Aproximación a través de programas de formación universitaria en Iberoamérica. *REVESCO. Revista de Estudios Cooperativos*, (119), 159-182. doi:10.5209/rev_REVE.2015.n119.49066
- Bobbio, N. (2000). *In praise of meekness: Essays on ethics and politics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bobbio, N., Matteucci, N., & Pasquino, G. (2007). *Dicionário de política*. Brasília, DF: Editora UnB.
- Boni, V., & Quaresma, S. J. (2005). Aprendendo a entrevistar: Como fazer entrevistas em ciências sociais. *Em Tese*, 2(1), 68-80. doi:10.5007/%25x
- Brunstein, J., Rodrigues, A. L., & Kirschbaum, C. (2008). Inovação social e empreendedorismo institucional: A ação da ONG "Ação Educativa" no campo educacional da cidade de São Paulo. *Organizações & Sociedade*, 15(46), 119-136. doi:10.1590/S1984-92302008000300006

- Buller, H. (2016). Animal geographies III: Ethics. *Progress in Human Geography*, 40(3), 422-430. doi:10.1177/0309132515580489
- Canto-Sperber, M. (Org.). (2013). *Dicionário de ética e filosofia moral*. São Leopoldo, RS: Editora Unisinos.
- Carvalho, M. C. M. (2007). *O utilitarismo em foco: Um encontro com seus proponentes e críticos*. Florianópolis, SC: Editora da UFSC.
- Chizzotti, A. (2010). *Pesquisa em ciências humanas e sociais*. São Paulo, SP: Cortez.
- Cloutier, J. (2003). *Qu'est-ce que l'innovation sociale?* Collection Études théoriques, n. ET0314. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3vAPHpK>
- Collis, J., & Hussey, R. (2005). *Pesquisa em administração*. Porto Alegre, RS: Bookman.
- Correia, S. É. N., Oliveira, V. M., & Gomez, C. R. P. (2016). Dimensions of social innovation and the roles of organizational actor: The proposition of a framework. *RAM. Revista de Administração Mackenzie*, 17(6), 102-133. doi:10.1590/1678-69712016/administracao.v17n6p102-133
- Costa, S. I. F., & Garrafa, V. (2000). *A bioética no século XXI*. Brasília, DF: Editora UnB.
- Coutinho, C. N. (Org.). (2011). *O leitor de Gramsci*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Civilização Brasileira.
- Crisp, R., Dall'Agnoll, D., Savulescu, J., & Tonetto, M. C. (Orgs.). (2018). *Ética aplicada e políticas públicas*. Florianópolis, SC: Editora da UFSC.
- Dagnino, R. (Org.). (2008). *Tecnologia social: Ferramenta para construir outra sociedade*. Campinas, SP: Editora da Unicamp.
- Dagnino, R. (2014). *Tecnologia social: Contribuições conceituais e metodológicas*. Florianópolis, SC: Insular.
- De Lazari-Radek, K., & Singer, P. (2017). *Utilitarianism: A very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Di Napoli, R. B. (2015). Animais como pessoas? O lugar dos animais na comunidade moral. *Princípios: Revista de Filosofia (UFRN)*, 20(33), 47-78. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3uuaf1Y>
- Diretoria de Bem-Estar Animal. (2020). *Prefeitura de Florianópolis*. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2RS8lp4>
- Dortier, J. F. (2010). *Dicionário de ciências humanas*. São Paulo, SP: Martins Fontes.
- Edwards-Schachter, M. E., & Wallace, M. L. (2017). 'Shaken, but not stirred': Sixty years of defining social innovation. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 119, 64-79. doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2017.03.012
- Edwards-Schachter, M. E., Matti, C. E., & Alcántara, E. (2012). Fostering quality of life through social innovation: A living lab methodology study case. *Review of Policy Research*, 29(6), 672-692. doi:10.1111/j.1541-1338.2012.00588.x
- Felipe, S. T. (2006a). Fundamentação ética dos direitos animais: O legado de Humphry Primatt. *Revista Brasileira de Direito Animal*, 1(1), 207-229. doi:10.9771/rbda.v1i1.10249

