

Strategies for Resolving Critical Incidents in the Start-Up Phase: Perspectives from Necessity Entrepreneurs in Burkina Faso

Adrien Tchibinda Nzaou¹, Théophile Bindeouè Nassè², Nicolas Carbonell Launois³

¹New Dawn University, Burkina Faso

²Simon Diedong Dombo University of Business and Integrated Development Studies, Ghana

³Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Spain

Received: 08 Oct 2024
Revised: 25 Oct 2024
Accepted: 15 Nov 2024
Published: 27 Nov 2024

*Corresponding author.

Théophile Bindeouè Nassè

Email:

nasstheophile2009@gmail.com

Abstract

From the actual start of activities to the crossing of the milestone, the entrepreneur of necessity encounters a multitude of problems of varying degrees of intensity that must be resolved so as not to jeopardize the sustainability efforts deployed until then. Our research work leads us towards a logical continuum seeking to understand over time, the behaviors adopted by the necessity entrepreneur to resolve critical incidents related to the start-up process. By incident is meant a difficulty that occurs during an entrepreneurial process and the consequences of which can be critical or serious if the entrepreneur does not resolve the incident. The critical (or serious) character here refers to what is not their routine. This means that the incident can slow down, slow down, induce or cause the abandonment of the process of starting the business of necessity. The empirical study is therefore part of an interpretive perspective and mobilizes a qualitative methodology known as the critical incident method. The analysis of research on entrepreneurial processes of necessity underscores the value of adopting a process perspective in the study of the phenomenon. Consequently, the research takes a longitudinal approach. We constituted a theoretical sample of twelve (12) necessity entrepreneurs from Burkina Faso, based in Ouagadougou who were followed through initial and in-depth interviews over a period of 15 months. The results indicate that, during the start-up process, entrepreneurs out of necessity leave with the means at their disposal (effect logic) rather than setting a predetermined goal (causal logic). At times, they mix between Causation and Effectuation according to planned or unforeseen events.

Keywords: Necessity entrepreneur, Start-up phase, Critical incidents, Behavior, Process approach



© 2024 by the authors; licensee Advances in Consumer Research. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY NC. ND) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

INTRODUCTION

The necessity entrepreneur is a special type of entrepreneur, forced to embark on the creation of their business, in the absence of any other realistic alternative. Starting a business is for them like the best option available to employ themselves, but they would not prefer the said option in a sustainable way. Indeed, these individuals commit to entrepreneurship because they have no better possible choices (Reynolds, Camp, Bygrave, Autio, & Hay, 2001, p. 8). Necessity entrepreneurs' contrast with opportunity entrepreneurs, as the latter engage in business creation by pursuing lucrative business opportunities for their own interests. This motivational approach was subsequently used to understand, explain and predict behaviors such as innovation (Reynolds, Bygrave, Autio, Cox, & Hay, 2002; McMullen, Bagby, & Palich, 2008; Okoro, Nassè, Ngmendoma, Carbonell, & Nanema, 2022) or the strategies of entrepreneurs (Block, Kohn, Miller, & Ullrich, 2015; Carbonell, Nassè, & Akouwerabou, 2020). However, questions still exist on the validity of these predictions of behaviors differentiated by motivations by necessity / opportunity. For some authors, the strict dichotomy of motivation of necessity versus motivation of opportunity is far too simplistic and does not correspond to entrepreneurial reality (Williams and Williams, 2014; Kirkwood and Campbell-Hunt, 2007). Therefore, it is likely that there are several types of entrepreneurs of necessity and / or opportunity. Recent studies show that necessity entrepreneurs behave differently compared to opportunity entrepreneurs. Our research is only interested in entrepreneurs of necessity.

Indeed, from the effective start of activities until the crossing of the course, the entrepreneur of necessity experiences a multitude of problems of varying degrees of intensity (critical incidents) that must be resolved so as not to jeopardize sustainability efforts made so far. The problem of resources, training, skills, self-confidence, malpractices (Nassè, 2021), and support are recurrent in the entrepreneurial process of necessity.

On the basis of these elements and with the help of a qualitative empirical study carried out on a theoretical sample of 12 business creators, the objective of our research is to study, through the start-up process, the resolution of incidents. We are only interested in understanding the strategies adopted and actions implemented to resolve them.

1.1. The start-up phase and critical incidents of necessity

The main objective of this section is to analyze research on the strategies of entrepreneurs of necessity in the resolution of critical incidents in the start-up phase. But before approaching the main objective, we explain a prerequisite for the analysis of any process phenomenon: the precision of the phases of the process which will be treated. This is what the first point (1.1) is about. It specifies and justifies the phase of the entrepreneurial process considered for the analysis. This precision is important: firstly because it makes it possible to assess the relevance of the choice of the phases of the process, secondly, because it favors a coherent mobilization of the existing literature on the chosen phases. The second point (1.2), studies the notion of critical incidents.

1.2 The start-up phase as an analysis center

Inspired by the definitions of the stages / phases carried out within the framework of the GEM and the PSED, our analysis concerns the behaviors of entrepreneurs of necessity in the resolution of cracks incidents in the nascent entrepreneurship phase and in the new entrepreneurship phase. These two phases form the start-up process (Carter et al., 1996; Lichtenstein, Carter, Dooley, & Gartner, 2007; Sammut, 1995, 2001; Bruyat, 1993) of the process-GEM model. The nascent entrepreneurship phase refers to the realization of actions for the creation of a company envisaged by the entrepreneur (Carter et al., 1996; Reynolds, Hay, Bygrave, Camp, & Autio, 2000). The new business phase refers to the entrepreneurial activities carried out by the new owner-manager within the framework of the business created ex nihilo. For the GEM, the nascent entrepreneurship phase concerns the first three months of activities. The new entrepreneurship phase takes effect from the third to the forty-second months of activity (i.e. 3.5 years of life). These two phases form the start-up process [1] (Carter et al., 1996; Lichtenstein, Carter, Dooley, & Gartner, 2007; Sammut, 1995, 2001; Bruyat, 1993) of the process-GEM model. The literature admits that the start-up process concerns the first four years of the life of the company created (Bruyat, 1993). We focus here on the start-up process because it is one of the most important parts of the entire entrepreneurial process. Indeed, it takes effect where dreams and the virtuality of entrepreneurial intention must be transformed into concrete actions. He sees surprises and difficulties arise that the nascent or new entrepreneur has little or no experience to cope with. It concerns the most decisive periods for the survival of the overall entrepreneurial process. However, little research (Sammut, 2001) has deeply analyzed the entrepreneurial start-up process. This analysis (at least by researchers) is even absent in certain contexts such as that of Burkina Faso. In our opinion, the importance of the start-up phase would imply that it should retain more researchers' attention, particularly in contexts such as that of Burkina Faso. The introduction of this research has already shown the challenges of nascent and new entrepreneurs, actors in the start-up phase. As a result, we have chosen to focus our attention on the behaviors of necessity entrepreneurs, as a strategy, during the start-up phase, particularly in the resolution of critical incidents. However, emerging and new entrepreneurs of necessity, the main players in the start-up process, encounter difficulties, referred to here as critical incidents, which can be detrimental to the continuity of the entrepreneurial process. We have also observed in the literature that research is much more oriented towards the causes of critical incidents. However, the strategies implemented to solve them are hardly studied. Given this lack of elements for understanding the behavior of critical incident resolution by entrepreneurs of necessity during the start-up phase, an investigation of this problem seems necessary.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

For Joly (2009) the term "critical incident" often refers to gender confusion (p.176). According to the author, the critical incident is not a "mini-case" as he has seen in the literature "nor a vignette, let alone an illustration" theoretical. The incident refers "to an event which is out of the ordinary, p.176". While for Bourion and Persson (2011), Flanagan used the expression "critical incident" which he defines as "any event that can occur to deteriorate the general purpose of an activity" (p.305). For these two authors, the method of critical incidents makes it possible to avoid, through "direct observations of human behavior", practical problems linked to the action. Applied in the military field, then in the civilian field, the method leads to the development of practices and principles consisting in guiding the logic of psychological action.

