

The Three Conditions for the Emergence of Early Symbiotic Entrepreneurship, BERRICHI, A.¹ and AL RASHDI, S.²

1. PhD, Professor, University Research Laboratory in Instrumentation and Management of Organizations, Faculty of Legal, Economic and Social Sciences, Mohammed First University Oujda, Morocco, abd.berrichi@ump.ac.ma.
2. PhD, Student, University Research Laboratory in Instrumentation and Management of Organizations, Faculty of Legal, Economic and Social Sciences, Mohammed First University Oujda, Morocco, alrashdi.sulaiman@ump.ac.ma.

Submission date: 310/08/2022**Acceptance date: 16/10/2022**

Abstract:

The state of the art reveals a plethora of themes where notions take place that can inform us about the specificity of entrepreneurship. This is the case with the positive role of SMEs in countering the phenomenon of environmental and social degradation.

This specificity of entrepreneurship based on the dialectical relationship linking the entrepreneur and sustainable development raises a debate around the ability of SMEs to include sustainable orientation in their business model and encourages to advance this question: why only a handful of SMEs are very committed to sustainable development, while for others the sustainable orientation is only very weakly integrated into their strategies?

To answer this question, at first attempt seems to be looming for us, to simply state this hypothesis: an SME is able to understand sustainable development actions when an entrepreneurial symbiosis occurs within it. At the origin of this symbiosis, the hybridization of three irreducible types of dimensions: a sustainable orientation, strategic direction and organizational direction. To identify this specificity, three questions will be considered: What is an entrepreneurial symbiosis? What are these foundations? And how does a symbiotic SME forge a strong sustainability orientation?

Many authors like Williamson et al., 2006, Cohen et Winn (2007), Spence et al., 2007, Patzelt et Shepherd (2010), York et Venkataraman (2010), etc., invite us to consider the positive role of the Small-to-Medium Enterprises (SMEs) to counter the phenomenon of environmental and social degradation.

This is very strategic invitation, nevertheless it arouses a debate around the ability of SMEs to include sustainable orientation in their business model and raises this question along the way, why only handful SMEs are very committed to sustainable development, while for others the sustainable orientation is only integrated very low into their strategies?

To answer this question, at the first attempt it seems to be able to make it possible to simply state this assumption: a SME is able to understand the actions of sustainable development when an entrepreneurial symbiosis occurs. At the origin of this symbiosis, the hybridization of three types of orientation or symbiont: a sustainable orientation experienced as a business opportunity, a strategic orientation that involves the simultaneous search for opportunities and strategic advantages related to sustainable development, an organizational orientation focused on the processes and activities through which SMEs wish to engage in sustainability orientation.

By placing our thinking around the concept of symbiotic entrepreneurship, we focus on the appropriate context for its development. To explore this context, three questions will be addressed: What is an entrepreneurial symbiosis? What are these bases? And how does a symbiotic SME forge a strong sustainability orientation?

Keywords: Symbiotic entrepreneurship, Orientation, sustainable development.

Les trois conditions d'émergence de l'entrepreneuriat symbiotique précoce

Résumé :

L'état de l'art révèle une pléthore de thèmes où prennent place des notions qui peuvent nous renseigner sur la spécificité de l'entrepreneuriat. C'est le cas du rôle positif des PME dans la lutte contre le phénomène de la dégradation environnementale et sociale.

Cette spécificité de l'entrepreneuriat basée sur la relation dialectique liant l'entrepreneur et le développement durable soulève un débat autour de la capacité des PME à inclure une orientation durable dans leur modèle d'affaires et incite à avancer cette question : pourquoi seule une poignée de PME sont très engagées dans le développement durable, alors que pour d'autres l'orientation durable n'est que très faiblement intégrée dans leurs stratégies ?

Pour répondre à cette question, un premier essai semble se profiler pour nous, il suffit d'énoncer cette hypothèse : une PME est capable de comprendre les actions de développement durable lorsqu'une symbiose entrepreneuriale se produit en son sein. A l'origine de cette symbiose, l'hybridation de trois types de dimensions irréductibles : une orientation durable, une orientation stratégique et une orientation organisationnelle. Pour identifier cette spécificité, trois questions seront envisagées : Qu'est-ce qu'une symbiose entrepreneuriale ? Quels sont ces fondements ? Et comment une PME symbiotique forge-t-elle une forte orientation durable ?

