

The Development of Social Entrepreneurship

A Comprehensive Overview of Social Entrepreneurship in Europe Since the Middle Ages

Anne Somsen (345674)

Abstract

In this paper it is explored how social entrepreneurship as defined by modern standards has existed since as long ago as the Middle Ages. A set of qualifications will be presented by which a number of social enterprises will be compared and evaluated. Five historical periods will be discussed and a social enterprise from each of them will be evaluated according to modern standards. This way it can be analyzed how social entrepreneurship has developed in Europe since the Middle Ages. This paper concludes that the existence of social enterprises as defined by modern standards depends heavily on the social and economic structure of Europe at the time.

Index

Introduction	3
Literature Review	7
Chapter 1: Medieval Times (1300-1500)	10
Setting the Scene	10
Description of the Guilds	11
Analysis of Social Impact	13
Chapter 2: Renaissance (1500-1700)	15
Setting the Scene	15
Description of the Workhouses	16
Analysis of Social Impact	16
Chapter 3: Industrial Revolution (1700-1900)	18
Setting the Scene	18
Description of Robert Owen and New Lanark	19
Analysis of Social Impact	20
Chapter 4: Post-War Society (1950-1980)	21
Setting the Scene	21
Description of Corporate Social Responsibility	22
Analysis of Social Impact	23
Chapter 5: Modern Times (1980-2010)	24
Setting the Scene	24
Description of the Fairtrade Labeling Company	25
Analysis of Social Impact	27
Discussion and Conclusion	28
References	30

Introduction

In 1980 Bill Drayton founded Ashoka, a company to help social entrepreneurs throughout the world (About Us). The company was founded in the United States, but quickly spread over the world, and can now be found in over 70 countries. This goes to show that social entrepreneurship has become an important part of society. Or has it always been an important part?

Social entrepreneurship is the hot topic of the last few years. Research is frequent and extensive (Alvord, Brown, & Letts, 2004, Gartner, 1989, Hoogendoorn, Pennings, & Thurik, 2010, Mair & Marti, 2006). According to Wennekers and Thurik (1999) Entrepreneurship is important for economic growth. The development of ICT and the information sensitive economy that we live in requires a new way of thinking, and entrepreneurs provide these new ideas. Much the same way, society relies on social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurs come up with creative new ideas to solve existing social problems, while at the same time continuing to be financially sustainable. Before social entrepreneurship became the modern version of itself, it must have existed in some way. Every age knows people who are dissatisfied with the state of society, and wish to change it. This willingness to change the social rules is what defines a *social* entrepreneur.

This paper aims to find social entrepreneurship before we gave it the name of social entrepreneurship. Aim of this paper is to show how social entrepreneurship developed through the ages. This research will contribute to current scholarly inquest, as it will describe where social entrepreneurship comes from, and the article will show that social entrepreneurship existed long before it was given the name social entrepreneurship. Looking for the past of social entrepreneurship will hopefully help make the current phenomenon clearer, and will bring into perspective the developments that can be expected from social entrepreneurship. Plenty of scholarly articles are concerned with the future of entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship (Dacin, Dacin, & Tracey, 2011, Seelos & Mair, 2005). A comprehensive history of social entrepreneurship has not been provided before, though, even though it is as important to look back as it is to look forward. Any historian will be able to explain how much we can learn from our past. The knowledge of events and behaviors of the past give us a guideline for the future. The future is, of course, never certain, but the past may provide us with a little experience to more reliably predict what is going to happen.

To research the development of social entrepreneurship, five different time periods will be discussed. During each time period a social enterprise will be discussed. The question during each chapter is, 'can this social enterprise be classified as a social enterprise according to modern standards?'

The five different time periods that will be discussed in light of social entrepreneurship are:

- Middle ages (1300-1500)
- Renaissance (1500-1700)
- Industrial revolution (1700-1915)
- Post war society & start of capitalism (1950-1980)
- Modern society (1980-now)

The research will be restricted to Europe, as history differs significantly from one part of the world to the next, and trying to encompass all of world history will not lead to productive research.

The structure for every period will be as follows: first there will be a description of major historical events and the social and economic situation in Europe during these times. Second will be the description of a social enterprise, and third there will be an analysis of the social enterprise. This analysis will aim to explain why the enterprise can be said to be social, and what impact it had on the rules of society at the time.

For the Middle Ages this paper will explore the guilds, the way they operated and how this related to a social change. According to Epstein (1998), the guilds were created to transfer skills through apprenticeships. They developed into much more than that. Kieser (1989) stated that the guilds were the predecessors of our current organizations and institutions. In his article from 1997, Rosser (1997) explains the workings of the guilds. They were not only groups of craftsmen making sure that their craft remained qualitatively satisfactory. The guild would mediate in disputes between its members, provide payment of sickness benefits, and find an income for the widows of the masters of the guild. They are considered social enterprises because they changed social rules. They changed the way widows and orphans were treated, and they changed the way craftsmanship was seen. Craftsmanship had always been the responsibility of the craftsman himself and quality could vary immensely. After the introduction of the guilds, the quality became much more consistent, and the customer could count on the same quality of work from all the craftsmen. Craftsmanship became much more appreciated and being a craftsman was a more desirable living.

The period after the middle ages is the renaissance, the time of art and inventions. Sider (2005) writes about life in the renaissance in Europe. She states that urban development was a large part of society during the renaissance. This leads to a more complex urban society, with more causes for social unrest. The most unfortunate of the free people flocking to the cities were left to begging. According to Spencer-Wood (2001), the first workhouses were developed because of several developments that left more people in poverty and put the people that were already poor out on the streets. Harrington (1999) explains that at the end of the sixteenth century, governmental poor policies changed drastically throughout Europe. The poor were no longer allowed to be on the streets, but were to be put to work in workhouses. Even though the working conditions in these houses were often deplorable, and most of them killed most of their inmates, the idea of these houses was, in essence, social. Poor people who did not know a craft were put to work, to learn to make an honest living, so they would not have to beg and steal anymore. Begging and stealing was never a much respected way of living, but through the work houses it became dangerous, and it changed the face of society. Society started to not just frown upon begging and stealing, but actively try to help those in need. The workhouses may not have been the best solution, but it set in motion a way of thinking that we still see today, where beggars are not just ignored, but taken care of.

During the industrial revolution there were several factory owners who treated their employees better than most, and believed in fair treatment of everybody. Robert Owen owned a number of factories and mills in the town of New Lanark in Scotland. His father-in-law started the community and its fair treatment of its workers. Paying them well and building them houses with decent sanitation (O'Hagan, 2007). When Robert Owen took over the village from his father-in-law, he extended the improvements on contemporary treatment of factory workers that his predecessor had already made. He provided the town with education, hygiene and health initiatives. Owen then went on to apply his model in different villages throughout Scotland (Donnachie, 2007), and after others heard of his idea, it spread over the world. Robert Owen saw the way society treated the workers in the factories, and how the simple rules of supply and demand had ruined the fair treatment of workers, and he wanted to change things. He had different ideas about how society should view factory workers and he taught that it was possible to run a profitable factory, and still provide the workers with proper shelter, food, and education. He changed the way society viewed the factories.

After the Second World War, a new age started. The rise of the multinational company occurred, and Corporate Social Responsibility became an important aspect of business. This is still a very new part of corporate culture, and a lot of businesses are not entirely sure how to go about

implementing a CSR scheme. Most of the literature seems to agree that each company should have their own way of contributing to society, and that there is not just one way of going about implementing CSR. Each company should decide their scheme based on their shareholders, their stakeholders, and their general business model (Van Marrewijk, 2003, Van Marrewijk & Were, 2003, Holme & Watts, 2000).