To define an "incident" in the context where we seek to understand the reasoning for resolving incidents in the process of creating a business by necessity, we use two key words: " 1. An event " has occurred, or " 2. A difficulty "arose in the process of creating an activity. These two terms can take the meaning of incident depending on the consequences that the incident itself causes. Our definition allows us to place them in the context of entrepreneurship on the one hand and on the other hand to give them a character of non-predictability (the incident is not predictable or predictable), it is not no more a routine (the incident is not ordinary) for the entrepreneur. Therefore, by incident we mean:

a) any relevant event occurring in the creation of an activity which may either delay or hinder it and therefore lead to the mobilization of resources for its resolution ;

b) any unexpected difficulty in the activity creation process that is not routine but that the activity creator must overcome in order to complete his creation process ;

c) any event that has arisen in the process of creating a business, the consequences of which are serious for the business in question, if it is not resolved or overcome;

d) any difficulty the causes of which may prevent the start-up and development of the activity.

These four elements (Joly, 2009) that we will use to define the incident in an entrepreneurial situation, allow us to place them in a problem-solving analysis framework.

2.1. Theoretical Development of the Behavior of the Necessity Entrepreneur during the Start-Up Phase

The entrepreneur of necessity behaves according to the characteristics of his organization, his know-how, his capacity to satisfy his customers, his environment, knowing that these considerations will be modified by the means of the perception which he has of components of its management system. All this is acquired, the perception is refined over time, but the newly installed necessity contractor is in a hurry. Financially challenged, the majority of necessity entrepreneurs start off by underestimating their working capital needs. More or less battered by the competition, it is always easier to tip a fledgling company, because it is fragile, than a solidly established company. Psychologically fragile, therefore diminished, because he/she is facing enormous difficulties. The emergency entrepreneur, in the start-up phase, does not always have enough perspective to effectively judge the situation, especially as untreated problems or critical incidents accumulate and, like an untreated cancer, ramifications progress, settle in, and gradually corrupt the whole system (Sammur, 2001). The entrepreneur by necessity, before indicating his intention to create a business, is above all the image of a social, economic and political reality; the family being his/her first social experience. It determines his behavior and transmits to him/her the values that we would like him/her to share. The entrepreneur by necessity is far from being someone who moves forward alone and who relies only on his/her own means to carry out his/her project. In this sense, Berglann et al. (2010), Krueger and Casrud(1993) argue that the entourage of the project leader must be favorable to him/her; and Carbonell and Nassè (2021) show that the entrepreneur should develop some successful leadership skills. For Nassè and Sawadogo (2019) fair practices in the market are necessary for companies to subsist in the environment. This entourage must have the necessary capacities or resources for the success of the project. According to Granovetter (1995), human behavior cannot be explained by only referring to individual motives; it is shaped and constrained by the structure of social relations in which every actor is registered. Focusing on a single entrepreneur leads to neglecting the reality of business creation, which often corresponds to a collective approach. For Dubini and Aldrich (1991), the creation of a company is a fundamentally relational activity. The family brings, in addition to moral support, emotional comfort, while friends, with experience in the field, provide advice, encouragement and rekindle the enthusiasm of the entrepreneur. The relational network is only one aspect of the factors that can stimulate the entrepreneurial intention of the individual. A state of mind and a dynamic of action of the individual are necessary to lead to entrepreneurial achievement. As a result, entrepreneurship would also be a dynamic of action and a state of mind that can be acquired through training, awareness of situations, support measures, or even through specific techniques and tools (Von Graevenitza et al., 2010); hence the importance of the education system whose mission is to raise awareness, prepare and train for entrepreneurship. For Rasmussen and Sorheim (2006), teaching entrepreneurship in schools and universities can modify the attitudes, change the behaviors and beliefs of young students about entrepreneurship, and facilitate their assimilation and integration, and accessibility to the entrepreneurial phenomenon. Verstraete (2000) argues that entrepreneurship education can shape student cognition by promoting the combination of three irreducible and inseparable dimensions: reflection, reflexivity and learning. The entrepreneur of necessity has a central place in the management system of the enterprise in the start-up phase: the system is, therefore, finalized through the expression of the goals of the entrepreneur. The credibility of the company rests on a suitable financial base. However, with the existing telematics means (Minitel, for example), it is very easy to know the financial position of a company. A forward-looking supplier will quickly consult the databases at his disposal before entering into a contract with the newly established company. Also, the company that is starting up can encounter critical incidents and find itself very quickly in a very unfavorable situation insofar as if its financial position turns out to be critical, suppliers, customers and other partners could, knowingly, quickly opt out.

Consequently, the credibility of the company is based, to a large extent and in the early days at least, on the personal funds of the manager, Sammur (2001). To convince bankers, suppliers, customers, the manager generally engages in his name. This is particularly linked to the fact that the company which is created out of necessity has no history, therefore no proof of its competence which could constitute a pledge of confidence with the various partners. As the company has no past, it is on that of the manager and his capacity for conviction that the negotiations will be based. It is up to him to find the words, the facts, which will give credibility to his action and which will allow the company to finance its start-up. The feasibility, for example, the survival of the enterprise of necessity and the allocation of financial resources, that is to say their distribution in based on internal needs and external guesswork. The feasibility of the operation depends, in fact, on the manager's ability to find the financial resources necessary to ensure the sustainability of the company. And this is not the easiest task as we know that the majority of necessity businesses fail because of insufficient capital. The theoretical

development of the behavior of necessity entrepreneurs is therefore now evident. And it seems that the more quickly the entrepreneur of necessity does not grasp these interdependencies between the five poles of the goals, the environment, the activities, the financial resources, the organization, the more quickly he realizes that each critical incident generates problems, multiple repercussions, and the better he can manage his business. Aware of this complexity, he can more easily realize the importance of both internal and external monitoring in order to grasp, or even reduce, the potential constraints represented by his environment. This system allows the entrepreneur of necessity to consider, for a given critical incident, all the elements which interact in the management of the company. It is now a question of understanding how problems are linked over time and how the entrepreneur of necessity manages to solve them. The question arises as to what are the triggers for the transformation and the behaviors adopted in the management of critical incidents. Each story, each creation process, like each business management, is specific. In addition, any event can be perceived differently, critical incidents along the way are likely to appear, disillusion arise, etc. So many parameters encourage us to consider each start as a specific case. These recurrences noted as much in the nature of the perceived critical incidents, in their method of resolution, as in their sequence and the contamination of the various poles of the management system, confirms us in the idea that there would exist different behaviors for each entrepreneur of need. In this sub-point, the analysis allowed us to realize first that the longitudinal qualitative studies show different strategies for resolving critical incidents in the start-up process.

