



11^{ème} congrès de l'Académie de l'Entrepreneuriat et de l'Innovation

Impact of societal evolutions: from classic to lifestyle entrepreneurs

Marie GOMEZ-BREYSSE, EDC Paris Business School, OCRE, MRM (France)

Abstract

Being established that the history of the company resulting from the history of the individual, intentions and behaviours of entrepreneurs are highly correlated to the entrepreneurs' motivations and evolve jointly to societal progress. The aim of this paper is to shed light on the evolution of entrepreneurs from societal change trends. Using a qualitative analysis, this study reports three major contributions. First, we propose a grid of analysis to compare entrepreneurs' ideal types. Second, we linked hypermodern individuals to the evolution of entrepreneurial behaviour. Finally, we conclude with a theory-based definition of the lifestyle and highlight their specific behaviour.

Keywords

Lifestyle entrepreneurs – entrepreneurial behaviours - motivations –postmodernism

INTRODUCTION

To lead to better theory in entrepreneurship, Welter et al., (2016) in a recent essay underlined the importance to consider the heterogeneity of entrepreneurs and suggest studying “other” entrepreneurs rather than focusing on technology and high growth businesses. Scholars highlight that some profiles of entrepreneurs were not growth oriented (Davidsson, 1991; Badulescu and Badulescu, 2014). Motivated by other types of gain such as existential ones, they give off a profit but do not look for its "maximization" (Brannback and Carsrud, 2011). At the same time, work on history of entrepreneurship calls for studying individual entrepreneurs in a modern global economy (Casson and Casson, 2014). The modernity can be envisaged in two ways: as a continuum on which steps are climbed gradually, or as real breaks. We could therefore distinguish four phases: pre-modernity, modernity, postmodernism and hypermodernity. This last societal trend implies different changes for individuals: return to past values, search for individuality, participation in network constellations, the end of spatial and temporal barriers and the development of “singularity” (the willing of individual to be unique) (Lipovetsky, 2004; Charles, 2009). Therefore, considering the link between societal progress, individual building and entrepreneurial motivations, it seems to be crucial to analyse these changes and observe their impact on the evolution of entrepreneurial behaviours and companies’ development.

Authors date the emergence of hypermodernity around 1970 (Lipovetsky, 2004; Charles, 2009). At this time, the entrepreneurial literature emphasized, that for some, the search for self-fulfilment precedes over economic gain (McClelland, 1961). Among these works, Johannisson (2004) proposes to classify these entrepreneurs according to their mode of governance (individual vs. collective) and their motivations (economic vs existential). It results in a clear contrast between two ideal-types of entrepreneurs: the classic entrepreneur and "lifestyle" one. The classic is the well-known entrepreneur as described by the main authors in entrepreneurship as an individual who takes risks to exploit an innovation and makes profit by capturing an opportunity and by creating an organization (Schumpeter, 1935, Stanworth and Curran, 1976). The "lifestyle" entrepreneur is defined as an individual motivated primarily by a life strategy (combination of life project and professional project), more concerned with self-fulfilment and the consequences of their professional activity both on society, family and environment (Komppula 2004; Maritz and Beaver, 2006) rather than economic gain. In this sense, lifestyle entrepreneurship seems to be very close to the condition of « hypermodernity »

in reason of the search of self-fulfilment, to place their value at the heart of their project whatever personal or professional and to benefit from spatial and time changes in establishing their professional project. However, to the best of our knowledge, there is no study analysing the link between these new societal artefacts and entrepreneurs' behaviours. Do they impact entrepreneurial behaviours and what are particularities of these new forms of entrepreneurship? In this context, our objective is to shed light on a conceptual framework for anchoring the "lifestyle" ideal type in the entrepreneurial theoretical corpus and thus characterize their behaviour. To better characterize the behaviour with each other, we compare the classical ideal type with "lifestyle" analysing hypermodernity dimensions. Given the emerging nature of the profile "lifestyle", we adopted a qualitative approach by multiple cases (Yin, 1994; Miles & Huberman, 2003). We have thoroughly examined eight cases of entrepreneurs whose companies belong to different fields of ICS INSEE (French industry classification: manufacturing, services for companies, services for individuals and agroindustry).

Our paper makes several contributions. First, based on entrepreneurship literature, we have developed a grid to compare classic and lifestyle entrepreneurs' behaviours. Second, we highlight impact of hypermodern individual on lifestyle entrepreneurship phenomenon and third we show the particularities of "lifestyle" ideal type behaviours.

This paper will follow an academic presentation: the first part is dedicated to the state of the art; the second to the methodology used; the third to the presentation of our results; the fourth to the discussion and finally a conclusion with perspectives for future research.

1. EVOLUTIONS OF THE ENTREPRENEUR: BUILDING A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

To better understand the link between hypermodernity and "lifestyle" entrepreneur and to characterize their behaviours' particularities, it is necessary to identify: what are the characteristics of the entrepreneur that have emerged over the centuries (1), and how these characteristics could be linked with hypermodernity and implied differences of behaviours between classical and lifestyle entrepreneurs (2).

1.1 Societal Trends and definition elements of entrepreneurs

Considering how society entering into the hypermodernity trend reveals the existence of other types of modernity before. Three main phases can be distinguished in the evolution of our society, showing the specific characteristics of the entrepreneur in connection with the societal changes: modernity (1), postmodernism (2) and hypermodernity (3).

1.1.1 Modernity: Risk taking and economic gain

Even if we can identify entrepreneurial experiences further than the thirteenth century (Casson and Casson, 2014), the first writings on entrepreneurship date from the eighteenth century (Cantillon, 1726). Until then, each company existed as a group of artisans; it was the phase of what we call corporatism. The arrival of reason and progress, especially developed by Kant through "rational individual", announces the entry into modernity. The entrepreneur appears as a person who takes risks and committed their own money for economic and personal satisfaction (Cantillon, 1726; Say, 1803). During this period, two dimensions characterize the emerging entrepreneur: taking risks and seeking profit.

A "Profitor". This period is marked by the rational development of enterprises. We note the establishment of the capitalist family businesses where the company gradually acquired the optimum benefit of the search function. The entrepreneur in its Schumpeterian acceptance looks for making profit (Stanworth and Curran, 1976). They exploit an opportunity to achieve this objective and take risks (Say 1803; Cunningham and al.1991).

A "Riskor". Entrepreneurs who invest their own money in the project are very involved on a personal level (Hisrich and Peters, 1991). That is why the risk is the level of confidence of the individual and their ability to realize, namely self-efficacy (Chen, Gene Greeneb, Cricke, 1998, Hopp and Stephan, 2012), the perception of their own abilities. Entrepreneurs therefore display various types of behaviour, and some have more confidence in their ability to develop a commercial offer, mainly based on their level of expertise (Shane and Venkataraman, 2000) rather than their ability to recognize a market opportunity (Eckhardt and Shane, 2003; Arentz, Sautet, Storr, 2013). That's why we call the entrepreneur a "Riskor", that is to say having a greater or lower ability to accept risk in terms of their perception of their own abilities.