In modern society there are large and small social entrepreneurs, and one of the large ones is the Fairtrade Labeling Company. This company is an umbrella for all kinds of smaller Fairtrade initiatives (Our Vision, 2011). These initiatives aim to provide producers of unfairly traded products with the means to live. Unified standards have been developed to define which products can be marked as being Fairtrade (Aims of Fair Trade Standards, 2011). The producers and workers get a fair price for their products and a fund for the village where they live so it can be developed. The products are then sold in the big supermarkets as an alternative to the mainstream brands (Brown, 1993). The extra cost to the products is not aimed at making a profit for the company, but at the fair price for the farmers, and the funds for the villages. The Fairtrade Labeling Company is considered a social enterprise because it tries to help the small producers of, for example, coffee beans, to make enough money to feed themselves and their family.

This paper is structured as follows: firstly, a short summary will be provided of some articles written about social entrepreneurship, so that a definition to be used for this paper can be ascertained. Next, each time period previously specified will be discussed. Finally, the findings of this paper will be briefly summarized, and a conclusion will be reached, in which the research question 'How has social entrepreneurship in Europe developed since the Middle Ages?' will be answered.

Literature Review

Entrepreneurship has existed almost as long as humanity has (Baumol, 1990). Baumol (1990) describes the history of entrepreneurship since the roman times. According to him, the number of entrepreneurs and the way they behave depends heavily on the rules of the game during the times that they live. The rules of the game determine the allocation of entrepreneurial effort across productive, unproductive, and destructive entrepreneurship. If the rules of the game are favorable, entrepreneurial effort will be allocated to productive entrepreneurship, and have a positive effect on the economy. If the entrepreneurial effort is allocated to unproductive entrepreneurship, there is no effect on the economy. If the rules of the game force the entrepreneurial effort to be allocated to destructive entrepreneurship, the economy may even be damaged.

The search for the meaning of entrepreneurship is newer (Gartner, 1989). According to Gartner (1989), defining the entrepreneur is not possible, because we have been asking the wrong question. For years, the research asked who the entrepreneur was (Brockhaus & Horwitz, 1985, Komives, 1972). This research focussed on the characteristics of the entrepreneur, and why they set up a company and someone else, in the same position, did not. However, we should not be asking who the entrepreneur is, but rather what he or she does (Gartner, 1989).

If this idea is extended to social entrepreneurs, one definition that has been put forward keeping in mind what an entrepreneur does is the one by (Martin & Osberg, 2007):

“Someone who targets an unfortunate but stable equilibrium that causes the neglect, marginalization, or suffering of a segment of humanity; (...), and who aims for and ultimately affects the establishment of a new stable equilibrium that secures permanent benefit for the targeted group and society at large.” (p.39)

Bornstein (2004) writes his book about social entrepreneurship to call attention to the people who try to make the world a better place. He looks at social entrepreneurs as a “(...) transformative force: people with new ideas to address major problems who are relentless in the pursuit of their vision (...).” (p.1) His view is one of what an entrepreneur does as well as who he or she is.

Mair & Marti (2006) do not look at who the entrepreneur is either; they go more in the direction that Bornstein (2004) took. The definition proposed by Mair and Marti (2006) is quite close to that of Martin and Osberg (2007). The element that the definition of Martin and Osberg (2007) was missing was that of the financial benefits. Mair and Marti (2006) incorporate this into their

definition of social entrepreneurship. Their definition is “a process that catalyzes social change and addresses important social needs in a way that is not dominated by direct financial benefits for the entrepreneurs.”(p.36) the social entrepreneurs of Mair & Marti (2006) are the ones that change the rules of the game for the entrepreneurs of Baumol (1990).

Social entrepreneurship has been researched a lot in the last couple of decades (Hoogendoorn, Pennings, & Thurik, 2010), and case studies seem to be the most popular (Alvord, Brown, & Letts, 2004). Alvord, Brown, & Letts (2004) try to identify what makes a successful social enterprise. Using 7 different cases, they find patterns in innovation, leadership and organization, and approaches to scaling up and societal transformation. They find that the most successful companies have in common that they have the potential to reach millions of people, and to catalyze high levels of social transformation.

Hoogendoorn, Pennings, & Thurik (2010) wrote a paper depicting the vast majority of the research into social entrepreneurship. According to them, research in social entrepreneurship can be divided into four different schools of thought. The innovation school of thought, the social enterprise school of thought, the Emergence of Social Enterprise in Europe (EMES) approach, and the UK approach. These can be divided into the American tradition and the European tradition. As this paper focuses on Europe, only the schools of thought of the European tradition will be discussed here. These are the EMES approach, and the UK approach. The EMES approach defines a social enterprise as having an explicit aim to benefit the community, as being launched by a group of individuals, enjoying a high degree of autonomy, participatory in nature, and not basing decision making power on capital ownership. It allows for some profit distribution because it includes co-operatives. The UK-approach defines social enterprises as businesses with primarily social objectives whose surpluses are principally reinvested for that purpose in the business or the community. Neither of these definitions seem to agree entirely with the four authors discussed before. Mair and Marti (2006), Martin and Osberg (2007), and Bornstein (2004) all seem to suggest groundbreaking innovations, and giant changes, that would fit in the successful companies that Alvord Brown and Letts found. These companies would have the potential to change the way society works in a fundamental way. However, the definitions proposed in the paper by Hoogendoorn, Pennings & Thurik (2010) can also be applied to much smaller companies with much smaller impacts.

This paper will make use of the EMES school of thought. The social enterprises that belong to this school of thought meet four criteria: firstly, a direct link between the mission and the activities is required. Secondly, the social enterprises are not to be managed by public

authorities or other organizations; third, the social enterprises are self sufficient. The fourth and last criterion is that the social enterprise is run according to a multiple stakeholder involvement model.

As illustrated by the discussion before, it is apparent that there are many different ways to approach social entrepreneurship, and thus very many different possible definitions. Finding a definition that would take into account all the different aspects of social entrepreneurship is extremely difficult, if not impossible.

In this paper the criteria for the EMES approach will be used as described by Hoogendoorn, Pennings and Thurik (2010), combined with the definition of Mair and Marti (2006). To create certain conditions that the social enterprises used for this paper will have to meet. This means that a social enterprise according to this paper is an enterprise that

- Addresses important social needs in such a way that financial benefits for the entrepreneurs are not the most important part of the organisation
- Has a direct link between the mission and its activities
- Is not managed by public authorities or other organisations
- Is self sufficient
- Is run according to a multiple stakeholder model

This definition of a social enterprise will be used because, first of all, the definitions and criteria that it is based on are recent, and therefore take into account most of the more recent research done into social entrepreneurship. Secondly, it will make it easier to analyze the social enterprises chosen and their place in society at the time. Both the definition used in the EMES approach and the definition designed by Mair and Marti (2006) will be used in this paper. This will have the benefit of added perspective on the enterprises through the ages, as the definition by Mair and Marti (2006) is focused toward groundbreaking companies that facilitate enormous social change, and the EMES definition can also be applied to smaller companies. Using this difference it will become clear on which scale the chosen enterprises operated.

The next part of this paper will be structured as follows: each time period will be given a chapter, and each chapter will be divided into three parts. The first part is the part where the major events of the time period will be discussed, as well as the social and economic structure of the time period. The second part will be dedicated to describing the social enterprise that was chosen for the particular period. The last part will be about analyzing the social enterprise according to the criteria mentioned earlier.

Chapter 1: Medieval Times

Setting the scene

Major historical events

Medieval times start after the fall of the Roman Empire. The fall of the Roman Empire is, however, different across the empire. The Eastern Roman Empire lasted a lot longer than the Western Roman Empire. As the Western Roman Empire was most of Europe, this is the part of the empire this paper will cover. It fell in the year 476 (Mark, 2001). This marked the start of the dark ages, or the early middle ages. The Middle Ages are also called the Dark Ages because all the knowledge that was so carefully cultivated by the Romans and the Greeks was either lost or forgotten. The art of writing was left to the clergy and the noblemen, and society turned to the feudal system (history.com, 2010).