2.2. The Entrepreneurial Process Approach

The aim of this subsection is to analyze in particular the consideration of temporality in the field of entrepreneurship. This consideration of time is accepted because entrepreneurship is most often understood as a process (Aldrich & Zimmer, 1986; Steyaert, 2007; Jaziri, 2009; Moroz&Hindle, 2012). As a process, entrepreneurship is also considered a complex phenomenon (Gartner, 1985; Moroz&Hindle, 2012). This means that it is underpinned by a system of interacting variables (Bygrave & Hofer, 1991). The complex character also implies that the explanatory factors of the processes are possibly numerous and overlapping. In order to achieve the objectives assigned to this subsection, the subject is structured around the main approaches of the entrepreneurial process. This process is mainly understood through two conceptions in which the taking into account of time, the ontology of reality and the underlying theoretical models are different. Thus, first of all, this research presents the so-called classical approach to entrepreneurship (Shah &Tripsas, 2007) that Sarasvathy (2001) qualifies as a causal approach in comparison with his theory of effectuation. Secondly, the following point reviews the second so-called effect or alternative approach (Fisher, 2012).

2.3. The Classic or Causal Approach

This point aims to discuss theories of the entrepreneurial process conceived in the classical approach. This type of process approach considers given objectives and focuses on finding the means necessary to achieve said objectives (Sarasvathy, 2001). Here, the entrepreneur's desire and predictive logic predominate. Four main elements underlie the initiation of an entrepreneurial process in this so-called classic approach: The first is the setting of the intention or objectives by the entrepreneur. For Katz & Gartner (1988), the intention within the framework of the process is related to the individual or collective cognitive dimension and not to the external or environmental dimension. The second is the prior mobilization of the (physical) resources necessary to achieve the set objectives. In this approach, consistency between intention and resources is necessary to achieve results. Consequently, bringing together resources is a prerequisite for entrepreneurs who follow this process logic. The third is planning. This is underpinned by a logic of prediction and will to control the future inherent in the setting of intentions and the search for resources. In this classic approach, planning is important. The fourth element is the business opportunity. Although not all of the authors consider it, it nevertheless remains widely shared and predominates processual conceptions of entrepreneurship (Verstraete&Fayolle, 2005). By this principle, the entrepreneurial process is understood as involving the discovery, evaluation and exploitation of business opportunities.

However, the classic approach raises questions in certain entrepreneurial contexts. Its four dimensions and the linearity of the process phases are thus not always shared. Other authors (Sarasvathy, 2001) thus advocate taking into account the indeterminate / unpredictable. The following point addresses this type of approach.

2.4. The Alternative or Actual Approach

This new point aims to analyze the phenomenon in an alternative approach. This approach departs from classical principles, in particular that relating to intentionality among others, to further explore "the entrepreneurial process in its deeply indeterminate dimensions without it being oriented by a strong teleological dimension" (Block et al., 2015, p. 13). The alternative approach is essentially represented by the theories of performance, improvisation and DIY. The effect approach was developed by Sarasvathy (2001). The performance is understood as an entrepreneurial process which, starting from a set of given means, focuses on the selection of the possible results that can be created with said means. For implementation, entrepreneurs do not follow pre-defined objectives that determine the process. Here, entrepreneurs are more focused on the means they see as given. The notion of means is rather broad here, because the mobilizable means of the environment must be taken into account. In addition, the entrepreneurs of the implementation do not register beforehand in a competitive logic. Rather, they are focused on building partnerships to make their project a reality. In the classic approach, the next step after goal setting was to mobilize the resources to build a desired world. Here, the entrepreneur

appreciates what is feasible with the means at his disposal (and can mobilize from his partners) in order to build a possible world. The performance considers the future to be unpredictable because volunteer entrepreneurs can help shape the future. These entrepreneurs have just a general aspiration which they try to satisfy with the means given. They see the surprise inherent in any entrepreneurial process as something to be exploited and not to be avoided through planning. The process is rather based on the emergence of an idea evolving according to the resources and skills of the entrepreneur. The implementation is intended to be a pragmatic and modest entrepreneurial process. This theory corresponds well to the behavior adopted by necessity entrepreneurs in entrepreneurial processes; because they carry out their actions in resourcefulness, in improvisation, theories which are connected with the realization. DIY was originally developed by Levi-Strauss (1966). He defines it as a process of actions consisting of “doing with the means at hand” (Baker, Miner, & Eesley, 2003, p. 264). The notion of resource is understood here in the sense of Penrose (1959), that is to say that in the context of shortages of resources, tinkerers do not resign themselves to the existing. The handyman does not focus on setting future goals, nor on mobilizing resources to achieve those goals. It focuses only on its “on-board resources” and then combines them to propose new objectives (Fisher, 2012). Consequently, it will be understood that the handyman is not oriented a priori by a predefined objective and strong planning in the conduct of his entrepreneurial process. The entrepreneur in this logic tinkers with his resources to find / create opportunities. These different principles differentiate DIY from traditional approaches and bring it closer to actualization. DIY can also be the result of an improvised process (Baker et al., 2003).

The theory of entrepreneurial improvisation comes from the literature on organizational learning. It was built to study crisis situations in companies (Weick, 1993) and for the development of new products (Crossman, Cunha, & Vera, 2005; Crossman, Lane, White, & Klus, 1996; Miner, Bassof, & Moorman, 2001; Moorman & Miner, 1998b, 1998a). In this context, improvisation is understood as the simultaneous convergence of design and execution in the production of something new over time (Moorman & Miner, 1998a, p.1). In terms of behavior in this process, improvisation is based on three fundamental principles. Spontaneity and creativity in and for the action of the individual or team improvising on the one hand, and the appeal to previous experience on the other hand (Crossman et al., 2005; Miner et al., 2001).