- Felipe, S. T. (2006b). Valor inerente e vulnerabilidade: Critérios éticos não-especistas na perspectiva de Tom Regan. *ethic@ – An international Journal for Moral Philosophy*, 5(3), 125-146. doi:10.5007/%25x
- Felipe, S. T. (2009). Antropocentrismo, sencientismo e biocentrismo: Perspectivas éticas abolicionistas, bem-estaristas e conservadoras e o estatuto de animais não-humanos. *Páginas de Filosofia*, 1(1), 2-30. doi:10.15603/2175-7747/pf.v1n1p2-30
- Felipe, S. T. (2014). *Acertos abolicionistas: A vez dos animais*. São José, SC: Ecoânima.
- Felipe, S. T. (2019). *Ética e experimentação animal: Fundamentos abolicionistas*. Florianópolis, SC: Editora da UFSC.
- Ferreira, R. M. F. (2002). *O desafio da colaboração: Práticas de responsabilidade social entre empresas e terceiro setor*. São Paulo, SP: Gente.
- Fletcher, T., & Platt, L. (2018). (Just) a walk with the dog? Animal geographies and negotiating walking spaces. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 19(2), 211-229. doi:10.1080/14649365.2016.1274047
- Flick, U. (2009). *Desenho da pesquisa qualitativa*. Porto Alegre, RS: Artmed.
- Francione, G. L. (2013). *Introdução aos direitos animais*. Campinas, SP: Editora da Unicamp.
- Garner, R. (2013). *A theory of justice for animals: Animal rights in a nonideal world*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Giaretta, J. B. Z., Fernandes, V., & Philippi Jr., A. (2012). Desafios e condicionantes da participação social na gestão ambiental municipal no Brasil. *Organizações & Sociedade*, 19(62), 527-550. doi:10.1590/S1984-92302012000300009
- Gonsalves, A. K. R., & Andion, M. C. M. (2019). Ação pública e inovação social: Uma análise do sistema de garantia de direitos da criança e do adolescente de Florianópolis-SC. *Organizações & Sociedade*, 26(89). doi:10.1590/1984-9260892
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. New York: International Publishers.
- Gramsci, A. (1989). *Concepção dialética da história*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Civilização Brasileira.
- Gramsci, A. (2014). *Further selections from the Prison Notebooks*. New Delhi: Aakar Books.
- Gregoire, M. (2016). Mulgan exploring various approaches of social innovation: A francophone literature review and a proposal of innovation typology. *RAM Revista de Administração Mackenzie*, 17(6), 45-71. doi:10.1590/1678-69712016/administracao.v17n6p45-71
- Heck, J. (2011). *Bioética: Autopreservação, enigmas e responsabilidade*. Florianópolis, SC: Editora da UFSC.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (2011). *Hegel's philosophy of right*. Hoboken: Blackwell.
- Henriques, F. C. (2014). *Autogestão em empresas recuperadas por trabalhadores: Brasil e Argentina*. Florianópolis, SC: Insular.
- Huisman, D. (2011). *Dicionário dos filósofos*. São Paulo, SP: Martins Fontes.