Social structure

Medieval towns often formed around large ecclesial centers (Trueman, 2006). Cathedrals and monasteries attracted pilgrims and traders.

In a town there would be different classes of people, there were the beggars and workers, the tradesmen and the craftsmen, and the clergy and noblemen. Living in a town was never easy. There was no sewage system, so waste was dumped out on the streets (Trueman, 2006). If you were lucky there was a ditch next to the road that carried most of it off to the nearest river, but more often this was not the case (Trueman, 2006). Life in a medieval town was unhealthy, unsanitary, dark, and usually very short. So why were the towns so attractive? This was mostly because of the existence of the guilds.

Economic structure

Cathedral towns usually had a big market square, where traders and craftsmen could trade their goods and services (Trueman, 2006). The economy of the town usually revolved around this market square. It was where most people made their money. If not directly by selling goods, then by running inns and pubs close to the square, to house and entertain the travelling guests of the market. During the later Middle Ages, the town would have another economic center: the guild house. From the guild house the craftsmen would be regulated. Being a part of the guild became a sign of quality products (Rosser, 1997), so if a craftsman was not a member of the guild, selling their craft became near to impossible. The tradesmen and the craftsmen had a lot to gain from a town, and the nobleman or clergy in charge of the town could make use of this interest (Trueman, 2006). Tradesmen and craftsmen paid taxes to the lord of the town, making the lords a good deal richer. In return, the tradesmen could make use of the market available in the towns, and the lord himself would often employ the craftsmen.

Description of Guilds

The guilds were first mentioned around 1100 AD, when a group of 23 fishermen in Mainz were granted the hereditary right to catch and trade fish (Wissell, 1971). After this first mention, there are more and more instances of craftsmen banding together. In 1149, the bed linen weavers of Cologne convinced the town magistrate to decree that every person who weaved bed linen had to be part of their guild (Kieser, 1989).

There are three theories for the development of guilds in the middle ages. The first is called the 'Feudal manor theory' (Muller, 1910), this theory states that guilds developed around manors or monasteries. The manors were run by the nobility, who had the money in the district. The monasteries were run by the monks and the clergy, who had most of the power in the area. Craftsmen were usually employed by the manors or the monasteries. As towns started to develop around the manor, the demand for craft goods increased, and the craftsmen moved into the towns. In these towns, the monastery or the local lord still ruled. They would set aside certain streets and parts of town for certain craftsmen. This developed into the guilds when the town became free of the rule of the monks or the lords.

The second theory is that called the "office theory" (Keutgen, 1965). This theory states that the guilds were developed by the offices of the magistrates in the town, to protect the citizens from exploitation and to make sure that taxes were paid.

The last theory is the 'unification theory' (Below, 1912). According to this theory, citizens in the Middle Ages had an affinity for banding together. This cooperative spirit stemmed from the need to be protected. The Middle Ages were a messy time where staying alive was difficult on one's own. Survival rates increased dramatically in groups. This need for protection and survival led to the development of guilds.

Becoming a member of a guild took a lot of time, effort and dedication. Boys were admitted to a workshop at a very young age. They were required to learn in the workshop of their master for a number of years, which differed per craft, but is most often seen to be seven years (Swanson, 1988). During that time they would go through several ranks within the workshop. This served the masters well, as there would always be enough cheap labor. The apprentices generally did not get paid much; they worked for room and board (Wallis, 2008). After this period of apprenticeship, the boys could arise to be journeymen. Still not full members of the guild, but they were now allowed to take on their own projects. If the projects were sold, they received most of the benefits (Guthrie, 2007). After another couple of years as a journeyman, they could apply to become a master of the guild. This meant creating a 'masterpiece': a piece of craftsmanship to prove that they were good enough to join the guild in full (Rosser, 1997). Most journeymen never became full members of the guild. Not necessarily because they were not

good enough, but because they chose to be employed rather than becoming masters and taking on that responsibility (Reininghaus, 1981). The rank of journeyman meant that finding work in a different city and different workshop was never very difficult. After all, the journeymen knew everything they needed to create good pieces of craftsmanship; they just never felt the need to prove so.

The guilds had many responsibilities, rules and traditions. They acted as a cartel, they enforced quality standards, they provided their members with income security, they protected their members from exploitation, and they took care of burials and widow care in the event of the passing away of one of its members (Epstein S. R., 1998, Rosser, 1997). Every guild was different and many rules and regulations varied per craft, but these benefits were usual for a craft guild in the Middle Ages.

The craft guilds started their decline around the fifteenth century. The guilds responded to economic crises by enforcing their cartels. This caused a lessening in adaptive ability for the guilds, so that other organizations, like factories, could expand faster at the expense of the guild. Pressure on the guilds increased, and they reinforced their cartels further (Kieser, 1989).

The guilds relied heavily on tradition, and even though technological innovations were sometimes taken into the production process, it was slow progress. If there was a threat that a machine might replace an entire guild, the production would be delayed (Hirshler, 1954). As being a member of the guild became less and less important, their influence and power decreased. This also meant that the traditional way of operating became open for innovation by craftsmen who were not part of the guild. Through invention and innovation they were able to create more efficient, cheaper products than the craftsmen who were part of the guild. Being a member of the guild became more of a problem than a benefit, and the guilds disbanded.

Analysis of Social Impact

In this section it will be explained why the guilds are a social enterprise, according to the definition stated in the literary review. After, it will be made clear why the guilds were chosen particularly, and shared why they made a social impact and in what way.

Addresses important social needs in such a way that financial benefits for the entrepreneurs are not the most important part of the organisation.

The way the guilds originated is not exactly clear, but it is clear what their goals were. The goals of a guild were to provide a quality product and protect their members. Every member of the guild paid a small annual sum for their membership (Rosser, 1997). This money went into widow funds, or disability and sickness funds, so if the member died or was grievously injured and not capable to take care of his family anymore, the guild could take care of him and his family instead (Fagniez, 1900). The money also went to upkeep of the guild house and the cartels that the guild maintained. Some of the money went to the church (Gorski, 2000). All in all, the guilds were not set up to be a profitable organisation in the first place. Being a board member of the guild did mean you could live comfortably, but the guild itself was not set up to make a profit.

The guild addressed important social needs. If a man died he would leave behind a family unable to take care of itself. The wife would have to find occupation, or they would have to go live with relatives. Work for women was scarce in the Middle Ages, and there were not always relatives around. Unless money was saved, the family would become poor and quite possibly die of starvation. The guild made sure the family was taken care of. The money may be less than what they had when the man of the house was still alive, or capable of doing his job, but they would not starve.

Another social need that the guild addressed was the need for protection. Not only of the craftsman, but also of the customer. The guild made sure that the products were of a consistent quality and the customer knew what they were paying for. Customers were protected against exploitation (Stabel, 2012).

Has a direct link between the mission and its activities

Missions differed per craft and per guild, but the basic idea was protection and collaboration. Their activities reflected precisely that.

Is not managed by public authorities or other organisations

The guilds were managed by older masters who had enough experience with the guild to know how it worked (Rosser, 1997). A manager would be asked when the previous one died, and they were voted in by the rest of the guild board. The magistrate and other authority figures in the town had no official influence. Of course, unofficially, they had quite a bit of influence and negotiating power, but the guilds were not managed by the town magistrate, but by the master craftsmen.

Is self sufficient

The guilds acquired their funds through the payment of membership fees (Epstein S. A., 1991). They were not supported in any other way and can therefore be said to be self sufficient.

Is run according to a multiple stakeholder model

A multiple stakeholder model implies that stakeholders have a say in the proceedings of the organization. Guilds held meetings if there were decisions to be made (Epstein S. A., 1991). The members would discuss what they thought should be done, but the board had the final say. This implies that guilds were run according to a multiple stakeholder model.