De nombreux auteurs comme Williamson et al. 2006, Cohen et Winn (2007), Spence et al. 2007, Patzelt et Shepherd (2010), York et Venkataraman (2010), etc. nous invitent à considérer le rôle positif des petites et moyennes entreprises (PME) pour contrer le phénomène de dégradation environnementale et sociale.

Cette invitation est très stratégique, néanmoins elle suscite un débat autour de la capacité des PME à inclure l'orientation durable dans leur modèle d'affaires et soulève cette question en cours de route, pourquoi seulement une poignée de PME sont très engagées dans le développement durable, alors que pour d'autres l'orientation durable n'est que très faiblement intégrée dans leurs stratégies ?

Pour répondre à cette question, il semble à première vue possible d'énoncer simplement cette hypothèse : une PME est capable de comprendre les actions de développement durable lorsqu'une symbiose entrepreneuriale se produit. A l'origine de cette symbiose, l'hybridation de trois types d'orientation ou symbiose : une orientation durable vécue comme une opportunité d'affaires, une orientation stratégique qui implique la recherche simultanée d'opportunités et d'avantages stratégiques liés au développement durable, une orientation organisationnelle centrée sur les processus et activités par lesquels les PME souhaitent s'engager dans l'orientation durable.

En situant notre réflexion autour du concept d'entrepreneuriat symbiotique, nous nous concentrons sur le contexte approprié pour son développement. Pour explorer ce contexte, trois questions seront abordées : Qu'est-ce qu'une symbiose entrepreneuriale ? Quelles en sont les bases ? Et comment une PME symbiotique se forge-t-elle une forte orientation vers la durabilité ?

Mots-clés : Entrepreneuriat symbiotique ; Orientation durable ; Orientation stratégique ; Orientation organisationnelle ; développement durable.

Introduction:

SMEs represent more than 90% of businesses in most economies. It is the same observation in Morocco: 98% of companies are SMEs. This critical mass is considered by many specialists not as an obstacle, but as an opportunity to be seized in order to increase the positive role of SMEs in taking charge of the social, environmental and economic dimensions linked to the problem of sustainable development (Princic et Floyd, 2003).

It is from this projection that authors such as Cohen and Winn (2007); Patzelt and Shepherd (2010); York and Venkataraman (2010), etc., invite us to consider the positive role of SMEs in countering the phenomenon of environmental and social degradation. While they have been regularly considered to be the main cause of the problem, originally for example from 70 to 80% of the negative impacts on the environment (Williamson et al., 2006). It could represent for these authors the most promising solution. However, this projection raises the question of the willingness and capacity of SMEs to include sustainability in their business model (Spence et al., 2007). The major challenge for some of them is how to stabilize the sustainable development dimensions in their business model and in fortiori link their activities to the achievement of value-creating objectives from a social and environmental point of view (O'Neill et al., 2009).

Based on this problem, that of knowing how a symbiotic SME forges a strong sustainable orientation, the objective of this article is simple. It is a question of identifying why only a small number of SMEs are very committed to sustainable development, while in others sustainable orientation is only very weakly integrated into their strategies. To answer this question, at the first attempt it seems to make us to simply formulate this hypothesis: an SME is able to understand the actions of sustainable development when an entrepreneurial symbiosis occurs within it. At the origin of this symbiosis, the hybridization of three types of orientation or symbiont: a sustainable orientation experienced as a business opportunity; a strategic orientation that involves the simultaneous search for opportunities and strategic advantages related to sustainable development; an organizational orientation focused on the processes and activities through which SMEs wish to engage in sustainability orientation.

Through these three dimensions, this article ultimately provides the following important new contributions. First of all, it helps to expand the current literature on entrepreneurship by providing a heuristic framework of the mechanism by which the integration of the three orientations

(sustainable, strategic and organizational) mediate the relationship between entrepreneurship and sustainable development and generates a specificity called symbiotic entrepreneurship.

The study of this specificity makes the originality of our testorization because its markers deserve to be explained. The few attempts to explain will go beyond the simple description of the specificity of the entrepreneurship focused on sustainable development, by providing theoretical explanations on the emergence of symbiotic entrepreneurship which allows SMEs to innovate in order to exploit the possibilities available to them in the fields of activity related to sustainable development.

The fact that some SMEs were able to successfully endorse the symbiotic entrepreneurship model eliminates the question of its relevance and encourages us to isolate the "markers" of this specificity.