- Hulgård, L., & Ferrarini, A. V. (2010). Inovação social: Rumo a uma mudança experimental na política pública? *Ciências Sociais Unisinos*, 46(3), 256-263.
- Hyppolite, J. (1996). *Introduction to Hegel's philosophy of history*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press.
- Joy, M. (2010). *Why we love dogs, eat pigs, and wear cows: An introduction to carnism*. Newburyport: Conari Press.
- Klerkx, L., & Aarts, N. (2013). The interaction of multiple champions in orchestrating innovation networks: Conflicts and complementarities. *Technovation*, 33(6-7), 193-210. doi:10.1016/j.technovation.2013.03.002
- Kowalski, G. (2012). *The souls of animals*. Novato: New World Library.
- Lafer, C. (2003). *Hannah Arendt: Pensamento, persuasão e poder*. São Paulo, SP: Paz e Terra.
- Laville, J. L. (2016). Repensando o espaço público e a economia: Contribuição da economia solidária à teoria da democracia. *Organizações & Sociedade*, 23(78), 369-377. doi:10.1590/1984-92307812
- Mackenzie, C. (2016). Vulnerability, needs and moral obligation. In C. Straehle (Ed.), *Vulnerability, autonomy, and applied ethics* (pp. 89-106). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Manzini, E. (2014). Making things happen: Social innovation and design. *Design issues*, 30(1), 57-66. doi:10.1162/DESI_a_00248
- Marquesan, F. F. S., & Figueiredo, M. D. D. (2018). Do ecoambientalismo à sustentabilidade: Notas críticas sobre a relação organização-natureza nos estudos organizacionais. *Organizações & Sociedade*, 25(85), 264-286. doi:10.1590/1984-9250855
- Martins, G. D. A., & Theóphilo, C. R. (2009). *Metodologia da investigação científica*. São Paulo, SP: Atlas.
- Mehmood, A., & Constanza, P. (2013). Social innovation in an unsustainable world. In F. Moulaert, D. MacCallum, A. Mehmood, & A. Hamdouch (Eds.), *The international handbook on social innovation: Collective action, social learning and transdisciplinary* (pp. 53-66). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Mello, C. J. (2018). *Trabalho, tecnologia e solidariedade*. Florianópolis, SC: Insular.
- Menezes, D. S., & Siena, O. (2010). Ambientalismo no Instituto Chico Mendes de Conservação da Biodiversidade (ICMBIO) na Amazônia Legal. *Organizações & Sociedade*, 17(54), 479-498. doi:10.1590/S1984-92302010000300008
- Miguel, L. F. (2018). *Dominação e resistência: Desafios para uma política emancipatória*. São Paulo, SP: Boitempo.
- Mill, J. S. (2015). *On liberty, utilitarianism and other essays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Minayo, M. C. S. (2014). *O desafio do conhecimento: Pesquisa qualitativa em saúde*. São Paulo, SP: Hucitec.

- Montgomery, T. (2016). Are social innovation paradigms incommensurable? *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 27(4), 1979-2000. doi:10.1007/s11266-016-9688-1
- Mora, J. F. (2001). *Dicionário de filosofia*. São Paulo, SP: Loyola.
- Mulgan, G., Tucker, S., Ali, R., & Sanders, B. (2007). *Social innovation: What it is, why it matters and how it can be accelerated*. London: The Young Foundation.
- Mulgan, T. (2014). *Understanding utilitarianism*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Murray, R., Caulier-Grice, J., & Mulgan, G. (2010). *The open book of social innovation*. London: The Young Foundation.
- Naconecy, C. (2009). Bem-estar animal ou libertação animal? Uma análise crítica da argumentação antibem-estarista de Gary Francione. *Revista Brasileira de Direito Animal*, 4(5), 235-267. doi:10.9771/rbda.v4i5.10633.
- Nicholls, A., & Murdock, A. (2012). The nature of social innovation. In A. Nicholls, & A. Murdock (Eds.), *Social innovation* (pp. 1-30). London: Palgrave Macmillan. doi:10.1057/9780230367098_1
- Nicholls, A., Simon, J., & Gabriel, M. (2015). Introduction: Dimensions of social innovation. In A. Nicholls, J. Simon, M. Gabriel (Eds.), *New frontiers in social innovation research* (pp. 1-26). London: Palgrave Macmillan. doi:10.1057/9781137506801_1
- Nicholson, J., & Kurucz, E. (2019). Relational leadership for sustainability: Building an ethical framework from the moral theory of 'ethics of care'. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 156(1), 25-43. doi:10.1007/s10551-017-3593-4
- Oliveira, M. A. (2014). *Correntes fundamentais da ética contemporânea*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.
- Oliveira, V. M. D., Gómez, C. R. P., & Correia, S. É. N. (2018). Os papéis da sociedade civil como protagonista no processo de promoção do consumo sustentável: Uma análise baseada na percepção de especialistas brasileiros. *Organizações & Sociedade*, 25(85), 229-246. doi:10.1590/1984-9250853
- Organização Bem-Animal. (2018). OBA!. Retrieved on from <https://bit.ly/3g0EoAG>
- Phillips, W., Lee, H., Ghobadian, A., O'Regan, N., & James, P. (2015). Social innovation and social entrepreneurship: A systematic review. *Group & Organization Management*, 40(3), 428-461. doi:10.1177/1059601114560063
- Piccoli, P., & Godoi, C. K. (2012). Motivação para o trabalho voluntário contínuo: Uma pesquisa etnográfica em uma organização espírita. *Organizações & Sociedade*, 19(62), 399-416. doi:10.1590/S1984-92302012000300002
- Pozzebon, M. (2004). Conducting and evaluating critical interpretive research: Examining criteria as a key component in building a research tradition. In B. Kaplan, D. P. Truex, D. Wastell, A. T. Wood-Harper, & J. DeGross (Eds.), *Information systems research: Relevant theory and informed practice information systems research* (pp. 275-292). International Federation for Information Processing, vol. 143. Boston: Springer. doi:10.1007/1-4020-8095-6_16