Guilds satisfy the conditions of being a social enterprise. They were chosen for their overwhelming presence in history. They were big parts of urban life during a couple of hundred years. Their significance should not be ignored. Without the guilds, life for a craftsman would have been a lot more complicated. The guilds addressed some very important social issues. According to Kieser (1989), the craft guilds were the predecessors that developed into our current organizations.

There are striking similarities between the guilds of the Middle Ages and the worker cooperatives that are considered to be social enterprises according to the European Tradition (Hoogendoorn, Pennings, & Thurik, 2010). Just like the medieval guilds, modern cooperatives provide their members with decision making power and in most instances a share of the profits. Research has found that the effect of worker cooperatives on the productivity of workers is largely positive (Estrin, Jones, & Svejnar, 1987).

Chapter 2: Renaissance (1500-1700)

Setting the Scene

Major historical events

The renaissance started around 1500 in Italy, and swept over Europe from the south.

Renaissance is a French word that literally means 'rebirth'. This rebirth refers to the art, culture and values of the ancients.

The fall of the Eastern Roman Empire in 1453 set a lot in motion in Italy, as people from the eastern countries moved west to escape the destruction in the former Roman Empire (Lendering, 2011). They took with them ideas and philosophies cultivated while Europe was enveloped in the darkness of the middle ages.

One of the most important inventions of the renaissance was the printing press. This way literature and ideas could be conveyed to a larger number of people, a lot faster (Giusepi, 2005). The renaissance saw a large change in ecclesial life as well. Luther and Calvin turned away from the Roman Catholic Church; they deemed the church too full of luxury. Monasteries were closed, or brought back to the ideas of poverty and prayers. The poor were kicked out of the hospitals and almshouses that were attached to the monasteries (Spencer-Wood, 2001).

Social structure

Cities grew, and society changed. A class system was still in place in most cities, but a new class was developing: the class of the newly rich, the merchants. There was not much that changed for the lower class citizens. They worked, or begged, and that was it. Then there was the class of craftsmen who kept renewing their methods of working, but ultimately kept doing what they had always done. Then there was the merchant class. They were the ones that had the luxury of thinking, philosophy, education, and art.

Economic structure

From the merchant class came the rise of capitalism. They were the class that invented the system of double entry bookkeeping around 1500. Urbanization was a large part of the economic development in Europe around the renaissance, as trade became more and more important (Allen, 2000). Economic focus shifted away from ecclesial centers, and towards harbors and trade routes. The VOC (the Dutch East India Company) and the English East India Company were founded and flourished throughout the renaissance. The VOC was a large part of the founding of the Amsterdam trade market and the start of the trade of shares (Gelderblom & Jonker, 2004).

Through this rise of capitalism and the fact that more and more people moved to the cities and

towns, looking for work and a better life, resulted in the increase of the amount of poor on the streets in the cities.

Description of the Work Houses

All around Europe the problem of the poor in the streets was taking on considerable proportions as towns and cities grew. Around 1600 the first workhouse opened in Amsterdam (Harrington, 1999).

During the renaissance the idea of 'deserving poor' and 'undeserving poor' spread through Europe. The deserving poor were those who could not help their situation, they were poor through sickness or deformity (Spencer-Wood, 2001). The other poor were the ones who were (in the minds of the renaissance nobility) just lazy. However, in those times there were a number of crises, where there were depressions in several industries, such as the textile industry in England. Crop failures were also not uncommon, and these might be reasons that the unemployed could not find a job (Woodbridge, 2003). The reason the workhouses were designed was that the higher classes did not see this and believed the unemployed to be in need of reform. The undeserving poor should remember what it was like to work, so that when they were released from the workhouse they could keep working and make a living for themselves and their families.

The motivation for setting up these workhouses was an economical one as well as a social one. The poor that were set to work in the workhouses had to produce something. They were not paid, and so provided free labor (Harrington, 1999). The products that they made were sold with a profit close to 100%. The social goal of these workhouses was to take the poor off the streets and teach them a craft. The philosophy behind this teaching was that if the poor learned a craft they would be able to support themselves using this craft when they left the workhouse.

Analysis of Social Impact

Addresses important social needs in such a way that financial benefits for the entrepreneurs are not the most important part of the organisation.

The workhouses were first and foremost a solution to the amount of beggars and poor in the cities. This is why they were set up. The social need they addressed was the need for safety in the streets, as the poor who were out on the streets frequently stole from passers by or attacked them. It also addressed the perceived social need for the poor to be reformed into people who were prepared to do honest hard work to bring home the money their families needed.

The part of this condition that is not fulfilled is the part where the financial benefits for the entrepreneurs are not the most important part of the organisation. If the workhouses had not made the nobility any money they would not have existed.

Has a direct link between the mission and its activities

The mission of the workhouses was to reform the poor by putting them to work. This is exactly what they were thought to do.

Is not managed by public authorities or other organisations

The workhouses were managed by the authorities, so do not qualify for this condition. The magistrates of the towns set up the workhouses and appointed the people running them. The profits made by the workhouses were mostly paid to the authorities, who would then give a share to the people running the workhouses.

Is self sufficient

The work houses were self sufficient in that they provided nothing to the people working there. The funds needed for running the house were not very large. The products that were made in the house provided ample funding for the house, and a profit for the authorities besides.

Is run according to a multiple stakeholder model

The stakeholders of a workhouse were mostly the magistrates of the town or city in which the workhouse was located. They would decide, together with the management of the workhouse, about what would happen to the workhouse. So it was run according to a multiple stakeholder model.

All in all, the workhouses were not social enterprises as such, but they did invoke social change. During the Renaissance, the individual became more important. It was no longer as important as in the Middle Ages to cooperate and work in groups. This meant that it was each man for himself. This led to the hordes of unemployed and then later the workhouses. Other than that there was a bit of philanthropy from the richer classes, but overall social concern was at an all time low.

The workhouses are said to be the early versions of much of our modern institutions, among them prisons, mental asylums, and orphanages (Byrd, 2009). The European Tradition recognises 'work-integration social enterprises'. These are social enterprises that seek to help the long term unemployed who are in danger of permanent exclusion from the workforce. These initiatives seek to improve the chances of the long term unemployed on the labour market through a number of strategies. The ones that bear most resemblances to the workhouses are the reschooling and training strategies, where the unemployed is taught to do different work than what they were originally trained for (Spear & Bidet, 2005).

Chapter 3: Industrial Revolution (1700-1900)

Setting the Scene

After the enlightenment of the renaissance, and all the inventions of that time, it was time for a new age. The steam engine is most commonly blamed for the start of the industrial revolution. Machines could be made with steam technology, this led to factories full of people. Whoever remained in the countryside after the renaissance was now bullied out by large, rich farmers who benefited from the invention of machines to help them plow big patches of land. All the small farmers left for the city in search of better opportunities. They found these opportunities in the form of factories. Different cities had different specialties. Transport became easier with the invention of trains, and so different cities specialized, importing other necessities.

Conditions in the factories were bad. Safety of the workers was not taken into account when designing machines or other work materials (Trueman, 2008). Losing fingers or hands was just part of the job. Workers were expected to work in excess of twelve hours a day, and were grossly underpaid (Feinstein, 1998). Children were required to work in the factories to help pay for the families needs. There were no laws against child labor, and the children were paid even less than their parents (Clapham, 1915). Still the people came looking for jobs. Working in the factory was better than not working at all. The conditions in the factories were accepted because if they were not accepted, the worker who complained would be out on the streets and there were three others trying to take his place (Poddar, 2013). People flocked to the towns for the work. These people needed a place to live, preferably close to the factory so the commute wouldn't be too long. Houses were built with great haste. They were unstable, unsafe, and cold. They were also expensive for an average factory worker. In a house meant for one family sometimes lived three.

The gulf between rich and poor was enormous in these times. The factory owners were the richest people in the towns, because they got away with paying their workers next to nothing, and selling their produce at a high cost.