After this phase, we witness the development of genuine organizations. Because of the aging entrepreneur and the increase in size on one hand, and the introduction of competition on the other, companies became delegated to managers. Postmodernism then began.

1.1.2 Postmodernism: innovation and organization in a globalized economy

Postmodernism (1870-1975) gave rise to the managerial company. We observe the emergence of theories of organizations successively (Taylor, Fayol and Ford) seeking optimal management of the organization to achieve a maximum profit already in logic of profitability for shareholders. At the time, late nineteenth century, the evolution and the future seemed to lie in the managerial and labour society for which we developed management tools that appear and prove unsuited to small structures. The second industrial revolution, the development of a

globalized economy and social developments of the twentieth century imposed lower economies of scale on great production, increased competition, changing consumer behaviour and deregulated market access (Brock and Evans, 1989).

In this context, the role of entrepreneurs will be decisive and be an important development. Schumpeter (1935) presents the entrepreneur as a “creator”, "engine of economic development" inventing new combinations of factors of production and at the heart of the activity to undertake innovation to create values and a monopolistic position. Three main characteristics emerged from this period: creation of value, organization of resources and development in globalized economy. These criteria's nurture the first elements of definition of entrepreneurs and evolved last year's conjointly with societal changes.

A “Creator”. Value creation refers to gain product for the market and can be understood in terms of the level of product innovation. The classic ideal type is defined as a destructive - creator (Schumpeter, 1935), largely tending to breakthrough innovation. They have a clear vision that gives them a projection to position their activity sustainably in the market and face competition (Shapiro, 1975; Miller, 1983; Gartner, 1985). More recently, authors argue that some entrepreneurs mobilize more a combination of know-how to create a new use, set up with a unique offer (Marcketti, Nihem, Fluoria, 2006). The central authority can rely on the expertise developed by the entrepreneur or individuality.

An “Organizator”. The organizational structure is the lever that can "combine" or "transform" the resources to capture a market opportunity or create a new activity (Aldrich, 1990). Literature therefore highlights the importance of the organization of resources in the development and performance of its business (Gartner, 1985; Bygrave and Hofer, 1991; Fayolle, 2007). Authors (Shane, 2000; Delmar, Davidsson, Gartner, 2003) consider the performance of a company from two commonly accepted criteria: growth measured by turnover and employment. More recently, Davidsson, Steffens and Fitzsimmons (2009) state that the growth does not necessarily reflect the actual value of creating a business. Not only the entrepreneur is a creator of organization that operates an innovation but also incorporates the environment into their decision making.

An “embedded” entrepreneur. If small business is not size faced globalization, to Penrose (1959), small structures are relevant to address these mutations. It presents as successful in international markets through the idiosyncrasy born from their ability to combine their resources. In this sense, the authors suggest the development of organizational skills to organize and implement the ideas from the accumulated resources (McClelland, 1961).

Following this long phase of structuring companies, the individual succeeds the organization at the heart of the entrepreneurial process, sign of hypermodernity.

1.1.3 Hypermodernity: New way of development and networking

If the global economy comes with postmodernism, the hyper competition and continuous improvement accelerate the process of internationalization and research of singularity ("uniqueness" Porter, 2006). The hypermodern society is marked by an illusion of total freedom, a strong deregulation and a high lack of mark generating a resurgence of the past, an identity-building search, a full self-realization quest and the emergence of new lifestyles (Lipovetski, 2004; Charles, 2009). Tavoillot (in Lipovetsky preamble, 2004) described hypermodernity as a modern revolution where we can underline the return to traditional values. Even if authors are sometimes in disagreement on the status of hypermodernity, (continuum or break in the modernity scale), this phenomenon is explained as another degree of modernity implying societal and individual changes and by inference evolution for entrepreneurship (Lipovetsky 2004, Aubert 2004). In this context and at the same time appeared the concept of "lifestyle"(Buttner and Moore, 1997; Henricks, 2002) and particularly in the entrepreneurship field (Johannisson, 2004). Therefore, hypermodernity, not to mention the evolution of the previous features observed in prior periods (sic. 1.2), sees the emergence of two new entrepreneurial characteristics, the development of international born companies and development of networking (Gartner, 1985).

A "Developer". The concept of development refers to the strategic choices to achieve its objective (Porter, 2006). Immersed in a global economy, the company to face international hyper-competition may consider an incremental (Johanson and Vahlne 1990) or global strategy (Tetteh and Burn 2001). Indeed, some companies will operate from the outset in the international market either, to respond to an opportunity or, to create one (Krueger, Reilly, Carsrud, 2000; Shane and Venkataraman, 2000).

A "Networker". Finally, the entrepreneur is embedded in a context with which they interact and develop relationships in their capacity as network designer (Gartner, 1985). The entrepreneur develops relationships in this environment. To the extent that they create and mobilize networks (Granovetter, 1995). Networking is "an activity in which the leaders of entrepreneurial SMEs build and manage personal relationships with individuals, especially in their immediate environment "(Saleilles, 2007: 320).

Prior research on evolution of an entrepreneur's concept along centuries established dimensions of classic entrepreneurship and highlights seven characteristics that will, according

to the profiles and motivations of these, express themselves differently: Gain, perception of risk, the creation of value (innovation), the organization resources, development of opportunities and the construction of networks and the embeddedness. Do hypermodern characteristics of society and individual have impacts on entrepreneurial behaviour and what are particularities of these new forms of entrepreneurship?

1.2 Towards a hypermodern entrepreneurship: from classic to lifestyle entrepreneur

To highlight differences between lifestyle and classical entrepreneurs and link hypermodernity trends and lifestyle' behaviours, we identify first, what is known about lifestyle entrepreneur (1), what is establish in prior literature concerning differences between classical and lifestyle entrepreneurs (2) and finally make proposal linking hypermodern characteristics and entrepreneurial behaviours (3).

1.2.1 What is known about lifestyle

The premise of theoretical identification of the entrepreneur "lifestyle" appears primarily with the work of Johannisson in 2004. In parallel we observe the early empirical studies defining an entrepreneur "lifestyle" imprinted in the tourism sector specificities. At this time, literature highlights two major distinctions between the classic entrepreneur and "lifestyle".

From a theoretical standpoint, literature identified very early the emergence of new motivations evoking search of self-fulfilment and recognition further forward than economic gain (McClelland, 1961). However, to go from the perception of new motivations to the certainty of a new profile it took more than 30 years (Buttner and Moore, 1997). If Henricks (2002) popularized the term "lifestyle" in the US, Johannisson (2004: 14) described the entrepreneur "lifestyle" as a "person who has irrational personal needs (according to Simon) such as self-fulfilment and enjoying their lives, which generates a new image of the entrepreneurial act, for example, the choices made regarding the implementation and organization. ". He uses terms of social engagement and calculated commitment in its typology referring respectively to the degree of personal satisfaction and economic satisfaction to differentiate the classic entrepreneur and "lifestyle". Theoretically, the authors present three characteristics of "lifestyle" entrepreneur: the search for a life project (Johannisson 2004; Nash and Stevenson, 2004), the interest of the activity produced by the combination of a passion and

work (Bouhaouala 1999; Henricks, 2002) and finally looking for a lifestyle rather than social capital as a location (Buttner and Moore, 1997; Johannisson, 2004).