- Prodanov, C. C., & Freitas, E. C. (2013). *Metodologia do trabalho científico: Métodos e técnicas da pesquisa e do trabalho acadêmico*. Novo Hamburgo, RS: Feevale.
- Profice, C. C., & Santos, G. H. M. (2017). De grumetes a kunumys: Estilos de infâncias brasileiras. *Revista História da Educação*, 21(53), 307-325. doi:10.1590/2236-3459/61054
- Rao-Nicholson, R., Vorley, T., & Khan, Z. (2017). Social innovation in emerging economies: A national systems of innovation based approach. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 121, 228-237. doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2017.03.013
- Reale, G., & Antiseri, D. (2018). *Filosofia: Idade contemporânea*. São Paulo, SP: Paulus.
- Regan, T. (2004). *The case for animal rights*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Regan, T. (2005). *Empty cages: Facing the challenge of animal rights*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Regan, T. (2006). *Defending animal rights*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Richardson, R. J. (2011). *Pesquisa social: Métodos e técnicas*. São Paulo, SP: Atlas.
- Rodrigues, A. L. (2007). Modelos de gestão e inovação social em organizações sem fins lucrativos: divergências e convergências entre nonprofit sector e economia social. *Organizações & Sociedade*, 14(43), 111-128. doi:10.1590/S1984-92302007000400006
- Rouanet, L. P. (2018). Sobre a validade da distinção entre animais racionais e irracionais. In L. P. Rouanet, & Carvalho, M. C. M. (Orgs.), *Ética e direitos dos animais* (pp. 105-118). Florianópolis, SC: Editora da UFSC.
- Sandel, M. (2010). *Justice: What's the right thing to do?* New York: Farrar Straus Giroux.
- Sanders, C. (2010). *Understanding dogs*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Sanders, C., & Arluke, A. (1996). *Regarding animals: Animals, culture, and society*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Santos, B. S. (2002). *Toward a new legal common sense: Law, globalization, and emancipation*. Oxford: Butterworths.
- Santos, B. S. (2014). *Epistemologies of the south: Justice against epistemicide*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.
- Santos, B. S. (2019). *Knowledges born in the struggle: Constructing the epistemologies of the global south*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Semeraro, G. (1999). Da sociedade de massa à sociedade civil: A concepção da subjetividade em Gramsci. *Educação e Sociedade*, 20(66), 65-83. doi:10.1590/S0101-73301999000100004
- Serpell, J. A. (1991). Beneficial effects of pet ownership on some aspects of human health and behaviour. *Journal of the royal society of medicine*, 84(12), 717-720. doi:10.1177/014107689108401208
- Serpell, J. A. (1996). *In the company of animals: A study of human-animal relationships*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Serpell, J. A. (2015). The human-animal bond. In L. Kalof (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of animal studies* (pp. 81-97). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shafer-Landau, R. (2012). *The fundamentals of ethics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sidgwick, H. (2013). *The methods of ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
doi:10.1017/CBO9781139136617
- Silva, K. D. V., & Pacheco, A. S. V. (2018). Gestão social e inovação social: Convergências e divergências teóricas. *Revista Pensamento Contemporâneo em Administração*, 12(2), 88-101.
doi:10.12712/rpca.v12i1.12222
- Silva, R. B., Tait, M., Novaes, H. T., & Fraga, L. S. (Orgs.). (2018). *Suleando a retomada com tecnociência social: O pensamento de Renato Dagnino*. Florianópolis, SC: Insular.
- Simmel, G. (1990). *The philosophy of money*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Singer, P. (2009). *Animal liberation: The definitive classic of the animal movement* (Updated ed.). New York: Harper Perennial.
- Singer, P. (2011). *Practical ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tenório, F. G. (2016). Administração e a questão social: Entre o “robinsonismo” e o “étiennismo”. *Organizações & Sociedade*, 23(78), 460-486. doi:10.1590/1984-92307867
- Timmermans, B. (2005). *Hegel*. São Paulo, SP: Estação Liberdade.
- Triviños, A. N. S. (2009). *Introdução à pesquisa em ciências sociais: A pesquisa qualitativa em educação: o positivismo, a fenomenologia, o marxismo*. São Paulo, SP: Atlas.
- Van Wijk, J., Zietsma, C., Dorado, S., de Bakker, F. G., & Martí, I. (2019). Social innovation: Integrating micro, meso, and macro level insights from institutional theory. *Business & Society*, 58(5), 887-918. doi:10.1177/0007650318789104
- Varadarajan, R. (2014). Toward sustainability: Public policy, global social innovations for base-of-the-pyramid markets, and demarketing for a better world. *Journal of International Marketing*, 22(2), 1-20. doi:10.1509/jim.13.0158
- Vázquez, A. S. (2018). *Ética* (38th ed.). Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Civilização Brasileira.
- Vitale, D., Spécie, P., & Mendes, J. S. R. (2009). Democracia global: A sociedade civil do Brasil, Índia e África do Sul na formulação da política externa ambiental de seus países. *Revista de Gestão Social e Ambiental*, 3(2), 160-178. doi:10.24857/rgsa.v3i2.157
- Wolch, J. R., & Emel, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Animal geographies: Place, politics, and identity in the nature-culture borderlands*. New York: Verso.
- Yin, R. K. (2017). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Authorship