Classes were clear: workers and beggars at the bottom, after which there was a small middle class of craftsmen who made products that could not be manufactured in the factories. On the same social standing you would find factory managers, who ran the factories for the owners who almost never showed up anymore. Then there were the factory owners and the nobility who enjoyed their indulgences and their money guilt-free.

Description of Robert Owen and New Lanark

In 1785 David Dale founded the town of New Lanark. It was common in these times to have a village where the citizens worked in the adjacent factories. This was the case here as well. The workers would live in the village and work in the cotton mills close to the village. David Dale provided the workers with a place to live, education, and welfare. This was not unusual. What was unusual was the standard that Dale set for the services provided to his workers (Donnachie, 2007). The villagers had a strong sense of community, as Dale set a tough discipline and was very fond of religion. More than 2000 people came to be part of New Lanark. In 1800, Robert Owen married David Dale's daughter and bought the village of New Lanark from Dale. Owen took over management immediately and brought in reforms that made him internationally famous. His main focus was education. He set up two different schools in the village, and made sure there was enough opportunity for the people of the village to make use of the schools. He thought it was very important for the village to be self sufficient, so he improved the efficiency of the nearby fields by having the villagers grow crops. These crops were sold in the village shop. The prices were always fair, and the villagers made enough money to buy what they needed. He became famous for his treatment of his employees. One example is that he closed the mills during a cotton crisis, when the price of cotton was so high that he didn't think it was economically viable to keep them open, but he kept paying his workers their normal salary (O'Hagan, 2005).

Robert Owen and his business partners ran the village. He saw the whole thing as one enormous business venture. Owen kept his employees in check through a system of regular monitoring and observation. He did not believe in harsh punishments, as he thought they were always unjust to the person being punished. Instead he devised a scheme to keep track of how his employees behaved each day. He had his managers assign each worker a four-sided piece of wood, with four different colors on it. Each color represented how the worker had behaved the day before and was displayed above his or her workstation. This meant that he could walk through his mills and see in an instance how his workers were behaving (Walsh & Stewart, 1993). Due to the community spirit that prevailed in the village, this public display of one's behavior made the workers more efficient. The community of New Lanark was later mimicked in other parts of Europe. Besides Robert Owen in Scotland, there were others with similar ideas. In 1895 George Cadbury, the founder of the famous chocolate brand, set up the Bournville Model Village, where the housing was not restricted to factory workers (Bryson & Lowe, 2002). The most successful Owenite community, however, was that of Ralahine in Ireland. The community was set up to produce cloth, and existed between 1831 and 1833 (Geoghegan, 1991).

Analysis of social impact

The mills and the village of New Lanark will be treated as Robert Owen say it: one giant business venture. This way it can be analysed as a social enterprise.

Addresses important social needs in such a way that financial benefits for the entrepreneurs are not the most important part of the organisation.

There was dire need for better working conditions in factory towns when Robert Owen took over in New Lanark. According to several sources (Donnachie, 2007, O'Hagan, 2005, Himes, 1928), David Dale meant well, but was in no way close to the improvements Robert Owen would make. Education was provided, but when Robert Owen took over it really improved in quality. He took care of the safety, and health of his employees. Something David Dale had only partly succeeded in doing. New Lanark was, at times, a very profitable undertaking (Robertson, 1971). However, there were also years that the mills made considerable losses, especially when wages were paid when the mills were closed. The village worked towards two different goals. The first was Owens social experiment, treating his workers well, and providing them with whatever they needed. The second was the profit that the mills made. Of course, object of the experiment was also to see if this treatment led to more efficiency in the mills and therefore a higher profit. Completely disassociating the financial benefit from the social benefit is, in this case, not possible. The village of New Lanark does not exactly fulfill the first criterion, but some nuance is called for.

Has a direct link between the mission and its activities

The vision of Robert Owen was to have three profitable mills, where the employees could work in safety and health, in a community setting, with minimal problems. The activities of the village were directed at a profitable mill and survival of the village itself. The efforts of the village frontman, Robert Owen, were directed at the other side of the mission, where providing for the villagers played a central role. Looking at the village as the enterprise, and Owen as the entrepreneur, the activities do not directly link to the mission provided by Owen.

Is not managed by public authorities or other organisations

Owen was not associated with the government, but was a businessman, and an industrialist.

Is self sufficient

New Lanark was very close to being self-sufficient, as this was important to Owen. The fields were tended to produce crops for consumption by the villagers, there were craftshops in the town itself, so that the villagers did not have to leave the village for the craft goods that they needed.

Is run according to a multiple stakeholder model

Robert Owen ran a tight and strict ship in New Lanark, and not one where other peoples ideas were appreciated. Government of the town was up to Owen and nobody else. The town was not run according to a multiple stakeholder model.

Chapter 4: Post War Society (1950-1980)

Setting the scene

Major historical events

After the Second World War, the United Nations was formed by 51 countries, that wanted to keep international peace for as long as they possibly could (UN at a Glance). In 1945 the cold war swept over Europe and the United States, the iron curtain was drawn and Berlin was divided. The cold war lasted well into the 1980s, when both sides had the potential for total worldwide destruction.

Social structure

In Western Europe, society was developing towards a more modern version of itself. During the 1960s and 1970s women fought for their place in professional society and politics (Stewart, Settles, & Winter, 1998). While in Western Europe ethnic minorities and women were changing the way they were being treated by society, in Eastern Europe social development was next to non-existent. The communist society was focused on production, most people were very poor, and any form of luxury products were not accessible (Giustino, 2007).

Economic structure

The years 1950 until 1973 saw a golden age in economic growth in Western Europe. This was because Western Europe was catching up to the United States. Now that they had lost half the continent to trade with, it was logical to turn to the United States. There was more investment in human as well as physical capital (Crafts, 1995). This golden age of economic growth also spurred the growth of a number of multinational companies. These enormous companies had no rules and regulations to abide by and were increasingly considered to be detrimental to the environment. This detrimental effect needed to be mitigated, and Corporate Social Responsibility was introduced. This was aimed at having companies take the responsibility for their actions. If there was a large part of the rainforest that needed to be cut for production, companies were urged to plant trees somewhere else. At the same time, there were large loans to pay back after the war. In 1973 the first oil crisis hit, the proclaimed embargo made oil one of the most expensive commodities on the planet. The embargo ended in 1974 and oil prices dropped again. In 1979 a drop in the supply of oil because of the Iranian revolution scared the

world and made the price of oil rise again. The price of oil became higher than was justified by the drop in supply, and this was quickly rectified.

In Eastern Europe, the economy was controlled by the government, they decided on the production in factories and on the farmlands. They decided when production happened, how much would be produced, and what the workers would get paid for it (Giustino, 2007). This focus on production was enforced through five-year plans that would presumably make the country rich and prosperous. These plans for production were focused on trucks, tanks and tractors and consumption goods were overlooked (Giustino, 2007).

Description of Corporate Social Responsibility

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) was first mentioned around 1950 (Carrol, 1999). The book 'Social Responsibilities of the Businessman' is the first book that argues that the several hundred largest businesses were vital centers of power and decision making (Bowen, 1953). He stated that businessmen were responsible for the consequences of their actions, and the effect those actions had on society. Where the fifties saw the start of CSR, it really took off in the sixties (Carrol, 1999). It was being recognized that even though profit is a company's main goal, this pursuit of profit should not hurt society in the process. Large corporations have the responsibility to look after this planet and its people, just because they are so big and could do as much harm as good.