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Within the framework of this study, we have opted for a comprehensive posture assuming that reality is constructed and involving an interdependence between the investigator and the investigated. Understanding thus calls for an interpretative epistemological posture (Lincoln & Guba, 2003; Avenier, 2011). It was carried out in Burkina Faso. A young country (with 81% of the population under 35), the unemployment rate is there and jobs are precarious (Calvès & Schoumaker, 2004; Calvès & Kobiané, 2014). The study explored this context with the objective of understanding the strategies implemented by entrepreneurs of necessity in the resolution of critical incidents in the start-up phase. The nature of our exploration is of a hybrid type, since it combines concomitantly and iteratively knowledge from the field and theoretical knowledge. We were particularly interested in the process of starting up micro and small businesses (1 to 25 employees), including the phases of developing the idea, its development, project development, launch and creation within the meaning of actual realization of investment or legal creation, as well as the first three years of the life of the new company (Bruyat, 1993, p.109). In line with the process dynamics, this qualitative research was carried out longitudinally over 15 months. Our research uses a qualitative methodology known as the critical incident. This method was first used in the military field, especially in the United States Army, by John Flanagan (1954). Today, it is used in the civil field such as the Social Sciences, to understand incidents related to the practices of organizations. The incidents are identified through the life stories of the interviewees. This method is also close to the grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) by not presupposing a theoretical framework. To collect data, as part of our study, we carried out theoretical sampling. To do this, it was necessary to define criteria making it possible, on the one hand, to achieve the theoretical objective and, on the other hand, to have a variety of the sample. Two criteria have been defined for the theoretical objective. The first is the nature of the entrepreneur's initial motivations. Any entrepreneur to be selected should have initial motivations of necessity: this is the exclusion criterion. The second is the phase in which the company of the selected entrepreneur is located; it must be in the activity phase: nascent / new. In addition to the theoretical criteria, six (06) other criteria were considered to have variety and ensure that the results can be based on rich data and cases. The first and second are age and gender, the third is the level of education, the fourth is entrepreneurial experience, the fifth is the sector of activity in which the entrepreneur operates, the sixth and final criterion is the (in) formal status of the company because the informal and formal sectors both constitute challenges for the economy of Burkina Faso.

Thus, a theoretical sample of twelve (12) necessity entrepreneurs was established and monitored for 15 months. For the data collection tools, during this period, through initial and then in-depth interviews, the data was collected using a recording device, coded via Topes V8.5, according to an inductive approach characterized by four basic steps : observation and recording of all facts, analysis and classification of facts, inductive derivation of a generalization from facts and verification.

For the processing and analysis of the data, we opted for a semi-automated textual content analysis with Tropes V.8 using the logbook as defined by Lejeune (2014).

4. RESULTS

We conducted a qualitative study with 12 business creators in the form of entrepreneurship that interests us (entrepreneurs). The study concerns the start-up phase because the initiated projects have become nascent or new companies. The purpose of this section is to present the results of the investigation on a case-by-case basis. This presentation aims to understand the strategies of entrepreneurs of necessity to resolve critical incidents occurring in the start-up phase.

Entrepreneur A: Dry cleaning (41 years old, woman)

Entrepreneur A holds a G2 (A' levels in accounting). His entrepreneurial project was born after losing his job. She was fired by her employer (microfinance structure) because of her pregnancy, from which she worked as a cashier. This situation pushed her to take the risk to meet her personal needs. Six months after the development of his initial project, difficulties appeared. When we meet for this research, the company was eight months in business. Entrepreneur A employed three permanent employees. Three months later, 2 of the 3 people making up his company's workforce resigned collectively. Added to this personnel difficulty were delays in rent. Additional difficulties such as repeated power outages have at the same time. The difficulties were also the emergence of competing companies in the immediate vicinity of company A. Company A is not able to compete. Faced with all these difficulties, E.1 now considering temporarily suspending the activities of his new company. Thus, she resolutely began a job search to the detriment of pursuing entrepreneurship in order to provide for her family, but her husband dissuaded her and asked her to persevere. Now accompanied by her economist, E1 took initiatives for the survival of the company. The reorientation of the strategy was then made. A few months later, when we left to delve into her situation, she told us that she benefited from the moral and financial support of her husband who allowed her to overcome the problem of late rent and power cuts. Due to personnel difficulties, entrepreneur A had to use an agency specializing in staff recruitment.

Entrepreneur B (27 years old, male): processing local products

B is unemployed in 2015; he was looking for a job. However, he was unable to find a satisfactory job offer. He then decides to exploit his business project. These occasional activities continued for a few months when he obtained a large order but did not have sufficient financial means to fulfill the order. So, he borrowed funds from his friends. In addition, he also decided to write the company's business plan to apply for financing. This approach allowed him to have a financing agreement. The evolution of the company has satisfied B because its customers are satisfied and the customer portfolio is growing. The company could not even meet its entire demand due to the limit of its production capacity. As such, he managed to raise funds from a local financial institution. He regularly obtains moral support from the leaders of public support institutions. The company also experienced other critical incidents. The first is high staff turnover. For example, during the first year, out of more than ten employees, only two did not quit. The second critical incident concerns the supply of production inputs. These inputs were products of foreign origin. At the local level, the local distribution of these inputs was monopolized by a single company with which B maintains conflicting relations.

Entrepreneur C (33 years old, woman): Fishmonger

The entrepreneur holds a Bac G2 (A' levels in Accounting). The idea of entrepreneurship was born following the difficulties in which she was entangled. She operates her project in a cosmopolitan district of Ouagadougou. She finds that the strategy implemented by her competitors aimed at harming her business, which pushes her to also build a response strategy to get the most out of the market. One of the difficulties that arose when her business was the lack of transport equipment used to move merchandise from purchase to distribution to customers. Following the advice of her friend, she submitted a request to a structure for informal activities. She also told us about the difficulties she faced due to frequent power cuts in the area where her business is located. She solved this difficulty by acquiring a generator with the help of her cousin who lives in France.

Entrepreneur D (41 years old, male): Distributing various products

He supported carrying out of activities, since he left school (6th grade), by going to help his friends distribute their goods at the market. Then, he argues with one of his friends who forbids him to help them again. Unemployed, entrepreneur D can no longer feed his family. This is how he had the idea of working on his own. Entrepreneur D also experienced some critical incidents. At first, suppliers and even some customers. This caused difficulties in the supply of its products. To deal with it, he mobilized his former informal network, notably his friends, relatives and former colleagues. Entrepreneur D then faces saturation in the egg market. To limit the entry of eggs, the government has taken the decision to ban import authorizations. If the decision is beneficial for internal producers, it has on the other hand accentuated the difficulties of supplying D with eggs because established companies which have large means to import have returned to local production. Despite these difficulties, his company is doing well overall due to the diversification of its products.

Entrepreneur E (32 years old, male): Sale of household appliances

Entrepreneur E obtained a primary school certificate (called CEPE in French). He embarked on entrepreneurship to support his family. His entrepreneurial idea came when he deemed the remuneration he received insufficient. When entrepreneur

E started his business, he had no employees. He played both the role of boss and employee. The first difficulty he encountered is financial, which prevented him to obtain supplies. Entrepreneur E had to use his savings and call on help of his family. Furthermore, he was victim of a burglary. He lost part of his stock. Entrepreneur E said he solved this critical incident with financial help of his brother who sold some of his cattle. This entrepreneur also had difficulty managing his business. He told us that he had followed business management organized by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

Entrepreneur F (40 years old, female): Mobile banking

After obtaining her A'levels in accounting (Bac G2 in French), entrepreneur F began looking for a job, because her parents cannot pay her university study fees. She then tried the civil service. It was then that she embarked on entrepreneurship. E.8 evolved in the transfer commonly called Mobile banking . Cell phone companies require a deposit before operating their services. Facing this requirement, this young entrepreneur encountered a first financial difficulty, which was resolved thanks to the funding granted to her by a solidarity financial institution set up by the government. Entrepreneur F, received training on mobile banking services organized by a mobile operator. In addition to this difficulty, F has suffered a few cases of embezzlement on the part of its employees; this led to the dismissal of employees. To put an end to it, she was advised to buy a new lock of which only she has the keys. To guard against such acts, entrepreneur F had to obtain the services of a security agent.