From an empirical point of view, we identified several studies in the last fifteen years in the tourism sector (e.g. Middleton, 2001; Andrews, Baum, Andrew, 2001; Morrison, 2006). These studies have led to a first characterization of these entrepreneurs. First, the authors define the "lifestyle" entrepreneur as an individual motivated more by the quality of life rather than growth. They do not want to sacrifice quality of life to maximize profit. From an economic point of view, the "lifestyle" entrepreneur accepts a lower level of return (capital and production) (Peters, Frehse, Buhalis, 2009). Second, they seek self-fulfilment (Maritz, 2006) and are concerned about the social, family and environmental consequences of their activities (Morrison, 2006). Studies in the tourism sector have observed the specific characteristics of "lifestyle" businesses: the underutilization of resources, more limited innovation (Peters, Frehse, Buhalis, 2009), aversion to control (that is to say a small opening to external capital), a clear preference for existing and networks built on shared values (Weieirmair, 2001) and low growth objectives consistent with the financial needs of their life projects (Komppula 2004; Badulescu, Badulescu, 2014). However, Shaw and Williams (2004) point out that the tourism sector is specific and it would be appropriate to observe the behaviour in other industries.

1.2.2 Distinction Classical - "lifestyle" highlighted in the literature

First, the gain expected. Whatever the aspiration of the entrepreneur, he expects a return of activity. Kirzner (1921) states that the entrepreneur's economic gain is just a return of risk they incur running their business activity. The gain is expressed in different ways in the literature ranging from the concept of "profit" (Stanworth and Curran 1976) to "existential gain" (Morrison, 2006). In the case of the classic entrepreneur as "lifestyle", the distinction of this is already clear. It is known that the classical entrepreneur expects first an economic return of their activity while the "lifestyle" entrepreneur hopes to gain an existential one (Johannisson, 2004; Morrison, 2006).

Second, the entrepreneur operates in an environment. The inclusion of the latter leads to the emergence of two types of concept: "embedding", i.e. the contextualization of the entrepreneur and their project and "network", i.e. the development of relationships with other individuals and organizations. The embedding is identified as the mechanism by which entrepreneurs can mobilize social capital (Jack and Anderson, 2002). This corporate social capital is an individual asset that can be defined as an integrated resource in the enterprise that is mobilized in the actions (Lin, 2001). So we call the entrepreneur to be "Embedded" in an

environment they chose either to their shared capital, which is necessary for the proper development of the company, or to satisfy the life project of the latter (Johannisson, 2004).

Lifestyle entrepreneurs look for existential gain rather than economic and return to traditional values such as family, ethical and environmental concerns and seems to be a result of hypermodern society. If literature has already provided an answer as to the motivations and choice of location of "lifestyle" entrepreneur, other practices remain unexplored such as : the development of these networks, the ability to put an offer on the market or to capture a new opportunity, ability to take risks and how to organize their development. These behaviours could be characterized and explained by societal trends.

1.2.3 Entrepreneurial behaviours and hypermodernity trend

Hypermodernity implies changes at different levels: society, environment and individual one. We suggest that these new artefacts have generated changes in entrepreneurial behaviours. Therefore, we retain the main characteristics underlined in prior research of this new societal trend in order to identify link between them and new entrepreneurs and better characterize their behaviours. As defined in the antecedent part, hypermodernity can be viewed as a new phase of modernity which results in a lack of marker and return to past values and generating an hypertext society where individuals participate in network constellations (2), the end of spatial and temporal barriers namely the “hyper opening” (1), where individual search self-fulfilment (3) and uniqueness to develop “singularity” (4) (the willing of individual to be unique) (Asher 2005, Lipovetsky 2004, Charles, 2009).

Hyper opening. The hypermodern society is characterized by the quest of abolition of rigid frameworks which constrain interpersonal, inter organizational and commercial relationships. However, time and space become flexible resulting in a fragmented life. Facing this instability, individuals want to keep their life sovereignty and look for options to better manage their own lives. Literature puts forward, besides the reasons that influence entrepreneurs do not consider growth, the benefits for the welfare of employees, entrepreneur's independence, control of the company and a better ability to survive (Wicklund, Davidsson, Delmar, 2003). Search of individual sovereignty for hypermodern individual and quest of egalitarian values can lead to not employ and choose alternative ways of development. Moreover, some empirical studies show that some entrepreneurs such as “lifestyle” are not growth oriented (Peters et al, 2009). The organizational choices can therefore bring the business to grow in the sense of size effect or expand their business without effect-size (Koenig, 2004). That's why we call the entrepreneur an "Organizator",

that is to say, they choose the way to combine and transform their resources to achieve their goals in a given environment, causing, or not, growth with "size effect ". Hyper opening, let places also to develop opportunity easily at local or global level. It is now recognized that the opportunities are the result of an iterative process rather than detected (Dimov 2007). Some people are more inclined than others to favour the construction process (Eckhardt and Shane, 2003; Arentz, Sautet, Storr, 2013). That is why we qualify the entrepreneur as a "Developer", that is to say, one that captures or creates an opportunity and develops incrementally or globally. To implement their strategic choice the entrepreneur must structure their organization.

Hypertext society or multi-adherence. Asher (2005) describes the hypermodern society of "hypertext society." Hypertext is a term borrowed from the lexical field of IT and means to link text. In this sense, the term "hypertext society" suggests a society anchored in relationships (connections / links) between individuals (texts). In these new configurations, networks exist differently, via tribe's construction and expert collective constructions where incremental learning develops. People gravitate according to their needs, changes of their own values, creating their own networks and their progress in their personal quest (Mafesolli 2000). Mainly there are two network construction pathways in entrepreneurship research: the network based on inter-organizational relationships and the personal network (O'Donell, Gilmore, Cummins, Carson, 2001). Prior research underlines that classical entrepreneurs mobilize above all inter organizational networks, however given that hypermodernity highlights more connections between individuals, we can suggest also changes in entrepreneurial behaviours.

Self-fulfilment. Facing abolition of marker, hypermodern individual is in a full identity building. They are presented as human beings in quest of individual sovereignty, free choices face to religion, values & product consumption... These free electrons build a social frame with their own values and search to create links and networks. They are shared between their desire of accomplishment and the sense of responsibility. Embedded in these social changes, is front of individual and collective responsibilities and have to make choices including for dimensions which were natural before. These changes result in an individuation of people who develop singularity (Lipovetski 2004, Aubert, 2004; Charles 2009). The hypermodernity trend considers that the individual is composite, they combine a multiplicity of the self, an accumulation of experiences, values, desires that create a singular and individualistic development which may rest its offer (Mafesolli,

2000; Asher, 2005). We qualify the entrepreneur as a "Creator" that is to say, creating value developing his offer in the market.