By "markers", we mean the features that are both characteristic and constitutive of a research object (Sfez, 2002). They are essential to help us fully understand symbiotic entrepreneurship since they specify, among other things, the symbiotic links that the characteristic elements of this phenomenon maintain between them and which correspond to new trends in terms of ideas and practices already in use within hundreds of SMEs.

The point that we wish to defend along the way in this article is that the legitimacy of symbiotic entrepreneurship does not emanate from the simple fact of its emergence or its adoption, but rather from the theoretical fact of adoptability, i.e. consistency with a determined set of antecedents or conditions of appearance (Mol & Birkinshaw, 2009; Vaccaro et al., 2012; Heyden, Sidhu, & Volberda, 2015). The corollary of this idea is that if symbiotic entrepreneurship has been deployed strongly among some SMEs, while in others it is only very weakly integrated into their strategies, its study ultimately requires its labeling or its theory¹. Hence the importance of decontextualizing the practical dimension of symbiotic entrepreneurship, i.e. taking an interest in its specificity as an object produced from an organized nexus of generic activities oriented towards pursuit of unique goals, those of sustainable development.

By placing our thinking around the emergence of symbiotic entrepreneurship, we focus on the appropriate conditions for the emergence of a "model of SME success" (Farsad and Ahsina, 2021). To explore this context, the following will be a question of successively presenting the different

¹ L'étiquetage fournit au passage des arguments rationnels quant à l'adoption de l'objet (Greenwood, Hinings & Suddaby, 2002; Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005). Cités par Adam-Ledunois & Damart, 2016, p.9.

orientations in order to identify the symbiotic link that binds them and by which SMEs provoke renewal or innovation within their organization.

1. Sustainable Orientation Entrepreneurship

The concept of entrepreneurial orientation refers to a range of organizational behaviors in decision-making that moves around several dimensions. The concept finds its origin in an article by Miller (1983) in which the path to entrepreneurship is studied according to the type of organization. Initially, it was reduced to the idea of creating a business, but today it suggests a broader representation oriented more towards the active search for new business opportunities (Julien et Marchesnay, 1996; Messeghem, 2002). That sustainable orientation of SMEs is part in the same direction: seizing and exploiting a new business opportunity in response to "market failures" (Cohen et Winn, 2007; Dean et McMullen, 2007), and from which the entrepreneurial process intends to continue (Fayolle 2004). This orientation cannot be explained by the sole variable of opportunity. It also derives from several other variables (Verstraete et Fayolle, 2005).

The first, does not limit the entrepreneurial process to business creation, it extends it to the development of existing organizations (Berger-Douce, 2007; Covin and Slevin, 1991; Messeghem, 2001; Lumpkin et Dess, 1996; Shane et Venkataraman, 2000; Verstraete et Saporta, 2006). The commitment of SMEs to sustainable orientation is considered in this sense as "an entrepreneurial act given its innovative and potentially value-creating character" (Spence, Ben Boubaker Gherib, et Ondoua Biwolé, 2007).

The second, considers the effort to create value and new wealth as the result of long-term sustainable behavior (Berger-Douce, 2009; Berger-Douce, 2011; Jenkins, 2009; Luetkenhorst, 2004; Martinet et Payaud, 2008; Porter et Kramer, 2006; Spence et al., 2011). Courrent et Spence (2014) explain in this regard that entrepreneurial processes can be implemented "to develop both economic results and overall performance, which includes non-financial objectives and stakeholder satisfaction".

The third, stipulates that SMEs with a sustainable orientation are those that have a strong entrepreneurial orientation and consider the principles inherent in sustainable development as attractive and feasible (Spence et al. 2007). The acceptance of these principles largely depends on the beliefs and attitudes of the owner-managers (Roxas et Coetze, 2012), convinced that it is the right thing to do (Princic et Floyd, 2003).

The fourth, explains the sustainable orientation of SMEs by the strong propensity to innovate, the strong proactivity entrepreneurial (Glaub et al., 2014)² and the tendency to take risks (Miller 1983; Lumpkin et Dess 1996; Covin et Selvin, 1991). A few studies have shown in this regard that the most innovative SMEs were also the most committed to sustainable entrepreneurship (Schaltegger et Wagner 2011; Spence et al. 2011). Sustainable behaviors, especially in SMEs, are linked to product or process innovation (MacGregor et al. 2010) and even more to organizational innovation (Jenkins, 2009; MacGregor and Fontrodona, 2011).

A fundamental idea emerges from all of these theoretical underpinnings: SMEs do not suit the sustainable orientation in a uniform way and that there are various levels of commitment stimulated by distinct motivations. These motivations are expressed more when SMEs with a sustainable orientation place their actions in a strategic perspective (Aka et Labelle, 2010; Spence, 2007; Spence et al., 2011). The intersection of entrepreneurial orientation and strategic orientation gives rise to the concept of sustainable orientation.

2. Strategically Oriented Entrepreneurship

The integration of strategic orientations more often associated with large companies is now associated with SMEs. Strategic orientation suggests that sustainable orientation is not only possible, but also beneficial. It is an orientation that involves the simultaneous search for opportunities and strategic advantages (Ireland et al., 2003) by taking entrepreneurial actions in favor of sustainable development with strategic perspectives (Ireland et al., 2003). Strategic orientation seems to affect significantly and positively. Sustainable orientation (Victor Corral-Verdugo et al., 2009), because it provides SMEs with a competitive advantage ensuring a superior positioning. This is “the ultimate objective of the strategic SME” (Josée St-Pierre, 2014).

The sustainable-oriented SME has a strategic vocation when it “achieves this through the development and marketing of innovative products and services that contribute directly to the targets of sustainable development” (Josée St-Pierre, 2014). It stands out from its competitors by the environmental policy it adopts, through the active role it plays within a network serving the

² Glaub et al. (2014) définissent la proactivité entrepreneuriale comme étant le comportement anticipatif et permanent des entrepreneurs pour améliorer les résultats de leurs entreprises (cité par Yacoubi et Tourabi, 2021, p.231). Lumpkin et Dess, (2001) l’associent à deux principales notions, à savoir le comportement dynamique et la poursuite d’opportunités d’affaires (cité par Zemzami et Mamad, 2021, p.320).

environment or sustainable development, but above all through its commitment to improving environmental and social practices (Josée St-Pierre, 2014). It is prepared to assume significant risks to identify new opportunities offered by the sustainable development niche.

Having adapted the breakdown of Carroll (1979) to the SME context, Courrent (2012) admits that only proactive SMEs voluntarily pursue a sustainable orientation and this unlike SMEs which adopt behaviors of disinterestedness, avoidance or compliance. The choice of proactivity is an eminently entrepreneurial choice: it is a strategic orientation towards new possibilities for the development of SMEs in response to environmental and social problems. With their prior knowledge of these problems, they are likely to be able to provide solutions (Belz et Binder, 2013), be in a better position to perceive opportunities focused on sustainable orientation (Belz et Binder, 2013), be able to create value for itself and for the community (Harmeling et al., 2009) and build a competitive advantage in a promising strategic niche (Asselineau et Cromarias, 2011) and not experience "difficulties in terms of stakeholder commitment to the company's objectives" (Chawki et Aït Lemqeddem, 2022). By linking the sustainable orientation to their strategic orientation, SMEs aim primarily to preserve their margins, to compensate for any loss in the creation of value (Dupuis, 2011) and ultimately to increase their chances of long-term survival (Miller, 1983; Lumpkin & Dess, 1996).

Closely linked to strategic orientation, sustainable orientation therefore aims to establish entrepreneurial behavior that refers to decision-making processes, practices and activities (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996) which will lead to voluntary and strategic entrepreneurial actions aimed at exploring and exploiting new opportunities. Having an entrepreneurial orientation is therefore a "strategic posture" (Covin & Slevin 1989) designed by a high-value organization that does not just identify and seize opportunities but acts strategically (Hitt et al., 2001). This high value is constituted when the strategic orientation of SMEs effectively combines opportunity-seeking behavior with advantage-seeking behavior by valuing these opportunities (Ireland et al., 2003). Through this combination, the sustainable orientation of exploring and exploiting new business opportunities links entrepreneurial and innovative behaviors on one hand and entrepreneurial responses to sustainability issues on the other hand.

Sustainable innovations only develop, here thanks, to an accommodation between the practices resulting from the sustainable orientation and the choices resulting from the strategic orientation, thus offering conditions conducive to innovation (Bocquet et Mothe, 2013), whose entrepreneurial

vision and management of resources from an organizational point of view would be the key to transforming the creation of value into a competitive advantage (Ireland et al., 2003).

The entrepreneurial vision is certainly driven by the entrepreneur (Carrière, 1991), but its implementation would require the mobilization of the present creative potential throughout the company (Nilsson, 1994). Sustainable orientation would therefore be the product of reflection at all levels of the organization (Asselineau et Cromarias, 2011). Verstraete (2002) presented this diffusion as the transition from entrepreneurship to management. We find here the entrepreneurial logic and the managerial logic as a central element, as in the integration of the sustainable orientation into the strategic orientation of the SME. The sustainable orientation would thus be linked to the strategic orientation as well as to conform with the organizational orientation.

3. Organizationally Oriented Entrepreneurship

The organizational orientation of entrepreneurship is centered on the process and on the organization that decides to foster and support intrapreneurial practices (Birkinshaw, 2003; Champagne et Carrier, 2004; Christensen, 2004), for the purpose of improving or making more innovative technologies and processes of the organization. Thereby, the concept of organizational orientation is strongly linked to innovation. It represents the process of creating new business within an existing SME in order to improve the profitability of the organization, increase its competitive capacity and strategically renew existing activities (Zahra, 1991). It also represents the process by which SMEs engage in sustainability orientation through new combinations of resources. This is the process of strategic renewal.

This process refers to the organization actions that lead to the design and implementation of innovations, expressed by the implementation of activities, "contributing directly to the targets of sustainable development" (Josée St-Pierre, 2014). From this perspective, organizationally oriented entrepreneurship is characterized by the expression of projective thinking (Fillon, 2007), declined as a sustainable orientation process (Belz et Binder, 2013).

The sustainable orientation model proposed by Belz and Binder (2013) has six stages. The first is the identification of environmental and social issues. The second is the recognition of an entrepreneurial opportunity to solve these problems. The third aims to align social and

environmental issues with entrepreneurial opportunities, motivated by the desire to turn this opportunity into an entrepreneurial project. The fourth aims to develop an innovative solution for the sustainable market, through improvements or combinations of existing resources leading to changes in the sustainable supply (Belz et Binder, 2013). The fifth is the creation of the new sustainable activity with superior quality products or processes that are successful on the market (Schaltegger et Wagner, 2011). The sixth stage is to position itself on a new segment or improving its position on an existing market by creating a niche. The challenge at this stage is to balance risk-taking, innovation capacity and an entrepreneurial spirit.

In the context of which we are interested, this sustainable orientation process explains how an SME is moving from a sustainable orientation and from an intention to do something to seize an opportunity and deduce a competitive advantage to an organizational orientation creating the necessary activities for that. What should be deduced from this? Essentially, the more an SME would be able to form strong links between its sustainable orientation and its organizational orientation, the more it would be able to deviate from the strategic orientation it has imagined. Without a voluntary commitment to this part, this triple orientation can have little real impact on environmental and social problems. It is clear that their construction would rather be based on symbiotic entrepreneurial logics.

Conclusion and perspectives:

Through symbiotic entrepreneurship, we wanted to place the interactions between the three sustainable, strategic and organizational orientations at the center of the innovation process and the development of a category of SMEs called symbiotic. These SMEs are endowed with both an early entrepreneurial symbiosis, allowing them to positively perceive the opportunities available to them in the fields of activities related to sustainable development, and established entrepreneurial symbiosis, allowing them to innovate in order to exploit these opportunities and consolidate their competitive position.

The symbiosis relationship is presented here as “the best entrepreneurial start-up concept” (Ann Dodor & al., 2018, p.2). It is considered the main catalyst for the creation of new generation companies. Due to the central role played by innovation, symbiotic entrepreneurship offers the advantages of creativity and competitiveness. Due to the links established between the three orientations, the organization is able to combine the key dimensions of its development (business

opportunities, innovation, ability to do, value creation) whose project preserves its margins. Symbiotic entrepreneurship can therefore allow the acceleration of development cycles as well as more flexible adaptation to market demands.

The symbiotic relationships between the three types of orientations mentioned above, namely the sustainable orientation welcomed as a business opportunity, strategic orientation which involves the simultaneous search for opportunities and strategic advantages related to sustainable development and organizational orientation centered on the processes and activities by which SMEs embark on the path of sustainable orientation, trace a close interaction between these three markers, the explanation of which has the merit of informing us about the conditions for the emergence of so-called early symbiotic entrepreneurship. These conditions are important for a number of reasons, the most important of which is that by developing symbiotic relationships between the three markers, a competitive advantage is obtained in the field of sustainable development, which might not have been possible without the company's ability to combine resources with a symbiotic intra-organizational model. Robert Doktor et Tung Bui (2018) recall in this regard that Schumpeter was precocious in his understanding of the fundamental dynamics of this entrepreneurship of opportunity: "the key concepts of what we now call opportunity entrepreneurship lie in the discovery of new combinations, unknown to others, which become the heartbeat innovations that drive successful opportunity entrepreneurship" (p.468).

It is finally this category of companies that will have to be called upon to develop symbiotic SMEs with a strong sustainable orientation. Their commitment to sustainable development is a symbiotic entrepreneurial act. Without their commitment, the sustainable development project risks becoming an "impossible project" (F. Labelle, 2008).

It is true that this research has provided a heuristic framework on the conditions for the emergence of symbiotic entrepreneurship but, on the other hand, it has not statistically established, with supporting data analysis, that there are relationships between SMEs committed to sustainable development and the three markers. The results of a field survey would therefore be very indicative of the three markers having the ability to justify the strategic positioning decided by companies. Obviously, a symbiotic relationship having a positive and significant effect on the choices of certain SMEs specializing in areas of activity related to sustainable development remains to be verified.

Practically exploring these symbiotic relationships could help answer questions that, how and why concerning the adoptability of the symbiotic entrepreneurship model by certain SMEs and to understand moreover, as pointed out by Zhou et al. (2007), the dynamic nature of a company, especially since the symbiotic relationships between markers are not static; they transform into different types as the business innovates and evolves over time. Therefore, it is essential to understand the overall dynamics (Casson Mark & al., 2007). Because leveraging the dynamics of symbiotic relationships can help SMEs in various ways, such as gaining access to other resources and capabilities held by partners (e.g. startups), by strengthening their business ecosystems and using network effects for their own interests (Ann Dodor & al., 2018, p.9). This reorientation of our study is significant, especially considering that existing studies of business ecosystems tended to focus on fragmentary aspects, such as roles and activities of partners; symbiotic relationships have not received much academic attention.

Bibliographie :

- Aka K. J. et Labelle F. (2010). La responsabilité sociétale des petites et moyennes entreprises ou La RSPME : une analyse de la littérature des dix dernières années, actes du Congrès de l'ASAC, Regina, Canada.
- Asselineau A. et Cromarias A. (2011). La RSE, un catalyseur d'innovations au service de la vision stratégique, *Revue Sciences de Gestion*, n°84, p.29–48.
- Belz, F.-M., et Binder, J.K. (2013). *Sustainability Entrepreneurship: A Process Model*. Rochester : Social Science Research Network.
- Berger-Douce S. (2007). Les stratégies d'engagement sociétal des entrepreneurs, *Revue de l'Entrepreneuriat*, Vol. 6, n° 1, p. 53-71.
- Birkinshaw, J. (2003). The Paradox of Corporate Entrepreneurship, *Strategy + Business*, 30, p.1-14.
- Bocquet R. et Mothe C. (2013). Profil des entreprises en matière de RSE et innovation technologique, *Management & Avenir*, n°66-8, p.132-151.
- Carrière J.B. (1991). La vision stratégique en contexte de PME : cadre théorique et étude empirique, *Revue internationale PME*, vol.3, n°3-4, p.301-325.
- Carroll A.B. (1979). A Three-Dimensional Conceptual Model of Corporate Performance, *Academy of Management Review*, vol.4, n°4, p.497–505.
- Casson Mark, Wadeson Nigel. The discovery of opportunities: Extending the economic theory of the entrepreneur. *Small Business Economics*. 2007 ; 28(4): 285-300.
- Champagne, D. et Carrier, C. (2004). Les études sur l'intrapreneuriat : objets d'intérêt et voies de recherche. 7ème Congrès international francophone sur la PME (CIFEPME), Montpellier, France.

Chawki A. and Aït Lemqeddem H., 2022. Strategic planning adoption by small and medium enterprises : Exploring the experience of Moroccan SMEs. *Revue Alternatives managériales et économiques*, Volume 4 : N° 2, avril 2022, 499-519.

Christensen, K. S. (2004). A Classification of the Corporate Entrepreneurship Umbrella: Labels and Perspectives. *International Journal of Management Enterprise Development*, 1 (4), p.301–315.

Cohen B., et Winn M.L. (2007). Market imperfections, opportunity and sustainable entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 22, No. 1, p. 29-49.

Corral-Verdugo, V., Bonnes, M., Tapia-Fonllem, C., Fraijo-Sing, B., Frias-Armenta, M. et Carrus, G. (2009). Correlates of pro-sustainability orientation: The affinity towards diversity. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, (29), p.34-43.

Courrent J.M. (2012). RSE et développement durable en PME, De Boeck Supérieur, Bruxelles.

Courrent J.-M. et Spence M. (2014). Orientation entrepreneuriale et engagement des PME dans des logiques de développement durable, in « Entrepreneuriat, développement durable et territoire. Approches contextualisées », Sous la direction de Guillouzo R., Chapitre 5, Edition Hachette Supérieur.

Covin J.G. et Slevin D. P. (1991). A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as firm behavior, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol.16, N° 1, p.7-25.

Covin, J.G. & D.P Slevin. (1989). Strategie management of small firms in hostile and benign environments, *Strategie Management Journal*, 10(1), p.75-87.

Dean T.J. et McMullen J.S. (2007). Toward a theory of sustainable entrepreneurship: Reducing environmental degradation through entrepreneurial action, *Journal of Business Venturing*, vol.22, N°1, p.50–76.

Dodor A., Li C., Gumah Akolgo I. & Quacoe D. (2018). Effect of Symbiotic Relationship on Self-organized Startup Entrepreneurship, an Innovative Synergy. *Journal of Economics, Management and Trade*, 21(4) : 1-13, 2018.

Doktor R. & Bui T. (2018). Editorial : The symbiotic relationship of entrepreneurship and information technology. *Int. J. Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, Vol. 33, No. 4, p.467-471.

Dupuis J.C. (2011). Le management responsable. Un modèle de gestion de l'obsolescence morale, *Revue Française de Gestion*, vol.37, n°215, p.69–85.

Farsad M. et Ahsina K. (2021). Modèle de la réussite des PME : Une revue narrative de la littérature sur les facteurs de succès et d'échec des PME », *Revue Alternatives managériales et économiques*, Volume 3 : N° 2, avril 2021, 318-337.

Fayolle A. (2004). Entrepreneuriat – apprendre à entreprendre, in Verstraete T. et Fayolle A. « Paradigmes et entrepreneuriat », *Revue de l'Entrepreneuriat*, Vol. 4, n°1, p. 33-52.

Filion, L.J. (2007). Pratique intrapreneuriale et visionnisme. Dans Filion, L.J. (dir.) Management des PME. Montréal : ERPI ; Paris : Pearson Education, p.445-460.

Harmeling S.S., Sarasvathy S.D. et Freeman R.E. (2009). Related Debates in Ethics and Entrepreneurship: Values, Opportunities, and Contingency, Journal of Business Ethics, vol.84, n°3, p.341-365.

Heyden, M. L. M., Sidhu, J. S., & Volberda, H. W. 2015. The Conjoint Influence of Top and Middle Management Characteristics on Management Innovation. Journal of Management, Published .

Hitt, M. A., Ireland, R. D., Camp, S. M., et D. L. Sexton (2001). Strategic entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial strategies for wealth creation, Strategic management journal, 22/6-7, p.479- 491.

Ireland, R.D., Hitt, M.A., & Sirmon, D.G. (2003). A model of strategic entrepreneurship: The construct and its dimensions ». Journal of Management, Vol. 29(6), p.963-989.

Jenkins H. (2009). A 'business opportunity' model of corporate social responsibility for small and medium sized enterprises, Business ethics: A European review, Vol. 18, n° 1, p.21-36.

Josée St-Pierre (2014). La Boussole de la durabilité pour les PME, INFOPME, Volume 14 – N°3, Septembre 2014, LAREPE Québec Canada.

Julien P.-A., et Marchesnay M. (1996). L'Entrepreneuriat, in Berger-Douce (2007), « Les stratégies d'engagement sociétal des entrepreneurs », Revue de l'Entrepreneuriat, Vol. 6, n° 1, p.53-71.

Labelle, F. (2008). La PME et le développement durable (DD): une démarche qui améliore les capacités d'innovation des entrepreneurs. Communication présentée à la CIFEPME-2008. <http://airepme.org/images/File/2008/C70.pdf>.

Lumpkin G. T. et Dess G. G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance, Academy of management review. Vol. 21, N°1, p.135-172.

MacGregor S. P. et Fontrodona J. (2011). Strategic CSR for SMEs: paradox or possibility ?, Universia Business Review, p.80-94.

Messeghem K. (2001). Peut-on concilier logiques managériale et entrepreneuriale en PME ?, actes de la 10ème Conférence de l'Association Internationale de Management Stratégique, Québec, Canada.

Messeghem K. (2002). Peut-on concilier logiques managériales et entrepreneuriales en PME ?, Direction et gestion, n° 194.

Miller D. (1983). The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms, Management science, Vol. 29, n° 7, p.770-791.

Nilsson W.B. (1994). Developing opportunity windows through creativity enhancements: 21st century style, The Canadian Manager, vol.19, n°2, p.24-25.

- O'Neill G.D., Hershauer J.C. et Golden J.S. (2009). The cultural context of sustainability entrepreneurship. *Greener Management International*, Vol. 55, p. 33-46.
- Patzelt H. et Shepherd D.A. (2010). Recognizing opportunities for sustainable development. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* (Online first).
- Princic, L., et Floyd, M. (2003). Engaging small business in corporate social responsibility: a Canadian small business perspective on CSR. *Canadian Business for Social Responsibility*, 21, 34-41.
- Roxas, B., et Coetzer, A. (2012). Institutional environment, managerial attitudes and environmental sustainability orientation of small firms. *Journal of business ethics*, 111(4), p.461-476.
- Schaltegger S. et Wagner M. (2011). Sustainable Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Innovation: Categories and interactions, *Business Strategy and the Environment*, Vol. 20, n°4, p. 222-237.
- Shane S. et Venkataraman S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 25, n°1, p. 217-226.
- Spence L. (2007). CSR and Small Business in a European Policy Context: The Five "C"s of CSR and Small Business Research Agenda 2007, *Business and Society Review*, Vol. 112, n°4, p.533-552.
- Spence M., Gherib J. B. et Biwolé V. O. (2011). Is Entrepreneurial will Enough? A North– South Comparison, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 99, n° 3, p.335-367.
- Spence, M., Ben Boubaker Gherib, J., et Ondoua Biwolé, V. (2007). Développement durable et PME: une étude exploratoire des déterminants de leur engagement. *Revue internationale PME*, 20(3-4), p.17-42.
- Spence, M., Biwolé, V. O., et Gherib, J. B. B. (2007). Une étude exploratoire des fondements du degré d'engagement des PME dans le développement durable. Ottawa : Université d'Ottawa, École de gestion.
- Vaccaro, I. G., Jansen, J. J. P., Van Den Bosch, F. A., & Volberda, H. W. 2012. Management innovation and leadership : The moderating role of organizational size. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49 :28-51.
- Verstraete T. et Fayolle A. (2005), « Paradigmes et entrepreneuriat », *Revue de l'Entrepreneuriat*, Vol. 4, n°1, p. 33-52.
- Verstraete T. et Saporta B. (2006). *Création d'entreprise et entrepreneuriat*, Editions de l'ADREG.
- Williamson D., Lynch-Wood G. et Ramsay J. (2006), « Drivers of environmental behaviour in manufacturing Sme and the implications for CSR », *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol.67, N°3, p.317–330.

Yacoubi L. et Tourabi A., 2021. Résilience psychologique de l'entrepreneur et résilience organisationnelle de la PME: élaboration d'un cadre conceptuel. *Revue Alternatives managériales et économiques*, Volume 3 : N° 2, avril 2021, 220-238.

York J.G. et Venkataraman S., (2010). The entrepreneur-environment nexus: Uncertainty, innovation and allocation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 2010, Vol. 25, No. 5, p. 449-463.

Zahra, S. A. (1991). Predictors and Financial Outcomes of Corporate Entrepreneurship: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 6 (4), 259-285.

Zemzami I. et Mamad M., 2021. Culture et proactivité organisationnelle. *Revue Alternatives managériales et économiques*, Volume 3 : N° 4, octobre 2021, 316-332.

Zhou Lianxi, Wu Wei-ping, Luo Xueming. Internationalization and the performance of born-global SMEs: The mediating role of social networks. *Journal of International Business Studies*. 2007 ; 38(4) : 673-690.