According to van Marrewijk (2003), CSR can be divided into three separate approaches. The first one is the shareholder approach, which states that the social responsibility of the company is to increase its profits, as this benefit its shareholders most. According to this approach, the company should not look at social consequences or doing any social good, as this is the domain of the government. The second approach is the stakeholder approach. This approach states that companies are not only responsible towards their shareholders, but also to all of their stakeholders. This expands the amount of the people the company has to justify their actions to. The third and last approach is the societal approach which argues that the company is an integral part of society and is therefore responsible for any actions that influence this society (Van Marrewijk, 2003). The approach followed and therefore the actions taken by a company are different per company. Van Marrewijk (2003) states in a later paper in the same year, that there is no 'one solution fits all' approach to CSR. Every company will go about their responsibilities in their own way, and in the way that will benefit them and their share- and stakeholders best (Van Marrewijk & Werre, 2003). In 1995, CSR ended up on the agenda of the World Business Council of Sustainable Development (WBCSD). In 1998 the WBCSD launched a two year project to find a workable definition of CSR, to find what represents good practice, and

to find a practical answer to the question: “what can a company do differently on Monday morning to make CSR happen?”. The report was published on January 1, 2000. The report also agreed that CSR is not something that we can have a standard for. Each company should go about their plan for their CSR in their own way. They do give some helpful tips and assessments about where to start and the report even includes a self assessment questionnaire to help companies assess how they are doing on CSR as they stand now (Holme & Watts, 2000). This goes to show that CSR is a new subject to companies as well as scholars, it merits a lot more research. Practically, companies should figure out for themselves how to implement CSR in their business model.

Analysis of social impact

Addresses important social needs in such a way that financial benefits for the entrepreneurs are not the most important part of the organisation

CSR addresses an important social need in that it makes sure that large companies with a lot of power do not ruin the planet we live on. CSR is not the most important part of the company though, and the entrepreneurs will always focus on making a profit.

Has a direct link between the mission and its activities

The activities of a company in light of CSR and the mission stated in their CSR statement usually coincide. The mission of the company itself has very little to do with the activities undertaken under the CSR part of the enterprise.

Is not managed by public authorities or other organisations

The CSR department is run by the people inside the company, and public authorities and other organisations have very little to do with this.

Is self sufficient

CSR relies on funds from the company. The department itself is not self-sufficient, but the company that it belongs to is.

Is run according to a multiple stakeholder model

CSR was developed for all the stakeholders of a company, even though they do not have much influence.

CSR is not a very good example of a social enterprise according to the definition used in this paper, but it was chosen for its significance for society. It is a way of controlling large corporations. The bad publicity from not following the CSR mentality alone would put a serious dent in the stock prices of any multinational corporation.

Chapter 5: Modern society (1980-2010)

Setting the Scene

Major historical events

A lot has happened in the last thirty years. The most significant event is the fall of the Berlin wall and the end of the cold war. Half of the European market opened up to the rest of the world. Not only could a lot be sold there, they also started to grow economically at an astonishing rate. After all, these eastern European countries had twenty years of economic growth to catch up to. The invention of the computer and the internet happened in this time period, as well as major innovations and changes in most technological fields.

Social structure

After the struggle for their rights in the 1960s and 1970s, women and ethnic minorities had gained some ground. It was no longer frowned upon for women to work, and diversity became an issue on the corporate agenda. Generally society moved to a freer and more equal footing. These developments were mostly restricted to the western part of the world. Social structure differs per continent and country. Where social structure in the western part of the world is concerned with equality and freedom, much of other parts of the world are still very concerned with religion and tradition.

Economic structure

The added market opportunities in Eastern Europe made for a pleasant economic climate. Mass privatization resulted in large amounts of unemployment in the former east block countries (Stuckler, King, & McKee, 2009). The invention of the computer and later the internet resulted in the internet bubble. There was so much excitement over this next big thing, the internet, that everybody wanted a piece of it. Internet companies saw their stock prices sky rocket. It did not last very long, because a couple of years later the bubble burst, and internet stocks plummeted (O'Brien & Tian, 2006). Nevertheless, a new era was born: the high tech information economy that we now live in. ICT became an important part of corporate culture. All of these changes and developments were mostly restricted to the western part of the world. The western part of the world now traded mainly in information and services, and no longer in so many agricultural products. These now mostly came from South America and Africa. These continents could be exploited by more developed countries because the resources were cheap, and labor was cheap. Prices for raw materials that were needed to make luxury products to be sold in developed countries were low. This made for fantastic opportunities. Unfortunately the prices stay low, and the farmers are powerless to do anything about it.

Description of Fairtrade Labelling Organization

In the second half of the 20th century, the alternative trade started up. 'Alternative trade', is trade that tries to either better social or ecological conditions (Brown, 1993). In agriculture the Fairtrade movement is the largest alternative trade organization (Raynolds, 2000).

The world market for Fairtrade products is growing at a rate of 10 to 25 percent per year (EFTA, 1998). It will probably never catch a very large market share, but it captures most of the niche that it caters to (Raynolds, 2000). Within the Fairtrade movement, two different factions can be identified (Hira & Ferrie, 2006). The first looks to create a whole new trading system, by trading through new distribution systems, mostly supported by NGO's and 'alternative trading organizations' (Hira & Ferrie, 2006). The second is the faction is the one that the Fairtrade Labelling Organization belongs to. This faction tries to use existing distribution systems to promote fair trade (Hira & Ferrie, 2006).

In 1988 the first Fairtrade label was launched, called Max Havelaar, after a character from Dutch literature. Fairtrade coffee from Mexico was first sold in the Netherlands under this name (Renard, 2003). The deal Max Havelaar had with the consumer was that the consumer paid a little bit more for their product, and in turn Max Havelaar made sure that the price difference would reach the coffee growers, and not the middlemen (Renard, 2003).

From 1988 onwards, Max Havelaar and other Fairtrade initiatives were set up around Europe, and in 1997, the Fairtrade Labelling Organization was established to provide these initiatives with an umbrella, and to standardize worldwide Fairtrade standards (History of Fairtrade, 2011).

The Fairtrade Labelling Organization has four sets of standards for different groups of people. There are the standards for small producer organizations, hired labor, contract production, and trade. All these standards aim to make trade around the world fairer.

According to their website, "the key objectives of the standards are to:

- ensure that producers receive prices that cover their average costs of sustainable production;
- provide an additional Fairtrade Premium which can be invested in projects that enhance social, economic and environmental development;
- enable pre-financing for producers who require it;
- facilitate long-term trading partnerships and enable greater producer control over the trading process;

- set clear core and development criteria to ensure that the conditions of production and trade of all Fairtrade certified products are socially, economically fair and environmentally responsible.” (Aims of Fair Trade Standards, 2011)

To achieve the first goal, the Fairtrade Labeling Organization sets ‘floor prices’, or a price minimum to be paid to the producers of the products (Rice, 2001). There has been some criticism on this way of operating. After all, the market is supposed to work according to supply and demand, and in agriculture, there is a lot of supply (Rice, 2001). This would mean that holding the price artificially high would lead to more supply, and eventually overproduction would occur.

Analysis of Social Impact

Addresses important social needs in such a way that financial benefits for the entrepreneurs are not the most important part of the organisation

The social needs that the Fairtrade Labelling Organization fulfills is the need for fair treatment of farmers, hired workers, producers and traders of agricultural goods. The focus of the company is totally on the people it is trying to help. In 2011 total income of the company was 15.8 million, and total expenditures were 15.3 million. In 2012 total income was 14.9 million and total expenditures were 14.1 million (Pauschert, Russell, & Freund, 2014). Profit is very small, and not the first goal of the company.

Has a direct link between the mission and its activities

The mission of the Fairtrade Labelling Company is as follows: 'Our mission is to connect disadvantaged producers and consumers, promote fairer trading conditions and empower producers to combat poverty, strengthen their position and take more control over their lives (Our Vision, 2011).' This mission is exactly what their activities work to achieve.

Is not managed by public authorities or other organisations

The Fairtrade Labelling Organizations is run by a board of directors and a general assembly. The board of directors handles the day to day running of the company. The general assembly meets once a year to decide on membership issues, to approve the annual accounts, and to appoint new members of the board of directors. Neither of these are public authorities or other organizations.