Search of uniqueness. The advent of the hedonistic individualistic ideology during the 2nd half of the twentieth, leads people to have fun according to their own choices and desires that are as numerous as unique as the individual. However, authors emphasize the paradox of "the multiplicity of the self", or the consideration of many values and desires that are building the individual and "community atmosphere" (Maffesoli, 2000), which requires players an existence that 'through others, the persona takes the risk of an individualistic and unique development which can make them, when pushed to the extreme, a prisoner. Finally, the search for singularity, the individual is part of the "process of individuation" (Maffesoli, 2000). It is the search and construction of the "I" reach do only in terms of "we" is the whole difficulty of the hypermodern individual characterized by a "composite character" (Asher, 2005). Entrepreneurs therefore display various types of behaviour, and some have more confidence in their ability to develop a commercial offer, mainly based on their level of expertise (Shane and Venkataraman, 2002) rather than their ability to recognize a market opportunity (Eckhardt and Shane, 2003; Arentz, Sautet, Storr, 2013). That's why we call the entrepreneur a "Riskor", that is to say having a greater or lesser ability to accept risk in terms of their perception of their own abilities. On this basis, the entrepreneur will propose an offer to the market and thus create value. Given that hypermodern individuals are on a quest of uniqueness, we propose that the lifestyle entrepreneur seems to be more willing to develop unique offers than capture an opportunity. On this basis, the entrepreneur will propose an offer to the market and thus create value. Given that hypermodern individuals are on a quest of uniqueness, we propose that the lifestyle entrepreneur seems to be more willing to develop unique offers than capture an opportunity.

Thus, hypermodernity is representative of this complex society which can be considered as dual, that is to say composed both by the mercantile exploitation and the search of humanists' values. The changes linked to this well balanced research highlight the central questions for the entrepreneurs' strategic behaviours. On this basis, the aim of our study is to identify the impact of hypermodern characteristics on 'lifestyle' entrepreneurs' behaviours and compare similarities and differences with the classical one. To do this we conducted a multiple case study.

2 METHODOLOGICAL RESEARCH ELEMENTS

To identify and characterize an emerging phenomenon, qualitative methodology is more adapted for which we define variables to be observed (1). This approach allows us to collect and analyse ad hoc data of several cases of companies on the previously identified issues to characterize the entrepreneur's management behaviours (Wacheux, 1996; Fayolle, 2002) (2).

2.1 A qualitative study to capture an emerging phenomenon

When it comes to analysing the mode of action of the entrepreneur (Gartner, 1989), using a qualitative methodology may be more appropriate (Fayolle, 2002). To understand and analyse the behaviour of "lifestyle" entrepreneurs, case study seems the most adapted approach given that "all aspects cannot be captured through a quantitative standard approach" especially at the stage of emergence of the research topic (Ettl and Welter, 2010: 113).

With the aim of identifying the differences and regularities, we prefer the qualitative approach by multiple cases (Glaser, Strauss, 1967; Koenig, 1993) and we adopt an approach of "hybrid exploration" (Charreire and Durrieux, 1999) materialized by an abductive approach.

We have set up a research protocol with three phases: an exploratory study of 3 cases to build our interview guide; a multiple case study in which we collected data using semi-structured interviews and secondary sources and thematic content analysis.

Mobilizing an abductive approach, the themes of the interview guide were defined in terms of two components: literature and exploratory study.

Firstly, the guide has been built from the determinants identified in literature and presented in detail ab initio. Secondly, we considered the answers of exploratory case studies. This exploratory study has transformed the determinants of literature into observable variables. That is to say, in themes that reflect the concepts that one wonders understandable in practice for the entrepreneur. Variables for which we must collect the content in order to answer our original questions which form the frame of the interview guide. Table 1 summarizes.

Table 1 - Characteristics of the entrepreneur and observable variables

Entrepreneur characteristics	Classic ideal type	Hypermodernity	Lifestyle ideal type observable variables
"Profitor"	Economic Gain	Need achievement, self-fulfilment, self-satisfaction	Motivations

Embedded	Social Capital	Multi-adherence	Strategy of location
Networker	Inter-organizational	Hypertext society	Network building
“Organizator”	Effect size growth	Hyper-opening: changes about space and time	Way of development: partnership / employment
Developer	Incremental development	Hyper-opening: changes about space and time	Strategy of development: incremental / global
Creation of value	Innovation	Individuality: search of uniqueness	Activity: Type of offer/ degree of innovation
“Riskor”	Seize opportunities	Individuality: search of uniqueness	Intents and risk attitude

Enabling the principle of saturation in its search means that one continues to collect data until it appears newer. We found a posteriori that after the 6th case saturation was reached and primordial check criteria to be considered a generalization of our results (Hlady-Rispal, 2002). Thus, the collection of data is a crucial step in the case study.

2.2 Data Collection and thematic analysis

Data was collected from entrepreneurs located in Languedoc Roussillon (France). Two main constraints were considered during the identification of the cases: building a database and validating the appropriateness of these companies with our criteria. Regarding the establishment of the database, we invested local networks: home businesses, Club of Young Leaders and participation in local events (Annual Award TPE ...). This involvement in networks has enabled us to create a company file that had to submit to the selection criteria for the study. The selection contained four criteria: the location (in the Languedoc Roussillon, we find that our region has statistics on migration flows well above the other), size (TPE, 0 to 9), motivation creation (life project is our "lifestyle" control variable) finally, the sector (to have a representation of all the fields registered in INSEE (national institute of economic statistics)).

As part of a multiple case study, it is essential to present cases to improve understanding of their practices (Miles & Huberman, 2003). Appendix 1 presents the case studies. It presents successively: the motivations and backgrounds of entrepreneurs; their activities and employees and non-employees (external partner/colleague) of these companies. For privacy reasons the names of the companies have been changed.

To analyse the collected data, we conducted a discourse analysis based on the thematic content to observe recurrences between cases. As Allard Poesi, Drucker-Ghent and Elhinger (1999), we mobilized the five stages of content analysis to process our data. Table 2 shows more concretely the processing of our data, through the example of the variable "strategic behaviour" on the theme "Development of the Business".

Table 2 – Process steps of content analysis

Process steps	Example for the variable "Strategic Practices"
Formulating objectives	Highlighting the entrepreneurial singularities "lifestyle" process
Cutting in text unit	Ex: "insertion in the equine environment by passion, we share the same values," "legitimacy in my professional home environment", "I am known in the institutional environment and this gives me a legitimacy acquired also by the friendly relations I could weave during my previous experiences, "shared values, good food, allows us to forge a link that allows maintaining close relations "
Counting rules design and coding of verbatim	Coding: passion, sharing of values, ecosystem and legitimacy.
Category classification	Cat 1: Passion - Cat 2: Expertise
Interpretation	Developing interpersonal and inter-organizational relations.