Alexandre Zawaki Pazetto

Master's degree in administration from University of Southern Santa Catarina (Unisul). Administration assistant at the Federal Institute of Santa Catarina (IFSC). Researcher at the Social Innovation Research Group at Unisul.

E-mail: alexpazetto@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5002-7410>

Nei Antonio Nunes

Doctoral researcher in political sociology from UFSC with postdoctoral research in the Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in the Human Sciences from UFSC. Professor at the University of Southern Santa Catarina (Unisul).

E-mail: neinunes@bol.com.br

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2744-9206>

André Luis da Silva Leite

Doctoral researcher in industrial engineering from UFSC with postdoctoral research in economics from UFRJ. Professor at the Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC).

E-mail: andre.leite@ufsc.br

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5212-3043>

Conflict of interests

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Authors' contributions

First author: conceptualization (equal), data curation (lead), formal analysis (equal), investigation (lead), methodology (equal), resources (equal), supervision (supporting), writing-original draft (lead), writing-review & editing (equal).

Second author: conceptualization (equal), data curation (supporting), formal analysis (equal), investigation (supporting), methodology (equal), resources (equal), supervision (lead), writing-original draft (supporting), writing-review & editing (equal).

Third author: conceptualization (equal), data curation (supporting), formal analysis (equal), investigation (supporting), methodology (equal), resources (equal), supervision (supporting), writing-original draft (supporting), writing-review & editing (equal).

Plagiarism check

O&S submits all documents approved for publication to a plagiarism check, using specific tools.

Data availability

O&S encourages data sharing. However, in compliance with ethical principles, it does not demand the disclosure of any means of identifying research participants, fully preserving their privacy. The practice of open data seeks to ensure the transparency of the research results, without requiring research participants to disclose their identity.

O&S is signatory to DORA (The Declaration on Research Assessment) and to COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics).



Creative Commons Atribuição 4.0 Internacional