Entrepreneur G (25 years old, woman): financial services provider

The birth of the idea of Project G was inherent in the fear of unemployment. In fact, G earned a Bachelor of Science degree in auditing and corporate finance. Since then, she was unemployed and got a job, then she quit in less than 6 months, feeling that the working conditions were difficult. No longer wishing to find herself unemployed, D planned to create a business in a field in which she dreamed of working: finance. Upon his resignation, G sought information to evaluate his project idea and implement it immediately. During the same period, she officially created her business. The idea of G's project was to offer individuals financial services including money transfers. The following month, the approval request procedure was actually launched and the bank informed him of the absence of a criminal record extract in the approval request, which would block the file. Seeking to obtain the criminal record certificate, G was unable to obtain it for three months. This situation is the result of the magistrates' strike. Thus, G waited in vain for legal services to resume and ended up restarting the job search. She received a criminal record after three months and began her activities after obtaining approval.

Entrepreneur M (28 years old): Hair salon

Entrepreneur H was born in Daloa (Ivory Coast), and she is of Burkinabe nationality. Having not gone very far at school, she escaped her parents who forced her to work on cocoa plantations. She was 14 years old when she chose to return to Burkina Faso to do business there in order to support herself. At 20, H decided to learn hairdressing. Her know-how allowed her to be retained in this salon as an employee for a salary and she resigned 2 years later (because she considered the salary insufficient) to work on her own account. Entrepreneur H is looking for a room to house his living room. She used the services of a direct seller, but he cheated her out of her rent money. She looked for another room and the landlord asked her to pay a deposit of 2 months' rent which she paid with her personal savings. When we first met H, she told us about competitive challenges, but that she had a strategy in place to overcome them. The strategy is to style their clients at home.

Entrepreneur I (47 years old): Make a hair salon

Entrepreneur I is of Togolese nationality residing in Ouagadougou (Burkina Faso). She holds a Certificate of Elementary Primary Studies (CEPE). When she arrived in Burkina Faso, she worked as a cook in a local restaurant then was fired after 2 years. Following the advice of one of her friends, she took training in female hairdressing, after which she found work in a hair salon. Three months later, she fell seriously ill, hospitalized for 2 weeks. After recovering, her boss refused to let her return to work. She then looked for a job in another salon. The attempts were in vain! It was then that she had the idea to create her own hair salon. At the start of her entrepreneurial activities, she needs to renovate the premises. The difficulties began for I. The new salon encountered, on the one hand, the distrust of certain customers who doubted its know-how, and, on the other hand, competition. She told us that she solved her difficulties by participating in training to learn new hairstyle models and by using the network of her former clients.

Entrepreneur J (40 years old, woman): Catering

Entrepreneur J was born in Ivory Coast and was not educated by her parents. She did odd jobs in restaurants in Abidjan. J then decides to return to Burkina Faso, his native country, to look for a job. The idea of a restoration project at the J was born from several facts. First, she had difficulty finding a job because her level of education was considered uncompetitive. Then his older brother did not provide for him. Finally, J believed that she had enough know-how to effectively undertake initiatives and achieve success. She then started her business exactly 9 months after arriving in Burkina Faso. She acquired the necessary equipment. But very quickly, she realizes that her financial means are not enough to meet her needs. So, she began approaching her friends and family in order to finalize her investment. Subsequently, she obtained some material aid and promises of financial support. One of the most important promises of financial support was the sending of a bank check to supplement his financial needs. But when J went to the bank with the proposed check, she was told the donor's

account was frozen. On advice, J also decided to contact financial institutions with a view to applying for a loan. She changed her mind because she did not have the guarantees required by financial institutions. Faced with these financial difficulties, J planned to look for partners to provide services in order to gather the financial means before getting back to the project. She got a service offer recommended by one of her friends to cook a meal for a wedding. She was paid upfront and managed to secure the resources needed to start the business.

Entrepreneur K (47 years old, woman): Catering

Entrepreneur K stopped her studies in high school due to lack of resources. She had trouble finding a job. Doing business seemed to be the only alternative to meet his personal needs. When entrepreneur K decides to make her project a reality, she was faced with a lack of funding. She struggled to obtain a bank loan to finance her project. It was thanks to her friend that she was able to overcome the obstacle. Her business was operating normally with 7 employees, but she had some concerns. She said she faced debt collection when offering coffee and lunch breaks. This situation put it in a position of insolvency with its suppliers. The latter refuses to grant him raw materials on credit. To overcome the difficulty linked to debt recovery, K told us that she had put in place a recovery strategy. She demanded advance payment before offering her services.

Entrepreneur L (40 years old, woman): Doing agribusiness

Entrepreneur L has a degree in hospitality. She did odd jobs in a few hotels in the area. She resigned from her last job as a cook in a large hotel in the area because of a salary she considered insufficient. After many fruitless job searches, she decided to start a business. The entrepreneur L had the idea of breeding because she had been breeding (in her family) since her childhood. Subsequently, she plans to make it a business project. With his business plan, E.14 participated in business plan competitions several times. She also contacted financial institutions, but they did not meet her requests. It was then that she decided to return to her family to raise start-up funds; and it established relationships with its future customers and suppliers to obtain customer advances and supplier credits to support the operation of its project. The company L suffered a natural disaster (strong wind) destroyed its livestock building, what was the company's main investment. This event had several effects. First, it influenced its production by lowering the production throughout the production year (season). Then, it required a reinvestment in building not only unforeseen, but also essential to the survival of the company in the first year. The combination of all these difficulties ended up raising the question of the ability of company to survive one year after its start-up. These difficulties lead L to consider fundraising to deal with them. Thus, she sought and obtains financial assistance from her husband, which allows her to relaunch her activities.

he above results indicate that, to resolve critical incidents in the start-up process, the necessity entrepreneurs in our sample benefited from the help of a family member, a relative or a friend. Some used their experience or personal savings, which reflects an ‘effectual behavior’. Others, on the other hand, have benefited either training or support in developing a business plan, which reflects “causal behavior”. However, very few of them have mixed causality and event-driven effects, reflecting “behavioralhybridization”.

5.DISCUSSION

Following a critical logic, in the previous section, we presented the results through the survey data. The aim was to know how necessity entrepreneurs, constituting our theoretical sample, according to their basic financial and intellectual conditions, behave to resolve critical incidents in the start-up phase, so as to subsequently categorize their behavior. Below we present in table form some of the results collected:

Table 1: Main Results

E*	Age	Gender	Level of studies	Activity	Funding	Personal	Strengths
A	41	Female	Bac G2	Dry cleaning	Yes = Husband	4	Husband Economist
B	27	Male	Baccalaureate	Industry	Friends/bank	12	Satisfied customers
C	33	Female	Bac G2	Fish	Yes = Cousin	3	Quality and service
D	41	Male	Primary	Distribution	No	1	Diversification
E	32	Male	Primary	Distribution	Yes = Brother	1	None
F	40	Female	Bac G and +	Mr. Banking	State Fund	3	Training
G	25	Female	Bac G and +	Finance	Banking	4	Specialization
H	28	Female	Primary	Hairdressing	No	1	None
I	47	Female	Primary	Hairdressing	No	1	Experience

J	40	Female	None	Kiosk	No	1	Experience
K	47	Female	High school	Restaurant	Yes = bank	8	Resilience
L	40	Female	University	Breeding	Yes = Husband	4	Experience

Source: questionnaires and authors' elaboration.

Legend: E* = Company. Personal = Personal. Assets = Competitive assets of the company.

The colors show us that entrepreneurs with high school and university levels, have all obtained funding to start businesses with more or less staff. Conversely, those who have not reached this level find themselves self-employed, without financing almost in all cases. H's, doesn't really seem like a case of success, but rather that his brother took pity on him and sold half his herd so he could try to survive, without any competitive advantage.

During the start-up phase, the results show that necessity entrepreneurs can adopt several behaviors to resolve critical incidents. They proceed either by procedural approach "causality", or by alternative procedural approach "effectuation", or by mixing the two. Therefore, this section particularly analyzes the behaviors of necessity entrepreneurs in the start-up phase. The adoption of this or that other behavior by the entrepreneur is not accidental. We have observed that necessity entrepreneurs give reasons to understand the adoption of a given behavior to solve a critical incident. Indeed, the entrepreneurs that we investigated are totally in the effectual logic of controlling an unpredictable future (Sarvasvathy 2009). Given their background, they cannot conceive, for lack of self-confidence (external control) and knowledge, of setting objectives through analysis. They de facto favor action over analysis and ultimately perfectly illustrate effectivist logic. These entrepreneurs start from the means at their disposal, their skills, their material resources, rather than setting a predetermined goal. In other cases, entrepreneurs necessarily adapt to a market demand than they can cope with. So they react very quickly. We recognize for some entrepreneurs that their past has forged in them this ability to adapt, to take advantage of opportunities and to see difference as a resource. They observe the behavior and modify their approach based on events, to better benefit from their observations. Their particular experiences gave them the "ability to see difference as a resource"(Alter, 2013). As such, Alter (2013) places atypical entrepreneurs, just like I, in a fully realized approach, without naming it. "The position of foreigner is thus part of the pride of atypical bosses, because they find resources to which normal ones have poor access" . In this spirit, they offer a second management lesson: value the tactical vision over the cognitive perspective, avoiding exhausting strategic capacity by too much modeling effort. These entrepreneurs therefore exploit contingencies. They remain flexible on objectives and take advantage of opportunities that arise on their path to integrate them into an ever-evolving project. They move and adapt, what they call "ingenuity", what researchers would call emergent strategy or tinkering. Of course, their situation as entrepreneurs necessarily forces them to think in terms of acceptable losses. In any case, they have very few funds and cannot borrow given their precarious situation, their extreme financial fragility and their low solvency with banks. Here again, these entrepreneurs apply efficient logic by default. The difficulties of life have given them a certain distance from material things, a certain serenity, a letting go. Furthermore, this acquired wisdom allows some to only up to their means, to always get up and start over. As a result, entrepreneurs necessarily prioritize the use of available resources to determine what their business will do and typically adopt a partnership strategy to leverage their limited capacities (C, D, F, and K). They make a "garage sale" to get a start-up savings, only use their savings and resort very little to borrowing (K). Furthermore, entrepreneurs constantly reinvest in their businesses, "to prepare for the future", they analyze. Just as the authors of the Source project have shown for entrepreneurs out of necessity, of survival, encountered throughout the world, those who succeed demonstrate the curiosity described by Schumpeter, know how to use their constraints as resources, view their environment differently to grow opportunities invisible to others. They resemble the atypical bosses described by Alter. A positive and enriching perspective for these "left behind" entrepreneurs. Some entrepreneurs, like D, E, F, K and L, resemble the profile of the "dreamer"described by the Source project: they do not hesitate to reinvest their income in order to sustain their activities and attach great importance to savings. Their projects are linked to traits or a personal story and not to a possible opportunity that another person will have detected. Here again, we are in effective behavior .Concerning the logic of partnership encouraged in the logic of effect, entrepreneurs resort to it by necessity and instinct. This is the case of E. C, E, F and H, and K. Their companies are the result of a collective of actors who form throughout the process to support the project and the future company. They also seek help of their close friends, whom they enlist in their business creation, even if these networks remain extremely limited, due to lack of social capital. This point is particularly highlighted in the questionnaire, in which entrepreneurs quickly and spontaneously mention the need to form partnerships to market their new products. Finally, entrepreneurs also seek their clients among their close circle, and grow gradually, with their support. They also identify them in relation to their own profile, their own needs. This is the case for entrepreneurs A, B, C, D, H, I and K. Their approach is pragmatic, based on their experiences, and not conceptual or theoretical. This coincides more by chance than by will with the approach encouraged by effective logic, more pragmatic, on the ground, almost intuitive. For them, it is not a voluntary process, but an obligation that is not very reassuring due to a lack of training and support. It is therefore more of an effective logic suffered than wanted, by inability to follow the causal logic however recommended by their possible companions.