The results of the study allow us to anchor the "lifestyle" entrepreneur in the existing body of theory and characterize their behaviour compared to classical.

3. RESULTS

This study compares the ideal type "lifestyle" to the classical ideal-type (1) and records the peculiarities of management practices "lifestyle" issued from hypermodernity and anchored in the existing body of entrepreneurship theory (2).

3.1 The "lifestyle": a hypermodern entrepreneur

3.1.1 Definition of "lifestyle"

The results in the inter-cases matrix (Table 3) allow us to position the ideal type "lifestyle" for each variable: Profitor, Creator, Developer, Organizer, Networker and Riskor. All entrepreneurs interviewed had primary motivation for the search for an existential fact of signing the gain in the "lifestyle" profile under the literature (Johannisson 2004; Maritz and Beaver, 2006). Dimension "Profitor" already validated in literature and controlled an upstream of the study which is therefore absent from the matrix.

Table 3 – Inter-cases matrix: characteristics of lifestyle entrepreneurs

Cases	Creator Skills Individual (I) Expertise(E)	“Organizator” Size effect (SE) Without size effect (WSE)	Developer Incremental (I) Global (G)*	Networker Passion (P) Expertise (E)	“Riskor” Opportunity seize (O) Uniqueness(U)	Embedded Social capital (CS) Living conditions (LC)
A	I	WSE	G	P	U	LC/SC ^o
B	I	WSE	I	P	U	LC
C	I	WSE	G	P	U	LC
D	I	WSE	G	P	U	LC
E	E	WSE	I	P/E	U	SC
F	E	SE	G	E	O	LC
G	E	SE	G	E	U	LC
H	E	SE	G	E	U	LC /SC

^o When there are the two responses, this means that the two parameters have had a role in the order mentioned.

At this stage, the results allow us to define the "lifestyle" as an entrepreneur who anchors their professional project as a life project. In this sense, they implement their activity, not based on a shared capital, but in view of their life choices (he is embedded). They offer a unique offering to the market rather than to seize an opportunity with more confidence in their ability to combine resources rather than their ability to recognize an opportunity (they create value and take risks). Because of their position in the predominantly called niche markets (e.g. enthusiasts circles), they are developing their activity globally which is reflected most often by creating a

born global company (he is a developer). Placing egalitarian values at the heart of their project, they reveal rather refractory to growth in jobs and promoting a development structure by an alter ego network as much as possible (he is an organizer). These results allow us to complete the ideal type "lifestyle" and to establish link between characteristics of hypermodern individual and entrepreneurial behaviours.

3.1.2 Comparison of ideal types: the impact of hypermodernity

The results show that the "lifestyle" is an entrepreneur in the theoretical sense insofar as they look for a gain, they take risks, they are embedded in an environment, they combine and transform their resources to be effective, and they develop their activity on the basis of an innovative offering and built their own networks. Table 4 shows both the entrepreneurial characteristics while showing the particularities of each ideal-type and the impact of hypermodernity. If a lifestyle entrepreneur meets all the characteristics of the entrepreneur, they stand out from the classical ideal type. From an accumulation of experiences and knowledge related to expertise or a passion, they develop unique competencies (referring here to the composite individual, Asher, 2005; or uniqueness strategy, Porter, 2006) at the origin of their unique offer. It is this research of uniqueness combined to their quest of self-fulfilment that gives confidence and leads him to take risks. Thanks to spatial and free time barriers (namely "hyper opening", Charles, 2009), they are positioned in micro markets, they develop from the start their business internationally in a context of hyper competition (Lipovetsky, 2004) and build their network from strong and lasting relationships because they are based on a passion and / or common values (Asher, 2005). Their values of humanism, ethics and equity research led them to rethink their organization and growth patterns. They will emphasize partnerships rather than growth through employment.

Table 4 – Link between evolution of entrepreneurial behaviours and Hypermodernity

Entrepreneur characteristics	Classic ideal type	Hypermodernity	Lifestyle ideal type
Profitor	Economic Gain	Self-fulfilment, egalitarian values	Existential Gain
Embedded	Social Capital	Multi-adherence	Living conditions
Networker	Inter-organizational	Hypertext society	Inter-individual relationship

Organizer	Effect size growth	Competitive cooperation in respect of their own values	Combination of resources and development of partnership
Developer	Incremental development	Hyper-opening: changes about space and time	Born Global
Creation of value	Innovation	Individuality: search of uniqueness	Uniqueness
Riskor	Ability to seize opportunities	Individuality: search of uniqueness	Ability to combine job and passion and develop expertise on it

However, it is essential to remember that the ideal type is an intellectual construct obtained by deliberate accentuation of certain features of the object (Coenen-Huter 2002: 53). If the ideal type does not emerge as an empirical reality, the link with this reality remains essential to assess how the reality moves towards or away from this ideal representation (Weber, 1988). The definition of ideal types assigned so the researcher to bring the measure from the case studies. The second part of the study results present specific behaviours of these and helps moderate the comments that could be exacerbated by the ideal-typical approach.

3.2 Hypermodern behaviours of lifestyle entrepreneurs

Our study highlights three predominant features: search of individual singularity that allows them to produce a unique offer (1); positioned on hyper competition and within a hyper opening environment, they develop specific relationships with territories and networks (2); and care of respect of their values and of social, familial and environmental impacts of their activities, lead them to think differently regarding their organization. (3)

3.2.1 Experience capitalization behind their singularity

The analysis of "lifestyle" entrepreneurs' background reported a diversity and richness of experiences ante creation, even in very different fields. This prerequisite allows them to develop their passion and expertise in a sector where they acquired legitimacy. Thanks to their

degree of individuation (Maffesoli, 2000), they develop a single differentiation (uniqueness, Porter, 2005). That is to say that the resources of the offer are based mostly on the individual (passion coupled with expertise and special character of the person). Unlike the classical ideal type, their offer does not systematically produce an innovation (Schumpeter, 1935), but such a strong differentiation it is considered as a unique offer. Moreover, the "lifestyle" entrepreneurs are more confident in their ability to turn their resources (passion/expertise) into offers rather than on their ability to capture a market opportunity. They have not decided to start their own business after spotting an opportunity and decided to exploit it, but to enable them either to combine their passion at work (know-how is the result of a combination of experience), or transform resources they capitalized on offer (Morales-Gualdrón, 2009).

The singular position has occurred predominantly in international niche markets (such as the western saddler or food histology examples), leading them to rethink their business development and lead us to revisit their relationships to territories and specifically to the central concept of proximity in entrepreneurship.