Is self sufficient

According to the annual report, income in 2012 was 45% membership fees, 42% grants by partners and 13% interest and other income (Pauschert, Russell, & Freund, 2014). This means that the corporation is about halfway to being self sufficient.

Is run according to a multiple stakeholder model

"Embracing transparency and stakeholder participation is an important way that we will be accountable for our work (Our Vision, 2011)". This sentiment is expressed on the website of the Fairtrade Labeling Organization. This brought to fruition in the general assembly that meets every year. This general assembly consists of 50% producer representation and 50% national fair trade representation. This way the stakeholders have a say in the company as well.

Considering all of the previous, it can be said that the Fairtrade Labeling Organization is a social enterprise.

Discussion and Conclusion

Table 1 is a summary of the findings in this paper. As can be seen from the table, only two out of the five organizations fulfill the first criterion.

The first criterion was that the enterprise addresses important social needs in such a way that financial benefits for the entrepreneurs are not the most important part of the organisation. This criterion was the only criterion that was not taken from the EMES approach, but from the definition for a social entrepreneur as proposed by Mair and Marti (2006). This definition was included because it suggests groundbreaking innovations that have the potential to fundamentally change society. The difference between the two definitions that were used to set up the criteria can be used to compare the organizations in terms of size and impact. As can be seen from the table, most of the companies discussed in this paper do not fit into this definition. Only the craft guilds in the Middle Ages and the Fairtrade Labeling Company in modern times can be said to fit into this definition.

Most of the organizations do seem to fit within the modern European tradition, or more specifically the EMES approach. As can be seen from the table, four out of five have a direct link

	Middle Ages (Guilds)	Renaissance (Workhouses)	Industrial Revolution (New Lanark)	Post War Society (CSR)	Modern Times (Fairtrade)
Social needs no profit	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Direct link mission and activities	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Not managed by public authorities	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Self sufficient	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
MSM	Yes	No	No	No	Yes

between their mission and their activities, four out of five are not managed by public authorities, four out of five are self sufficient, but only two out of five are run according to a multiple stakeholder model. This is not surprising, as a multiple stakeholder model is a very modern concept, and did not quite fit into the social structure of most of these times.

If the social structure of the times is taken into account, the table and the companies are put in a different light. In the Middle Ages, social structure was very much focused on people sticking together and helping one another out. Survival chances were higher in groups. It is therefore more logical for social enterprises to occur. During the renaissance the individual became more important, and, as we can see from the table, the social enterprise did not fulfill three out of five criteria. During the industrial revolution people were closer to each other once again, if only because they were forced to work in close quarters in the factories (Medick, 1976). A strong hierarchy was apparent in society around this time, so the criterion of a multiple stakeholder model was not fulfilled. Most of the others were, and in the industrial revolution, three out of five criteria were fulfilled. During the post war society people were fighting for their freedom, and capitalism was on the rise. This made society more individualistic, and this is reflected in the outcome of this research. Only two out of five criteria were fulfilled. In modern times we see that four out of the five criteria were fulfilled. Now that we have established a society where people are equal, we are starting to turn to helping each other again.

The question that was posed at the start of this paper was as follows: “How has social entrepreneurship in Europe developed since the Middle Ages?” This paper has tried to answer this question in light of the social and economic developments in several periods throughout history. This paper can conclude that the development of social entrepreneurship depended heavily on the social and economic structure that prevailed within Europe at the time. The research seems to suggest a link between the attitude of society toward helping others, and the development of social enterprises. This cannot be proven by this research, mainly because this paper only discusses one case per time period, and this is not enough to draw any general conclusions. This connection between social structure and social entrepreneurship merits more research.

Another factor that might influence the existence of social enterprises is economic structure and welfare. This paper has looked at one particular enterprise per time period. However, many more must be available, and every one of them will be able to tell us something about that particular time period. In previous research, the history of social entrepreneurship has only been briefly mentioned. It is important to find out more about this history, and research exactly what impacts the existence of social enterprises.

The main limitation of this research is the amount of cases researched per period. It is quite difficult to draw conclusions based on one example out of one historical period, especially because the historical periods are quite large. Further research focused on the different periods individually would be beneficial. In this research, choices were made in relation to the historical time periods covered. There are more periods and parts of the world that are not covered by this research but should be researched all the same. Research into the history of social entrepreneurship in the Americas or Asia might give different results. Research into social entrepreneurship in the first half of the 21st century or ancient times will add to the overall picture that was started with this research.

References

- Aims of Fair Trade Standards*. (2011). Retrieved July 11, 2014, from Fairtrade International:
<http://www.fairtrade.net/aims-of-fairtrade-standards.html>
- History of Fairtrade*. (2011). Retrieved July 11, 2014, from Fairtrade International:
<http://www.fairtrade.net/history-of-fairtrade.html>
- Our Vision*. (2011). Retrieved July 11, 2014, from Fairtrade International:
<http://www.fairtrade.net/our-vision.html>
- About Us*. (n.d.). Retrieved July 15, 2014, from Ashoka: <https://www.ashoka.org/about>
- Allen, R. C. (2000). Economic structure and agricultural productivity in Europe, 1300–1800. *European Review of Economic History*, 1 - 25.
- Alvord, S. H., Brown, L. D., & Letts, C. W. (2004). Social Entrepreneurship and Societal Transformation: An Exploratory Study. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 260-282.
- Baumol, W. J. (1990). Entrepreneurship: Productive, Unproductive, Destructive. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 3-22.
- Below, G. V. (1912). Die Motive der Zunftbildung im deutschen Mittelalter. *Historische Zeitschrift*, 23-48.
- Bornstein, D. (2004). *How to Change the World: Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bowen, H. R. (1953). *Social Responsibility of the Businessman*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Brockhaus, R. H., & Horwitz, P. S. (1985). The Psychology of the Entrepreneur. In D. L. Sexton, & R. W. Smilor, *The Art and Science of Entrepreneurship*. Cambridge: Ballinger.
- Brown, M. (1993). *Fair Trade*. London: Zed Press.
- Bryson, J. R., & Lowe, P. A. (2002). Story-telling and History Construction: Rereading George Cadbury's Bournville Model Village. *Journal of Historical Geography*, 21–41.

- Byrd, M. D. (2009). The First Charles Town Workhouse, 1738-1775: A Deterrent to White Pauperism? *The South Carolina Historical Magazine*.
- Carrol, A. B. (1999). Corporate Social Responsibility: Evolution of a Definitional Construct. *Business Society*, 268-295.
- Clapham, J. H. (1915). Soe Factory Statistics of 1815-1816. *The Economic Journal*, 475-479.
- Crafts, N. F. (1995). The Golden Age of Economic Growth in Western Europe, 1950-1973. *The Economic History Review*, 429-447.
- Dacin, M. T., Dacin, P. A., & Tracey, P. (2011). Social Entrepreneurship: A Critique and Future Directions. *Organization Science*, 1203-1213.
- Donnachie, I. (2007). Utopian Designs: the Owenite Communities. *Spaces of Utopia: An Electronic Journal*, 19-34.
- EFTA, (. F. (1998). *Fair Trade Yearbook: Towards 2000*. Gent: Druk in de weer.
- Epstein, S. A. (1991). *Wage Labor and Guilds in Medieval Europe*. Boulder: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Epstein, S. R. (1998). Craft Guilds, Apprenticeship, and Technological Change in Preindustrial Europe. *The Journal of Economic History*, 684-713.
- Estrin, S., Jones, D. C., & Svejnar, J. (1987). The Productivity Effects of Worker Participation: Producer Cooperatives in Western Economies'. *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 40-61.
- Fagniez, G. (1900). *Documents relatifs a l'histoire de l'industrie et du commerce en France*. Paris.
- Feinstein, C. H. (1998). Pessimism Perpetuated: Real Wages and the Standard of Living in Britain during and after the Industrial Revolution. *The Journal of Economic History*, 625-658.
- Gartner, W. B. (1989). "Who Is an Entrepreneur?" Is the Wrong Question. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 47-68.
- Gelderblom, O., & Jonker, J. (2004). Completing a Financial Revolution: The Finance of the Dutch East India Trade and the Rise of the Amsterdam Capital Market, 1595-1612. *The Journal of Economic History*, 641-672.
- Geoghegan, V. (1991). Ralahine: An Irish Owenite Community (1831-1833). *International Review of Social History*, 377-411.
- Giusepi, R. A. (2005). *Beginning and Progress of the Renaissance*. Retrieved 2014 йил 30-June from History-world.org: history-world.org/renaissance.htm
- Giustino, C. (2007). *Everyday Life in Eastern Europe*. Retrieved July` 9, 2014, from Making the History of 1989: chnm.gmu.edu/1989/exhibits/everyday-life/introduction
- Gorski, P. S. (2000). Historicizing the Secularization Debate: Church, State, and Society in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe, ca 1300 to 1700. *American Sociological Review*, 138-167.

- Guthrie, C. (2007). On Learning the Research Craft: Memoirs of a Journeyman Researcher. *Journal of Research Practice*, 1-9.
- Harrington, J. F. (1999). Escape from the Great Confinement: The Genealogy of a German Workhouse. 308-345.
- Himes, N. E. (1928). The Place of John Stuart Mill and of Robert Owen in the History of English Neo-Malthusianism. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 627-640 .
- Hira, A., & Ferrie, J. (2006). Fair Trade: Three Key Challenges for Reaching the Mainstream. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107–118.
- Hirshler, E. E. (1954). Medieval Economic Competition. *The Journal of Economic History*, 52-58.
- history.com. (2010). *Middle Ages*. Retrieved June 25, 2014, from History.com: www.history.com/topics/middle-ages
- Holme, R., & Watts, P. (2000). *Corporate Social Responsibility: Making Good Business Sense*. Geneva: World Business Council for Sustainable Development.
- Hoogendoorn, B., Pennings, E., & Thurik, R. (2010). What Do We Know about Social Entrepreneurship? An Analysis of Empirical Research. *International Review of Entrepreneurship*, 1-42.
- Keutgen, F. (1965). *Amter und Zunfte*. Aalen: Scientia Verlag.
- Kieser, A. (1989). Organizational, institutional, and Societal Evolution: Medieval Craft Guilds and the Genesis of Formal Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 540-564.
- Komives, J. L. (1972). A Preliminary Study of the Personal Values of High Technology Entrepreneurs. In A. C. Cooper, & J. L. Komives, *Technical Entrepreneurship: A Symposium* (pp. 231-242). Milwaukee: Center for Venture Management.
- Lendering, J. (2011 йил 11-April). *Byzantine Empire*. Retrieved 2014 йил 30-June from Ancient History Encyclopedia: www.ancient.eu.com/Byzantine_Empire/
- Mair, J., & Marti, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, 36–44.
- Mark, J. J. (2001, December 1). *Western Roman Empire*. Retrieved June 25, 2014, from Ancient History Encyclopedia: www.ancient.eu.com/Western_Roman_Empire/
- Martin, R. L., & Osberg, S. (2007). Social Entrepreneurship: The Case for Definition. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 27-39.
- Medick, H. (1976). The Proto-Industrial Family Economy: The Structural Function of Household and Family during the Transition from Peasant Society to Industrial Capitalism. *Social History*, 291-315.
- Muller, W. (1910). *Zur Frage Des Ursprungs Der Mitterlalterlichen Zunfte*. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer.

- O'Hagan, F. J. (2005). Robert Owen and the Development of Good Citizenship in 19th Century New Lanark. *Global Citizenship Education: Philosophy, Theory and Pedagogy*, 1-11.
- O'Brien, P. C., & Tian, Y. (2006). Financial Analysts' Role in the 1996-2000 Internet Bubble. *Working Paper Series*, 1-30.
- Pauschert, V., Russell, L., & Freund, K. (2014). *Unlocking the Power: Annual Report 2012-2013*. Bonn: Fairtrade International.
- Poddar, A. (2013). *Working & Living Conditions*. Retrieved July 15, 2014, from The Industrial Revolution: firstindustrialrevolution.weebly.com/working-and-living-conditions.html
- Raynolds, L. T. (2000). Re-embedding Global Agriculture: The International Organic and Fair Trade Movements. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 297–309.
- Reininghaus, W. (1981). Die Entstehung der Gesellengilden im Spatmittelalter. *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 3-23.
- Renard, M.-C. (2003). Fair Trade: Quality, Market and Conventions. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 87–96.
- Rice, R. A. (2001). Noble Goals and Challenging Terrain: Organic and Fair Trade Coffee Movements in the Global Marketplace. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, 39–66.
- Robertson, A. J. (1971). Robert Owen, Cotton Spinner: New Lanark 1800-1825. In S. Pollard, & J. Salt, *Robert Owen, Prophet Of The Poor; Essays In Honour Of The Two Hundredth Anniversary Of His Birth*. (pp. 145-163). Cranburry: Bucknell University Press.
- Rosser, G. (1997). Crafts, Guilds, and the Negotiation of Work in the Medieval Town. *Past and Present*, 1-31.
- Santos, F. M. (2012). A Positive Theory of Social Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 335-351.
- Seelos, C., & Mair, J. (2005). Social entrepreneurship: Creating new business models to serve the poor. *Business Horizons*, 241—246.
- Sider, S. (n.d.). Handbook to Life in Renaissance Europe. In S. Sider, *Handbook to Life in Renaissance Europe*.
- Spear, R., & Bidet, E. (2005). Social Enterprise for Work Integration in 12 European Countries: A Descriptive Analysis. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 195–231.
- Spencer-Wood, S. M. (2001). Introduction and Historical Context to The Archaeology of Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Almshouses. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*, 115-122.
- Stabel, P. (2012). Guilds in late medieval Flanders: myths and realities of guild life in an export-oriented environment. *Journal of Medieval History*, 187-212.

- Stewart, A. J., Settles, I. H., & Winter, N. J. (1998). Women and the Social Movements of the 1960s: Activists, Engaged Observers, and Nonparticipants. *Political Psychology*, 63-94.
- Stuckler, D., King, L., & McKee, M. (2009). Mass Privatisation and the Post-Communist Mortality Crisis: a Cross-National Analysis. *Lancet*, 399-407.
- Swanson, H. (1988). The Illusion of Economic Structure: Craft Guilds in Late Medieval English Towns. *Past and Present*, 29-48.
- Trueman, C. (2006). *Medieval Towns*. Retrieved June 25, 2014, from History Learning Site: www.historylearningsite.co.uk/medieval_towns.htm
- Trueman, C. (2008). *Factories in the Industrial Revolution*. Retrieved July 15, 2014, from History Learning Site: www.historylearningsite.co.uk/factories_industrial_revolution.htm
- UN at a Glance. (n.d.). Retrieved July 9, 2014, from United Nations: www.un.org/en/aboutun/index.shtml
- Van Marrewijk, M. (2003). Concepts and Definitions of CSR and Corporate Sustainability: Between Agency and Communion. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95-105.
- Van Marrewijk, M., & Werre, M. (2003). Multiple Levels of Corporate Sustainability. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107-119.
- Wallis, P. (2008). Apprenticeship and Training in Premodern England. *The Journal of Economic History*, 832-861.
- Walsh, E. J., & Stewart, R. E. (1993). Accounting and the Construction of Institutions: The Case of a Factory. *Accounting Organizations and Society*, 783-800.
- Wennekers, S., & Thurik, R. (1999). Linking Entrepreneurship and Economic Growth. *Small Business Economics*, 27-55.
- Wissell, R. (1971). *Des alten Handwerks Recht und Gewohnheit*. Berlin: Colloquium.
- Woodbridge, L. (2003). Jest Books, the Literature of Roguery, and the Vagrant Poor in Renaissance England. *English Literary Renaissance*, 201-210.