On the other hand, very few of them used the proposition adopted causal behavior. The latter resolved critical incidents that occurred in their start-up process either benefiting from training; this is the case for entrepreneurs E, F and I, or support by developing a business plan; this is the case of entrepreneur B, F, or even a managerial theory A and K, government decree B and D. The rare mentions of causal behavior are made in the negative, to explain that many do not use it. When asked if they analyze long-term opportunities, to select the most profitable, the answer is almost negative for most entrepreneurs by necessity in our sample, like A. However, some have actually adopted one or more times predictive logic in making forecasts. However, sometimes this causal behavior did not occur on their own initiative. In most cases, these entrepreneurs do not set turnover targets. They “know” intuitively that they will make a profit, especially because they invest very little each time, start with limited means, and grow their activity by adapting to demand. They don't think about their chances of success, but work hard. They have little to lose, everything to gain, unwittingly opting for a penetration strategy, with very good value for money. The only concession to causal logic is to analyze their direct competitors. This is the case of A, C, H and I. What we read implicitly is the lack of entrepreneurial skills of entrepreneurs by necessity, who have not trained in entrepreneurship, since they did not intend to become entrepreneurs. They are unable to use the classic tools of causal logic, business plan, market research, analysis of consumer behavior, the environment, sales forecasts, etc. Classic analytical approaches to market research, for example to quantitative studies by questionnaires or qualitative studies by interviews are not accessible to entrepreneurs by necessity. They cannot afford the services of expert firms to submit market studies, measurements of potential customers and proposals for this customer base, with sales estimates and forecasts. We note that for most entrepreneurs by necessity in our study, the resolution of critical incidents was facilitated by the combination of several factors relating to our two (2) proposals. At the same time, they benefited from funding from support structures who believed in the project by creating a business plan and the help of their family or a friend (example entrepreneurs B and F). While other entrepreneurs claim to have resolved critical incidents in their activities by the joint association of several following essential factors: help from family, personal contribution without requesting a bank loan and experience of several years in the same area where they now. These entrepreneurs are in fact dominantly part of an effective logic of controlling an unpredictable future by favoring, *de facto*, action over analysis. Lacking self-confidence, resources, training and skills, they systematically resort to effective assessment. They take stock of available resources, because they know they have to “do with what they have. The material resources available guide the choice to create a business and denote an ability to mobilize resources differently, more freely. It's more about common sense, simplicity and moderation than strategy. Projects are most often linked to personal traits or a story and not to a possible identified opportunity. The company starts small, the initial idea is not decisive, the time for growth and development is important, the entrepreneur first uses the means at his disposal. The entrepreneurial approach is modest. In the absence of comfortable leeway, ideas are quickly tested and modified based on market reactions, trying to turn inevitable obstacles and constraints into opportunities. The approach is extremely pragmatic. These entrepreneurs, by necessity place little trust in statistics and market data, focus little on expected returns and sales forecasts, think by necessity in terms of acceptable losses, holistically. They apply “by default” by adapting, for example, to circumstances knowing that they cannot bend the context to their desires. They experiment, tinker, repair instead of buying, salvaging and recycling. The development requires experimentation and appropriation, much more than theory. In the absence of entrepreneurial skills, having not been trained in business since they did not intend to become entrepreneurs, they do not feel able to use the classic causal logic, business plan, market research, analysis of consumer behavior, environment, sales forecasts. This coincides more by chance than by will, with the approach encouraged in effective logic. For them, it is not a voluntary process, but an obligation that is not very reassuring, due to a lack of training and support. It is therefore more of an effective logic suffered than desired. Above all, the feedback steps, and the process of successive interactions, to involve ecosystem do not work. The crucial step of networking, of creating partnerships, has not been taken. The partnership encouraged in implementation are not fully developed. There is no collective of actors set up throughout the process to support the project and future activity. The social network remains small, partnerships limited. This observation invites us to move away from a stigmatizing, degrading and sterile vision of entrepreneurs by necessity to move to a vision of constraints, internal and external, strong or weak, weighing on entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship, in proportions sometimes incompatible with success, in order to be able to act on it. In addition, the hyper-constrained context described in the context of necessity entrepreneurship allows entrepreneurs to develop certain valuable managerial skills, and spontaneously adopt a fruitful but partial implementation process.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, the objective of this research is to understand the behaviors adopted by necessity entrepreneurs (Reynold, 2001) in the resolution of critical incidents occurring during the start-up phase, allowing them to finalize the entrepreneurial process. We carried out a longitudinal thematic analysis close to the anchored approach. Throughout the process of collecting, coding and analyzing data, the principle of constant comparison has been strictly taken into account. This process has enabled us to achieve a number of results. This study allowed us to understand the cognitive processes and relational networks that entrepreneurs of necessity mobilize or use in the resolution of critical incidents. Thus, we note in this study the emergence of two behavioral tendencies: a first is that known as “pure effectationist behavior” ; that is, contractors who have resolved critical incidents using the resources at their disposal. A second tendency is that known as “hybrid effectationist behavior” ; that is, those who have adopted behavior that combines Causation and Effectuation to

resolve critical incidents. In this tendency, effectual logic is dominant. We note all the same that the separation of Causation and Effectuation is not obvious. Admittedly, our sample is small and we can admit that probably in these situations of entrepreneurship of necessity, as in other entrepreneurial situations, the level of heterogeneity is high, as suggested by the work of Caliendo and Kritikos. (2009). Certain individuals may be forced to set up their own business, particularly because of their age, but they may also have resources, be highly motivated and be endowed with a very strong desire to be an entrepreneur. However, these first results already have implications. Although the qualitative content has shed some interesting light on the business start-up phase out of necessity, however, there are still some poorly lit areas. And this is the result of our exploratory approach, which despite everything presents some biases and limits that we were aware from the start.

Limits: Our study has several limitations, the first of which relates to the logic of theoretical sampling that we had the ambition to achieve. The second limitation is that we have focused on entrepreneurial processes; it would also be necessary to study the "passage to the act", the moment, the triggers and the underlying reasons why an individual who perceives himself constrained, decides despite everything to create. As suggested by Minguet G. (2013), the question remains unresolved: "How do we go from this perception of constraints, from this objectification of constraints to the fact that certain subjects-actors seize them despite taking risks, the absence of political vision, environment, and network. I will extend the idea of constraint with that of taking action: why some do it while others do not, under what social, economic, environmental conditions, etc. "

The third limitation is the abandonment of observations as a data collection technique.

Research perspectives: Regarding the prospects for future research, we note all the same that research on processes covers several possible extensions. The first is to continue this research on the extension of longitudinal follow-up. The second is the search for a theoretical generalization of our research proposals in countries, which share with Burkina Faso a certain proximity to the entrepreneurial ecosystem, institutional structures and cultural traits. The third is to develop in a future research work the theme of perseverance in entrepreneurship of necessity. Finally, it is relevant to undertake research on the stakeholders in entrepreneurship of necessity, in the Burkinabé context.

In view of the results obtained, we suggest a real involvement in terms of public policies because the structural, social and institutional framework is increasingly failing to accompany and support the entrepreneurs of necessity (Nakara & Fayolle, 2012). The words collected also reflect their distress and their loneliness in a precarious and little protective environment. The State must, for example, reduce its administrative and fiscal pressure, if it really wishes to encourage this form of entrepreneurship. We also suggest developing the entrepreneurial culture and the use of effectual logic in Burkina Faso. A first work must be done on the perception of failures and resilience, which could start in a very fruitful way from an early age in school. It is about seeing failure as an opportunity to learn and grow, not as a negative and stigmatizing outcome.

Funding

This research has not been funded.

Competing Interests

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgement

The authors are grateful to the respondents, and to the editors of the *Advances in Consumer Research*.

REFERENCES

1. Avenier, M. J. (2011a). Les paradigmes épistémologiques constructivistes : postmodernisme ou pragmatisme ? *Management & Avenir*, 3(43), 372-391.
2. Avenier, M. J. (2011b). Pourquoi jeter le bébé avec l'eau du bain ? *Méthodologie sans épistémologie n'est que ruine de la réflexion ! Le Libellio d'AEGIS*, 7(1), 39-52.
3. Baker T., Miner, A. S., & Eesley, D. T. (2003). Improvising firms: bricolage, account giving and improvisational competencies in the founding process. *Research Policy*, 32(2), 255-276.
4. Block, J. H., Kohn, K., Miller, D., & Ullrich, K. (2015). Necessity entrepreneurship and competitiveness strategy. *Small Business Economics*, 44(1), 37-54.
5. Bourion, C., & Persson, S. (2011). La transmission intergénérationnelle des talents par le mentoring épistolaire. *Revue Internationale de Psychosociologie*, 17(41), 303-317.

6. Bruyat C. (1993), Bruyat, C. (1993, p.27 et p.56). Création d'entreprise : contributions épistémologiques et modélisation. (Thèse de doctorat). Université Pierre Mendès-France-Grenoble II, Grenoble.
7. Bygrave, W. B., & Hofer, C. W. (1991). Theorizing about entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 16(2), 13-22.
8. Caliendo M., & Kritikos A.S. (2009). I want to, but I also need to: start-ups resulting from opportunity and necessity. IZA DP n° 4661.
9. Calvès, A.-E., & Kobiané, J.-F. (2014). Genre et nouvelles dynamiques d'insertion professionnelle chez les jeunes à Ouagadougou. *Autre Part*, 1(3), 33-56.
10. Calvès, A.-E., & Schoumaker, B. (2004). Deteriorating economic context and changing patterns of youth employment in urban Burkina Faso: 1980–2000. *World Development*, 32(8), 1341-1354.
11. Carbonell, N., & Nassè, T.B. (2021). Examining the key success factors in Africa based on 4 aspects: leadership, adaptation, efficiency and strategic positioning from a survey of Burkina's entrepreneurs. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 25(4), 1- 10.
12. Carbonell, N., Nassè, T. B., & Akouwerabou, D. (2020). African economic paradox: industrialization creating jobs and added value or active participation in global value chains: what solutions to develop for the less advanced and landlocked countries like Burkina Faso? *International Journal of Advanced Economics*, 2(1), 1-20.
13. Carter N.M., Gartner W.B., Shaver K.G., & Gatewood, E.J. (2003). The career reasons of nascent entrepreneurs », *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(1), 13-39.
14. Crossan, M., Cunha, M. P. E., Vera, D., & Cunha, J. (2005). Time and organizational improvisation. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(1), 129-145.
15. Dubini P., (1988). The influence of motivations and environment on business start-ups: some hints for public policies. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 4, 11-26.
16. Fisher G., (2012). Effectuation, causation and bricolage: A behavioral comparison of emerging theories in entrepreneurship research. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36(5), 1019-1051.
17. Flanagan, J. C. (1959). Critical requirements: A new approach to employee evaluation I. *Personnel Psychology*, 2(4), 419-425.
18. Gartner, W. (1985). A conceptual framework for describing the phenomenon of new venture creation. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(4), 696-706.
19. Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. A. (2010). *La découverte de la théorie ancrée*. Paris : Armand Colin.
20. Granovetter, M. (1985). Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91(3), 481-510.
21. Joly A., (2009). Pédagogie de l'incident critique dans la formation des responsables. *Revue Internationale de Psychosociologie*, 15(37), 173-216.
22. Joly, A. (2009). Pédagogie de l'incident critique dans la formation des responsables. *Revue Internationale de Psychosociologie*, 15(37), 173-216.
23. Katz, J., & Gartner, W. B. (1988a). Properties of emerging organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(3), 429-441.
24. Katz, J., & Gartner, W. B. (1988b). Properties of emerging organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(3), 429-441.
25. Krueger, N.F. & Carsrud, A.L. (1993). Entrepreneurial intentions: applying the theory of planned behavior. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 5, 315-330.
26. Levi-Strauss, C. (1966). *The savage mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
27. Lichtenstein, B. B., Carter, N. M., Dooley, K. J., & Gartner, W. B. (2007). Complexity dynamics of nascent entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22(2), 236-261.
28. Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2003). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In *The Landscape of Qualitative Research*. (Denzin N. K. et Lincoln Y. S., p. 253-291). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
29. McMullen, J.S., Bagby, D.R., & Palich, L.E. (2008). Economic freedom and the motivation to engage in entrepreneurial action, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 32(5), 875-895.
30. Miner, A. S., Bassof, P., & Moorman, C. (2001). Organizational improvisation and learning: a field study. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(2), 304-337.

31. Moorman, C., & Miner, A. S. (1998a). Organizational improvisation and organizational memory. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(4), 698-723.
32. Moorman, C., & Miner, A. S. (1998b). The convergence of planning and execution: improvisation in new product development. *The Journal of Marketing*, 1-20.
33. Moroz, P. W., & Hindle, K. (2012). Entrepreneurship as a process: Toward harmonizing multiple perspectives. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36(4), 781-818. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2011.00452.x>.
34. Nakara, W. A., Bouguerra, N., & Fayolle, A. (2017). Supporting and training female necessity entrepreneurs. In *The Routledge companion to global female entrepreneurship*. (p. 167-180). London and New York: Henry C., Nelson T. and Lewis K.
35. Nassè, T. B. (2021). Marketing practices and the dark side of inequity: a qualitative research in African private companies. *International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research*, 3(9), 319-325.
36. Nassè, T. B., & Sawadogo, Y. M. (2019). Internal equity and customer relationship management in subsistence markets: a comparative and a qualitative study of three private companies in Burkina Faso. *International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research*, 1(1), 42-58.
37. Okoro, J. P., Nassè, T. B., Ngmendoma, A. B., Carbonell, N., & Nanema, M. (2022). Entrepreneurship education and youth unemployment challenges in Africa: Ghana in perspective. *International Journal of management & entrepreneurship Research*, 4(5), 213-231.
38. Penrose, E. (1959). *The theory of the firm*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
39. Reynolds, P. D., Bygrave, W. D., Autio, E., Cox, L. W., & Hay, M. (2002). *Global entrepreneurship monitor: 2002 executive report* (p. 51). Kansas City, MO: Kauffman Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership.
40. Reynolds, P.D., Camp, S.M., Bygrave, W.D., Autio, E., & Hay M., (2001). *Global entrepreneurship monitor: 2001 executive report*. Kansas City, MO: Kauffman Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership.
41. Sammut, S. (1995). *Contribution à la compréhension du processus de démarrage en petite entreprise* (Thèse de doctorat). Université Montpellier 1, Montpellier.
42. Sammut, S. (2001). *Processus de démarrage en petite entreprise : système de gestion et scénarios*. *Revue de l'Entrepreneuriat*, 1(1), 61-76.
43. Verstraete, T. (2000). *Entrepreneuriat et sciences de gestion* (Doctoral dissertation).
44. Sarasvathy, S. D. (2001). Causation and effectuation: toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 243-263.
45. Shah, S. K., & Tripsas, M. (2007). The accidental entrepreneur: the emergent and collective process of user entrepreneurship. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 1(1-2), 123-140.
46. Steyaert, C. (2007). Entrepreneurship as a conceptual attractor? A review of process theories in 20 years of entrepreneurship studies. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 19(6), 453-477. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08985620701671759>.
47. Verstraete, T., & Fayolle, A. (2005). Paradigmes et entrepreneuriat. *Revue de l'Entrepreneuriat*, 4(1), 33-52.
48. Weick, K. E. (1993). The collapse of sensemaking in organizations: the Mann Gulch disaster. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 628-652.
49. Williams, N., & Williams, C. C. (2014). Beyond necessity versus opportunity entrepreneurship: some lessons from English deprived urban neighbourhoods. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 10(1), 23-40.