3.2.2. Relationships at proximity to the proximity of relationships

This study highlights that lifestyle entrepreneurs develop their companies thanks to network constellations, instead of basing their development on local embeddedness. This means that the territory concept is no longer a priority factor in business success. The results show that "lifestyle" entrepreneurs choose to locate their business according to their life project and not of the capital that the country can provide and secondly they are implanted in niche markets. Lifestyle entrepreneurs do not find their resources in a particular territory but in their own network which they create. This fact presents a new notion of space, signalling the end of distance constraints on economic and social activities. Lifestyle entrepreneurs consider, if not the local territory, the market actors which are (due to the specificity of their activities) located throughout France and even worldwide in order to build their networks. Also, we can observe the creation of their own local networks through the implementation of clubs, galleries, etc....Impassioned by their activities, they develop their hobbies in new settings and then modify their local territory.

Passion for sailing, or tourism of western riding, looking for a homecoming or a new life choices, these entrepreneurs are looking heliotropism, the presence of the activity they consider their passion, human-sized cities or access to culture. This relationship to the business of installation of choice is a major difference with the classic entrepreneur seeking primarily a social capital (suppliers, customers, raw materials, tax incentives ...) However, if they do not

favour the geographical proximity of their market (Pecqueur, 2004), "lifestyle" entrepreneur is very close to it (Tregear, 2005). The "lifestyle" entrepreneurs benefit from low spatial and time barriers and know to use the height of the information and communication technologies (ITC). Although located far from their market, they are often connected and talk about close relationships for the reason of the sharing of same passion or same values.

From raw data, majority of cases were born "Global" because of their positioning on "micro-niches" (Torres, 2002; Johannisson, 2004). Depending on the activity: they have a national / European influence (if the legislation restricts the action) or international with a global strategy. Indeed, there is no adaptation of the corporate strategy. Among the 8 cases, 6 have evolved in a global market where a share of export is variable but growing through word phenomenon to electronic buzz for products or services to both individuals and professional networks. This concept of proximity, built on shared values, a shared passion also creates changes in the development of the company as an organizational level as on a commercial level.

3.2.3 An organization built and developed on interpersonal relationships

Sharing common values, passion, commitment to community networks, "lifestyle" entrepreneurs benefit from their personal networks (O'Donnell, Gilmore, Cummins, Carson, 2001). Addicts of the multi-adherence concept, they belong to several tribes and clubs according to their passion and values. Unlike classic entrepreneur, showing a temporary mobilization of personal networks at the time of creation and inter-organizational relationship building, we note that the "lifestyle" entrepreneurs continue to develop interpersonal relationships where the actor is the individual and links are often informal. The companies are between three and five years old at the time of the study and continue their development from interpersonal relationships. They are implemented in multiple networks and tribes and build personal networks that are interconnected (Aldrich, Zimmer, 1991). The results highlight three features that promote interpersonal relationships in the development of the company: passion, shared values and strong legitimacy within an ecosystem. Interpersonal relationships are observed at several levels.

Firstly, they play a development trigger role and facilitate cooperation and the upstream and downstream partnerships (sharing of values, ethics, and passion) named in this first case as cognitive network or "extended" (Aldrich, Zimmer, 1991).

Secondly, they are a catalyst for growth. The "lifestyle" entrepreneur tends to avoid the hierarchical relationships and favours development rather than growth within the meaning of effect size (5/8, knowing that in a case where there is growth size effect, the employee is the

wife of the entrepreneur). He prefers to work with partners rather than grow his payroll (Davidsson, 1991).

Finally, relationships are found as a driver of customer relations. During the interviews conducted, all entrepreneurs dedicated an important place in their speech to sharing a passion and/or shared values in which to undertake the relationship in a more interpersonal dimension rather than inter-organizational and where individual mutual trust consists of cementing the construction of network development.

The cases highlight the existence of a more innate than acquired system that can recall the effectuation mechanisms as described by Sarasvathy (2001) and based on three main features: a niche market; the advent of new technologies (for circulation simultaneously information, communication and online stores, as near as possible distance relationships); and the revival of the role of values (hypermodern individual who seeks to satisfy their desires, to build their own guardians and revive ethics).

4. DISCUSSION

In this article, we propose an analysis of the impact of societal evolutions on entrepreneurial behaviours taking into account hypermodern characteristics in the comparison between ideal type "Classic" and "lifestyle". On this basis, the article proposes major contributions on a theoretical (1) and managerial level (2). Finally, the study showed results that should be further deepened to allow a better understanding of the process of development of companies founded by a "lifestyle" entrepreneur (3).

4.1 Contribution to literature

4.1.1 A grid of analysis

Prior literature mentions the difficulty in defining the entrepreneur because of a lack of theoretical unity (Lasch and Yami, 2008) and diversity of samples and methods (Gartner WB, 1989). Our proposal of a definition leaves room for ideal-types insertion. This definition of gathering the seven dimensions of an entrepreneur from literature such as looking for a gain, risk perception, value creation, organization of resources, opportunity and environment for development (available in recessed and network construction), allowed us to suggest a grid to facilitate comparison between different ideal-types. Moreover, it is a means to better classify existing work in order to isolate the remaining elements to be studied (Filion LJ. 1991). In this

perspective, the approach used in this study can be applied to position other types of entrepreneurs such as: the social entrepreneur and others.

4.1.2 Hypermodern entrepreneurs

We better understood the evolution of entrepreneurial behaviours establishing links between hypermodernity characteristics and entrepreneurs' dimensions. We highlight that the emergence of lifestyle entrepreneurs resulting from societal changes. Lifestyle entrepreneur as hypermodern individual looking for self-accomplishment with return to ethical and moral values in a hyper opening world and a hypertext society (Lipovetsky, 2004; Asher, 2005; Charles, 2009). These new artefacts generate changes in the strategic behaviours of entrepreneurs. We are observing a new generation of entrepreneurs who chose lifestyle logic rather than a classical one. For instance, lifestyle entrepreneurs, integrating hypermodern dimensions, can be defined as an individual who takes risks, confident in their ability to produce a unique offer and with expectation to existential gain, i.e. to accomplish their life projects controlling social, familiar and environmental impacts of their professional activities. Placing egalitarian values at the heart of their project, they chose specific development of their activities, privileging partnerships and interpersonal relationships rather than employment and inter organizational network.

4.1.3 Comparison between classic and lifestyle behaviours

The comparison study allows us to better highlight their specific behaviours issued from hypermodernity. If literature had already underlined differences between the classic entrepreneur and lifestyle model as the search for existential gain, the choice of location depending on the desired living conditions and not social capital and the combination of professional and life projects for entrepreneur "lifestyle", our study helps to complete the definition concerning the other dimensions and emphasizes three major characteristics (Johannisson B., 2004, Marcketti Nihem, Fluoria, 2006).

Firstly, the "lifestyle" entrepreneur has more confidence in their ability to produce a unique offer because of the combination of resources produced between capitalization of experience and passion rather than their ability to capture a market opportunity (Krueger, Reilly, Carsrud, 2000; Shane and Venkataraman, 2000). This reveals a major difference with the classic entrepreneur (Stevenson Jarillo, 1990; Bygrave, Hofer, 1991; Kirzner, 1997) and shows the evolution of entrepreneurial behaviors. However, these results moderate works established in tourism sector showing an under-utilization of resources and limited innovation (Peters, Frehse, Buhalis 2009). On this point, we reach the work of Hewitt-Dundas (2015) which shows a presence "lifestyle" profiles among academic entrepreneurs (that is to say the entrepreneurs

behind academic spin-offs from or related to a research laboratory). This combination of resources allows us also to think differently regarding their organization. They develop network constellations to better extend their activities instead of employing people. Based on egalitarian values they privilege emergence of alter ego rather than employment growth.

Secondly, when the type of activity permits and answers to hyper opening, they create a global company, that is to say positioned on international markets since its inception. In reasons of their unique offer (as defined in Porter, 2005) and their position in niche markets "lifestyle" create businesses qualified in literature of "born global" (Tetteh and Burn 2001).

Thirdly, If classical firms spend relationships in inter-organizational relationships during their development (O'Donell, Gilmore, Cummins, Carson, 2001), the "lifestyle" entrepreneur built his development only around interpersonal relationships. Like the work of the individual hypermodern Maffesoli (2006), the "lifestyle" can integrate other clans, other tribes, but remain in a mode of interpersonal relationships where sharing of common values is the glue of the relationship.

4.2 Managerial implications

From a managerial point of view, this study reveals the "hyper Connection" need (Asher, 2005) of "lifestyle" to develop their business because of their niche position. There is a physical distance to both the resources and the market made possible by the strong mobilization of ICT and networks. On this point, our work, in line with those of Philip (2006), shows the impact of ICT on the development of SMEs. "The portability of services" and products, "customer accessibility", "innovative processes" and "coordination structures" allow remote business development offering not only unique products but also a specific operating structures : the location (Buttner and Moore, 1997; Johannisson, 2004), the reticular business development and entrepreneurial organizational management with partners (legally independent) rather than managerial (with salaried staff).

Second, from this comparison between the motivations, expectations and behaviours of classic entrepreneurs and "lifestyle", the support structures should be better able to understand the aspirations and behaviours of each and can thus give them specific advice during the phases of creation and development. Given that societal changes, support structures have to consider better the evolution of individual and the place of entrepreneur in the project to propose adapted support. Finally, study business history and particularly individual entrepreneur contributes better to entrepreneurship education (Pittaway, 2001).

4.3 Limitations and future research

At the time of the study companies were 3 to 5 years old and our data are cross sectional which does not allow us to analyse the companies' growth process. However, given the challenges associated with investments of public policies in companies, the economic and structural situation that requires an entrepreneurial wave, it is essential to evaluate how to create value in this type of business. Rather averse to growth within the meaning of the effect-size entrepreneurs "lifestyle" favour the establishment of partnerships rather than conventional recruitment. Conscious independence and full of ethical values, they prefer to let others develop and independently manage their own business and work well with counterpart (alter-ego). These results confirm the work of others who found that some entrepreneurs had no aspiration to grow (Davidsson, 1991 2009; Hessels, Van Gelderen, Thurik, 2008). However, the results of the study highlight the growth targets in line with the financial needs of the life project of the entrepreneurs (Komppula 2004; Badulescu, Badulescu, 2014). This suggests a possibility to create value without effect-size and calls for a specific study of their growth process. To do this, it is necessary to consider a longitudinal study.

CONCLUSION

This article aims to answer to critical need of studying individual entrepreneur in a modern global economy (Casson and Casson, 2014). Facing a modern global economy and its excess (Comte-Sponville, 2009), new societal trends appear as, for instance, sustainable entrepreneurship (Spence et al., 2011). Anchored in hypermodern society, described as complex and dual (search of flexibility/quest of marker; search of accomplishments, desire/sense of responsibility...), lifestyle entrepreneurs are an illustration of this search of alternative ways to do business. They look for well-balanced professional projects composed both by the mercantile exploitation and the search of humanists' values. This quest conducts them to: choose locations for living conditions for them and their families; to expect existential gain (social, environment, familiar,) rather than only economic ones; to evolve in multiple networks according to their life projects and develop their business around strong relationships whose origin is based on sharing common values; to be confident in their ability to combine their resources to propose a unique offer, to develop their organization with counterpart (alter ego) rather than employees and to be engaged in an incremental learning dynamic. On these bases, this study contributes to distinguish the classical and "lifestyle" ideal-types. The observed distinctions relate to the nature of the desired gain (economic / existential), the link to the

territory (place of life / social capital), the attitude relative to opportunity and risk (confidence in their ability to offer a unique supply rather than capturing a market opportunity), the organizational practices (refractory to growth within the meaning effect-size growth -size effect) and development (comprehensive strategy vs. incremental). Literature underlines that classical entrepreneurs tend to achieve higher economic performance compared to lifestyle. But, what about the other dimensions of global performance (social, economic, and environment)? This is a challenging extension of its work.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, R., Baum, T. and M.A Andrew. (2001). « The «lifestyle» economics of small tourism businesses», *Journal of travel tour Research*, 1, p.16-25.
- Aldrich HE. (1990). « Ethnicity and entrepreneurship », *Annual review of sociology*, 16, p.111-135.
- Arentz J., Sautet F., Storr V. (2013). « Prior-knowledge and opportunity identification », *Small Business Economics*, 41, n° 2, p.461-478.
- Ascher F. (2005). « Le mangeur hypermoderne », Odile Jacob, Paris, 330 pages.
- Aubert N., (2004). « L'individu hypermoderne », Toulouse Eres, 320 pages.
- Badulescu A., Badulescu D. (2014). « Is there evidence of a European «lifestyle» entrepreneur in tourism », *Annals of University of Oreada, Economic Science*, 23, n°1, p.231.
- Buttner E.H, Moore D.P. (1997). « Women's organizational exodus to entrepreneurship: self-reported motivations and correlates with success », *Journal of small business management*, 35, n°1, p. 34-47.
- Bygrave Wd., Hofer Cw. (1991). « Theorizing about entrepreneurship », *Entrepreneurship Theory and practice*, 6, n°2, p.13-22.
- Cantillon R. *Essai sur la nature du commerce en général*, London & Paris, (1756), Gyles.R.
- Carsrud A., Brännback M. (2011). « Entrepreneurial motivations: what do we still need to know? », *Journal of small business management*, 49, n°1, p.9-26.
- Charles S., (2009). « For a Humanism Amid Hypermodernity: From a Society of Knowledge to a Critical Knowledge of Society », *Axiomathes*, 19, n° 4, p. 389-400.
- Charreire S. & Durieux F. (1999). « Explorer et tester », in *Thietart*, Méthodes de recherche en management, Dunod, p 553.
- Chen Cc., Gene Greeneb P., Crickc A. (1998). « Does entrepreneurial self-efficacy distinguish entrepreneurs from managers? », *Journal of Business Venturing*, 13, n°4, p. 295–316.
- Coenen- Huter J. (2002). « Entretien avec Jacques Coenen-Huther, mené par Cristina Ferreira ». In : *Carnets de bord. Revue de jeunes chercheurs en sciences humaines*, Genève, n° 4, p. 49-53.
- Cooper Ac., Woo Cy., Dunkelberg Wc. (1988). « Entrepreneurs' perceived chances for success », *Journal of Business Venturing*, 3, n°2, p. 97–108.
- Cunningham Jb., Lischeron J. (1991). « Defining entrepreneurship? », *Journal of small business management*, 29, n°1, p 45-61.
- Davidsson, P., Steffens, P., Fitzsimmons, J. (2009). « Growing profitable or growing from profits: Putting the horse in front of the cart? » *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24, p.388–406.
- Davidsson P. (1991). « Continued entrepreneurship: ability, need and opportunity as determinants of small firm growth », *Journal of business venturing*, 6, p. 405-429.
- Delmar, F., Davidsson, P., & Gartner, W. B. (2003). « Arriving at the high-growth firm. »

- Journal of Business Venturing*, 18, n°2, p.189-216.
- Filion LJ. (1991). « Vision and Relations: Elements for an Entrepreneurial Metamodel. » *International Small Business Journal*, 9, n°2, p 26-40.
- Gartner WB. (1989). « Who is an entrepreneur is the wrong question? », *Entrepreneurship, theory and practice*, summer 1989, p 43-64.
- Glaser B.G., Strauss A.L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*, Aldine de Gruyer, (1967), New York.
- Henricks M. (2002). *Not just a living: the complete guide to creating a business that give you a life*, Perseus Books group, (2002).
- Hessels J., Van Gelderen M., Thurik R. (2008). « Entrepreneurial aspirations, motivations and their drivers », *Small Business Economics*, 31, p.323-339.
- Hewitt-Dundas N. (2015). « Profiling UK university spin-outs », ERC, 1, n°35.
- Hisrich RD., Peters MP. (1991) « On Your Own: How to Start, Develop and Manage a New Business », Business One Irwin, 1991, Homewood.
- Hopp C., Stephan U., (2012). « The influence of socio-cultural environments on the performance of nascent entrepreneurs: Community culture, motivation, self-efficacy and start-up success », *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 24, n°9-10.
- Johannisson B. (2004). « Entrepreneurship in Scandinavia: bridging individualism and collectivism », *International studies in entrepreneurship*, tome 3, p 225-241.
- Kirzner IM. (1997). « Entrepreneurial Discovery and the Competitive Market Process: An Austrian Approach », *Journal of Economic Literature*, 35, p. 60-85.
- Komppula R. (2004). « Success and Growth in Rural Tourism Micro-Businesses in Finland: Financial or Life-Style Objectives? » in Thomas, R. (Ed.), *Small Firms in Tourism. International Perspectives* (pp. 115-138), Amsterdam et al.: Elsevier Science.
- Krueger N. (1993). « The Impact of Prior Entrepreneurial Exposure on Perceptions of New Venture Feasibility and Desirability », *Entrepreneurship Theory and practice*, fall 1993.
- Krueger Nf, Reilly Md., Carsrud A. (2000). « Competing Models of Entrepreneurial Intentions ». *Journal of Business Venturing*, 15, n°5-6, p.411-32.
- Lasch F., Yami S. (2008). « The nature and focus of entrepreneurship research in France over the last decade: a French touch? », *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, p.339-360.
- Lipovetsky G., (2004). « Les Temps hypermodernes », Paris, Grasset, coll. « Nouveau collège de philosophie », p.186.
- Marcketti S., Niehm L., Fuloria R. (2006). « An exploratory study of «lifestyle» entrepreneurship and its relationship to life quality », *Family and Consumer Sciences research journal*, 34, n°3, p 241-259.
- Maritz A., Beaver B. (2006). « The new Zealand «lifestyle» entrepreneur », *Human capital: Regional Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*
- Middleton VTC. (2001). *The Importance of Micro-Businesses in European Tourism*. In *Rural Tourism and Recreation: Principles to Practice*, ed. L.Roberts, p.197–201.
- Miles M., Huberman M. (2003). *Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook*, Sage Publication.
- Miller D. (1983). « The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms », *Management science*, 29, p.770-791.
- Morrison A. (2006). « A Contextualization of Entrepreneurship ». *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research*, 12, n°4, p.192-209.
- Nash L., Stevenson H. (2004). *Just enough: Tools for creating success in your work and life*, Wiley and Sons Eds.
- O'Donnell A., Gilmore A., Cummins D., Carson D. (2001). « The network construct in entrepreneurship research: a review and critique », *Management Decision*, 39, n°9, p.749-760.
- Peters M., Frehse J., Buhalis D. (2009). « The importance of lifestyle entrepreneurship : a

conceptual study of the tourism industry», PASOS, *Revista de turismo y patrimonio cultural*, 7, n°2, p.393-405.

Porter M. (2006). « What is strategy », in Mazzucato, Mariana. 2002. *Strategy for business: a reader*. Sage Publications.

Sarasvathy S.D. (2001). « Causation and effectuation: toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency », *The Academy of Management review*, 26, n°2, p.243-246.

Say JB. (1964). *Treatise on Political Economy: On the Production, Distribution and Consumption of Wealth* (translation 1964), (1803), New York: Kelley.

Schumpeter JA. (1935). *The theory of economic development: An inquiry into profits, capital, credit, interest, and the business cycle*, Transaction Publishers.

Shane S., Venkataraman S. (2000). « The Promise of Entrepreneurship as a Field of Research », *The Academy of Management Review*, 25, n°1, p. 217.

Shapiro A. (1975). *Entrepreneurship and economic development*, Entrepreneurship and enterprise development, Milwaukee project ISEED.

Shaw G., Williams AM. (2004). *From «lifestyle» Consumption to «lifestyle» Production: Changing Patterns of Tourism Entrepreneurship*, in Thomas, R. (Ed.), *Small Firms in Tourism: International Perspectives*, p.99-113, Amsterdam et al.:Elsevier.

Stanworth Mjk. , Curran J. (1976). « Growth and the small firm? An alternative view», *Journal of Management Studies*, 13, n°2, p. 95-110.

Tregear A. (2005). « «lifestyle», growth, or community involvement? The balance of goals of UK artisan food producers », *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 17, n°1, p 1-15.

Stevenson HH., Jarillo JC. (1990), « A paradigm of entrepreneurship: entrepreneurial management», *Strategic management journal*, 11, p.17-27.

Weieirmair K. (2001). « Theoretical foundations or considerations regarding the growth of tourism enterprises », *Tourism Review*, 56, n°3/4, p.17 – 25.

Welter F., Baker T., Audretsch DB., Gartner WB., (2016). “Everyday entrepreneurship- A call for entrepreneurship research to embrace entrepreneurial diversity”, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, October, 2016.

Yin, Y. K. (1994) *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage