

**Enterprise creation from the angle of duality:
“necessity entrepreneurship/opportunity entrepreneurship”
An exhaustive review of the literature**

AZZI Zahoua ¹

¹ Laboratory : Management, Governance, Innovation, and Organizational Performance (M.A.G.I.P.O) Higher school of Commerce, Algérie, etd_zahazzi@esc-alger.dz

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received:29/01/2024

Accepted:12/12/2024

Online:31/12/2024

Keywords:

Entrepreneurship,

Nécessité,

Opportunité,

Push motivation,

Pull motivation,

JEL Code: M13; L32

ABSTRACT

This article aims to review the literature on necessity entrepreneurship and opportunity entrepreneurship, emphasizing the importance of understanding the specificities of this classification. Because it will contribute more to the effectiveness and relevance of public policies, indeed the entrepreneurial aid programs (support, financing, training, etc.) should be differed considerably between these two types of entrepreneurs. Through the use of a personalized approach and appropriate to each type of entrepreneur, rather than using a generalist approach that does not distinguish between opportunistic entrepreneurial logics and those based on necessity.

**La création d'entreprises sous l'angle de la dualité : « Entrepreneuriat de
nécessité/Entrepreneuriat d'opportunité »
Une revue exhaustive de la littérature**

AZZI Zahoua ¹

¹ / Laboratoire : Management, Gouvernance, Innovation et Performance des Organisations (M.A.G.I.P.O) École Supérieure de Commerce, Algérie, etd_zahazzi@esc-alger.dz

ARTICLE INFO

Reçu:29/01/2024

Accepté:12/12/2024

En ligne:31/12/2024

Mots clés:

Entrepreneuriat,

Nécessité,

Opportunité.

Motivation push,

Motivation pull,

Code JEL: M13; L32

RÉSUMÉ

L'objectif de cet article est d'analyser la littérature sur l'entrepreneuriat de nécessité et l'entrepreneuriat d'opportunité, en insistant sur l'importance de comprendre les particularités de ces deux classifications. Cette compréhension peut aider à améliorer l'efficacité et la pertinence des politiques publiques en la matière. En effet, il est important de différencier significativement les programmes d'aide aux entrepreneurs tels que l'accompagnement, le financement et la formation, en utilisant une approche personnalisée et adaptée à chaque typologie d'entrepreneur. Plutôt que d'adopter une approche généraliste qui ne distingue pas les logiques entrepreneuriales opportunistes et celles fondées sur la nécessité, cette approche permettra de mieux répondre aux besoins spécifiques de chaque type d'entrepreneur.

- INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship research is expanding rapidly and attracting increasing attention from researchers, practitioners, and policymakers. It emphasizes the central role of entrepreneurship in economic growth and job creation (Bhola & Verheul, 2006). However, despite the significant contributions of research in this field, some researchers believe that the scientific study of entrepreneurship is still in its early stages. Furthermore, these contributions are no longer sufficient to develop a deep understanding of an increasingly complex phenomenon, addressing several elements and levels of study covered by different disciplines.

The field still raises many questions to be addressed and several research questions remain unanswered. According to (Gódány, Ladislav, Renata, & Tibor, 2021) these questions are related to the entrepreneurial environment, which encourages or hinders entrepreneurial activity, but also to the attitude and aspirations of entrepreneurs, entrepreneurial behavior, potential, and motivation to start a business.

The forces that motivate people to become entrepreneurs are among the questions that remain poorly understood, although they are important for understanding entrepreneurship (Bhola & Verheul, 2006). Indeed, for an individual, the decision to start a business and become an entrepreneur is a major decision in their life. This is why researchers have been interested in studying the various motivations and motives that lead individuals to engage in entrepreneurial activities (McMullen, Bagby, & Palich, 2008). According to the literature, not all individuals who become entrepreneurs react uniformly to their environment. In general, it considers that starting a business can be chosen or undergone (Gabarret & Vedel, 2015). In other words, the decision to start a business by an individual can be triggered by attraction factors, or by push factors.

Based on the distinction between being pushed or pulled towards entrepreneurship, one of the most important motivational classifications in the field of entrepreneurship is that expressed by the push/pull motivations (Reynolds, et al., 2005), (Block & Wagner, 2010). These authors argue that when referring to these two types of entrepreneurial motivations, the entrepreneurial act is often represented in a dichotomous way: as a choice between entrepreneurship out of necessity or out of opportunity.

This dichotomy was used in the study of (Reynolds P. , Camp, Bygrave, Autio, & Hay, 2001) conducted in the framework of the work provided by the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) which was interested in the new factors of decision-making of business creation. According to the authors, some people voluntarily engage in the creation of new businesses in order to pursue business opportunities for their own interests. This category of entrepreneurs engage in opportunity entrepreneurship. On the other hand, other people engage in the creation of new businesses, because they have no better alternative, and they perceive this entrepreneurial action as the best option available to employ themselves. Although they do not necessarily prefer this option, this category of entrepreneurs engage in necessity entrepreneurship (Reynolds P. , Camp, Bygrave, Autio, & Hay, 2001).

Since the appearance of this distinction between necessity entrepreneurship and opportunity entrepreneurship, its use has become dominant in the entrepreneurship literature, making this subject a highly studied theme in recent years. The classification has also been used under the terms disadvantaged/innovative entrepreneurship (Ritsilä & Tervo, 2002) and constrained/voluntary entrepreneurship .

Since its appearance, researchers have found that there are several differences between the two types of entrepreneurship. Some studies have focused on the initial profiles of individuals who engage in entrepreneurship. While other studies are interested in establishing relationships between initial motivations and different entrepreneurial behaviors between the two types of entrepreneurs during the realization of their projects (Zoumba, 2017). Based on these elements, two questions arise: how do the characteristics and behaviors of necessity entrepreneurs differ compared to those of opportunity entrepreneurs? And to what extent will the distinction between necessity/opportunity entrepreneurs contribute further to the design of effective public policies to promote entrepreneurship?

The objective of our research is to examine the literature regarding the distinctive characteristics of necessity entrepreneurship and opportunity entrepreneurship. Initially, we will present the motivations related to necessity entrepreneurs and those of opportunity entrepreneurs using the "push and pull" categorization approach. Then, we will attempt to present the differences between the two types of entrepreneurship. Finally, we will discuss the contribution of the distinction between the two types of entrepreneurship in the design of public policies aimed at promoting entrepreneurship.

I.MOTIVATIONS OF NECESSITY/OPPORTUNITY ENTREPRENEURS ACCORDING TO THE "PUSH AND PULL" THEORY

Motivation is generally understood as "the cause that explains human behavior" (Fenouillet, 2016). Other researchers such as (McClelland, 1953) (Maslow, 1954), (Herzberg, 1959) have interpreted it as an impulse that either aims at satisfying a need or achieving predetermined goals. In management sciences, motivation occupies a preponderant place in the field of entrepreneurship as it translates the links between the activation of the individual's internal energy and his orientation towards the creation of a business. According to (Carsrud & Brännback, 2011) individuals who decide to create new businesses are significantly motivated by a number of factors, which are either of economic nature such as unemployment, the absence of other economic perspectives, ..., etc., or social such as the help of society, the desire for work-life balance, ..., etc., or finally psychological or personal such as the desire for independence, autonomy, need for fulfillment, desire for success, ..., etc., or motivated by these three aspects combined.

For a long time, the literature on entrepreneurial motivation has considered that the decision to create a business is triggered by one of two types of factors (attraction factors and push factors):

- Pull factors relate to motivations driven by "desirable" reasons, such as the possibility of seizing an opportunity, working autonomously and/or having greater control over work. Alternatively, they may be fueled by the desire to be socially active, with the aim of achieving social goals (Yitshaki & Kropp, 2015)
- Push factors, they can be associated with personal or external factors. They refer to the aspects of a "forced" decision. People are pushed towards entrepreneurship because they have fewer opportunities in the labor market, or because they are not satisfied in their work.

This distinction was developed by (Shapero, 1975) in his famous model "the formation of the entrepreneurial event". The model aims to study the "why" or the life events of a person that push them towards entrepreneurship rather than towards another professional path. According to this model, the start-up of a new business is a consequence of a major change in the individual's personal situation. This situation is called "displacement", it is associated with the psychological characteristics of the individual as well as the contextual factors of his environment. This change leads to the individual's intention to start a business, it is generated by an event:

- Negative (family obligations or low family income, divorce, layoff, job dissatisfaction due to, for example, a bad atmosphere, bad relationship with management, etc.).
- Positive which can be (need for independence, personal fulfillment, desire for wealth, challenge, ambition, the desire to take on a personal challenge, power, opportunities, etc.).

Following this perspective, several authors such as (Watkins, 1976), (Vesper, 1980), (Gilad & Levine, 1986) have developed a theory on entrepreneurial motivations called "Push and Pull". This theory argues that entrepreneurship is considered to be either chosen or forced, that is, the creation of entrepreneurial activities is linked to both types of motivation, "pull" linked to positive displacements and the motivations for creation "push" linked to negative displacements (Shapero & Sokol, 1982).

II.From Push-Pull Motivations To The Necessity/Opportunity Dichotomy

Entrepreneurship is considered "opportunity-based" in the case where the entrepreneur's motivations are of the "pull" type, and "necessity-based" in the case where the entrepreneur's motivations are of the "push" type. The notions of necessity entrepreneurship and opportunity entrepreneurship were examined in the framework of the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (Reynolds P., Camp, Bygrave, Autio, & Hay, 2001), which sought to distinguish entrepreneurial processes based on the type of "push" and "pull" motivation of entrepreneurs.

Since the emergence of this dichotomous classification, its use has become increasingly common in contemporary research on entrepreneurship. This distinction remains dominant and is widely used in management science studies, in particular in surveys conducted by the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM), which examines the new psychological and economic factors that influence the decision to start a business.

Necessity entrepreneurship is defined as the act of starting and growing a new business, perceiving this choice as the best available option for one's professional career, without necessarily preferring this option. The necessity entrepreneur decides to start their business without a prior plan, meaning that the individual becomes an entrepreneur but without truly having decided to do so. This decision is made in order to meet a purely economic need, and to obtain a better income. This category of business creators engages in the absence of better options and is often motivated by "negative" factors or events such as the absence of work due to a layoff or unemployment, professional dissatisfaction, divorce, a need for professional flexibility, insecurity in the current job, a need for social recognition, etc. (Bayad, El fenne, &

Ferry, 2016). Entrepreneurs of the "necessity" type are often considered to be people who are rejected or marginalized by society, seeking to prove their worth through entrepreneurship, as highlighted by (Galid & Levine, 1986).

In contrast, opportunity entrepreneurship refers to individuals who have "pull" motivations, who have engaged in the creation of new businesses in order to pursue business opportunities for their own interests. It is a voluntary entrepreneurial participation (Reynolds P., Camp, Bygrave, Autio, & Hay, 2001). In this category of entrepreneurship, the individual decides to start an entrepreneurial activity due to "positive" factors such as the desire for independence, autonomy, fulfillment, wealth, the discovery of a market opportunity, etc. (Giacomin, Janssen, Guyot, & Lohest, 2010).

It is important to note that the relevance of the dichotomy (necessity and opportunity) is justified by its success on a global scale thanks to its simplicity and ease of application. Nowadays, the distinction between necessity entrepreneurship and opportunity entrepreneurship is becoming increasingly important because the clarity between the "push" and "pull" factors is very important for designing an effective entrepreneurship policy, especially for the startup phase. Indeed, in many industrialized countries, economic policy differs significantly between these two types of entrepreneurs (Block & Wagner, 2010).

IV. Distinctive Characteristics Between Necessity And Opportunity Entrepreneurship

Since the distinction between necessity and opportunity entrepreneurship by GEM, entrepreneurship researchers have sought to determine the distinctive characteristics of each type of entrepreneurship. Some of this work has examined the macroeconomic impact of these two types of entrepreneurship. While other studies have adopted a microeconomic approach that focuses on the differences in terms of socio-economic characteristics between the two profiles of creators.

IV.1. The Macroeconomic Approach

The approach is interested in the macroeconomic impact of necessity and opportunity entrepreneurship, especially in terms of economic growth and development of the country, as well as job creation, innovation, etc.

Necessity entrepreneurship is considered by (Henrekson & Steven, 2004) as a "second-order" entrepreneurship because it does not have a significant impact on the economic growth of the country. It is often present in less developed countries, while opportunity entrepreneurship is considered a "first-order" entrepreneurship, as it is linked to innovation, growth, and economic development of the country. It is often present in developed countries.

The literature on necessity and opportunity entrepreneurship shows that these different types of entrepreneurs have distinct behaviors in terms of objectives, such as growth, innovation, success, job creation, survival rate of the business and/or profitability, as well as in the choice of business sectors (Verheul, Thurik, Hessels, & Van der Zwan, 2010).

According to McMullen, Bagby, and Palich (2008), these differences can be explained by several factors, including the fact that necessity-driven entrepreneurs often lack the resources and capabilities to take advantage of opportunities. They are more sensitive to costs and fear of failure. In contrast, opportunity-driven entrepreneurs generally have access to extensive resources and are able to seize opportunities. They are therefore more likely to take risks and enjoy the freedom of decision-making to pursue self-fulfillment.

Indeed, several researchers have shown that necessity entrepreneurs are less likely to be involved in product innovation than opportunity entrepreneurs. Studies conducted by Hessels, Van Gelderen, and Thurik (2008) showed that opportunity entrepreneurs are much more likely to contribute to innovation than necessity entrepreneurs. These latter create businesses that are characterized by a low level of innovation and tend to imitate existing activities on the market to minimize risks and ensure the survival of their business.

Opportunity entrepreneurs have a greater ambition than necessity entrepreneurs in terms of creating new jobs (Reynolds, Camp, Bygrave, Autio, & Hay, 2002). However, this should not neglect the significant role of necessity entrepreneurship in reducing the unemployment rate. Public policies are interested in this type of entrepreneurship as an alternative professional insertion to support unemployed individuals who are unable to find a job through traditional recruitment.

According to (Shane, Locke, & Collins, 2003), if motivations play a role in the evolution of the company, they can also influence the sectoral choice of the creator. These sectoral differences were highlighted by (Giacomin, Janssen, Guyot, & Lohest, 2010) in their study on a sample of 538 business creators. These researchers used the terms (constraint and voluntary) instead of (necessity and opportunity), and they demonstrated that necessity and opportunity motivations

have a significant impact on the sectoral choice made by the individual. According to the authors, entrepreneurs primarily motivated by reasons of constraint have a higher probability of creating in sectors with low barriers to entry, such as trade, catering, and services. In contrast, entrepreneurs primarily motivated by voluntary reasons have a higher probability of creating innovative, profitable, and/or high-growth sectors, such as finance and industry.

On their side, (Reynolds P., Camp, Bygrave, Autio, & Hay, 2001) showed in their work that the percentage of necessity entrepreneurs is higher in the sectors of agriculture, forestry, fishing, and catering, compared to opportunity entrepreneurs, who seem to be more present in the sectors of automotive and business services.

(Lia, Huangb, & Songc, 2020) states that opportunity entrepreneurship is linked to highly growth-oriented and high-technology businesses, while necessity entrepreneurship involves low-technology businesses, with less advanced or relatively unsophisticated technological development or equipment.

IV.2. Microeconomic Approach

Other previous work on necessity and opportunity entrepreneurship adopts a microeconomic (individual) approach focused on the business creator. This approach has shown that necessity entrepreneurs differ from opportunity entrepreneurs in terms of individual characteristics. Several researchers such as (Block & Wagner, 2010), have highlighted the differences between the two types of entrepreneurs. Concerning socio-economic characteristics, particularly with regard to age, gender, professional experience and level education, and "role model," etc.

Most of these studies converge to conclude that necessity entrepreneurs, compared to opportunity entrepreneurs, are characterized by an older age, a lower level of education with few degrees, and in particular, a lower social and human capital than opportunity entrepreneurs. They also have less work experience, less ability to identify and exploit entrepreneurial opportunities, and a limited, or even nonexistent, entrepreneurial network compared to opportunity entrepreneurs. In addition, they are less likely to have a family role model (Bhola & Verheul, 2006), necessity entrepreneurs are distinguished by the fact that the majority of them are women, immigrants, rural residents, and unemployed and that the household income of their households seems to be lower than that of opportunity entrepreneurs.

Finally, in terms of personality factors and perceptions of obstacles, necessity entrepreneurs are more likely to be influenced by the perception of obstacles, administrative complexities, including a lack of financial support, difficulties in obtaining enough information about their project, and an unfavorable economic climate. In addition, necessity entrepreneurs are less willing to take risks and risk failure, which may be related to the reason for starting their own business, that is, they have no other employment option to support their needs (Zwan, Thurik, Verheul, & Hessels, 2016).

TABLEAU. 3 : SYNTHESIS OF THE ELEMENTS OF THE LITERATURE ON THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN NECESSITY ENTREPRENEURS (NE) AND OPPORTUNITY ENTREPRENEURS (OE)

OPPORTUNITY ENTREPRENEURS (OE)			
Characteristic	Hypothesis	Researchers	
Impact on economic development	Necessity entrepreneurs (NE) have a lower impact on economic development than opportunity entrepreneurs (OE)	(Acs, 2006)	
Business cycle	Opportunity entrepreneurs (OE) lead the business cycle of two years, while necessity entrepreneurs (NE) lead the business cycle of one year only	Koellinger and Thurik (2012)	
Goals	Exportation/croissance/innovation	Opportunity entrepreneurs (OE) are more oriented towards export, growth, and innovation goals, while necessity entrepreneurs (NE) are oriented towards imitation	Hessels, Van Gelderen, and Thurik (2008); Hechavarria and Reynolds (2009);
	Imitation		McMullen, Bagby, and Palich (2008)
	Strategy	Opportunity entrepreneurs (OE) are more oriented towards differentiation strategies, while necessity entrepreneurs (NE) are oriented towards cost leadership strategies	(Block et al.,2015)
	Job creation	Opportunity entrepreneurs (OE) have a higher ambition towards job creation than necessity entrepreneurs (NE)	Reynolds et al. (2002); Morris et al. (2006); Hechavarria and Reynolds (2009)
	Profitability	Opportunity entrepreneurs (OE) are more profitable than necessity entrepreneurs (NE)	Block and Wagner (2006); Block and Sandner (2009)
Activity area	Opportunity entrepreneurs (OE) operate in technology, automotive, and service sectors, while necessity entrepreneurs (NE) operate in agriculture, forestry, fishing, and hospitality, retail sectors	Reynolds and al. (2001); Hughes (2006); Caliendo and Kritikos (2009); Giacomini et al. (2016)	
Business creation procedures	Opportunity entrepreneurs (OE) are more active (take more actions) than necessity entrepreneurs (NE)	Guzman and Santos (2001); Giacomini and al. (2016); Van der Zwan e and al. (2016)	

Age	EO are older than EN	(Reynolds et al.,2001); (Block and Sandner, 2009); (Block & Wagner,2010);(Verheul et al., 2010); (Fossen and Buttner, 2013)
Sex	Men are more likely to become EO than to be EN	(Reynolds et al.,2001); (Block and Sandner, 2009); (Block & Wagner,2010);(Verheul et al., 2010); (Fossen and Buttner, 2013)
Level of education	ON est moins éduqués que les EO	(Bhola and al.,2006) ; (Fossen and Buttner 2013 ; (Stephan et al., 2015)
Household income	Household income appears to be higher among EOs than among ENs	(Bergmann et Sternberg, 2007) ; (Xavier-Oliveira et al., 2015)
Professional experience	EOs have more relevant professional experience than ENs	(Caliendo & Kritikos, 2009) ; (Robichaud and al.,2010)
Attitude towards obstacles or perception of obstacles	EN perceive and encounter obstacles to starting a business more than EO	(Verheul and al., 2010) ; (Bhola and al., 2006); (Van der Zwan and al., 2016)

Source: Emerged from previous research

IV. 3.The Importance of Distinguishing Between the Two Types of Entrepreneurs

A better understanding of the distinctive characteristics of the two types of entrepreneurs can help policymakers identify segments of entrepreneurship that require specific support and intervention. This can be done by qualifying the real needs of each type of business creator and adapting an adequate offer in terms of public support, training, financing, etc. This understanding also allows policymakers to redirect public policy strategies towards the type of entrepreneurship targeted, depending on the resources and means available, as well as the objectives set. For example, encouraging creative entrepreneurship is about stimulating opportunity entrepreneurship. On the other hand, encouraging the unemployed to start a business will benefit necessity entrepreneurs (Bhola & Verheul, 2006).

Indeed, in several countries around the world, such as Germany, the entrepreneurship situation is specific, insofar as the policies aimed at encouraging entrepreneurship differ between necessity and opportunity entrepreneurs because they are aware that the policies that are effective for the two types are not the same. (Bayad, El Fenne, & Ferry, 2016). For example, a specific encouragement program may be appropriate for opportunity-motivated entrepreneurs, but not for necessity-motivated entrepreneurs. In other words, policies that are effective for necessity-oriented entrepreneurs are likely not to be valid for opportunity-oriented entrepreneurs, and vice versa (Bergmann & Sternberg, 2007).

The German government is an interesting case in that it recognizes the differences between opportunity and necessity entrepreneurs and develops specific programs for these two groups. It offers public grants to promote entrepreneurship as a way out of unemployment, and thus primarily supports necessity entrepreneurs. The goal of this program is to withdraw unemployment benefits from participants. However, given that start-up grants and formal education are public expenditures, it is important to know whether the start-up program allows participating nascent entrepreneurs to use their education productively.

(Amit & Muller, 2013) also, consider that the distinction between necessity and opportunity entrepreneurs can help venture capitalists validate potential entrepreneurs to finance. Indeed, one of the most difficult tasks for them is to assess an entrepreneur's ability to turn an idea into a viable business. By focusing on the entrepreneur's motivation in the context of their attributes rather than their characteristics alone, they are likely to improve their ability to choose the winners.

V. Weaknesses of the push/pull approach

According to (Gabarret & Vedel, 2015), the main question that arises after the theoretical development of necessity and opportunity entrepreneurship is the following: to what extent is the classic dichotomy of entrepreneurial motivation in its push/pull approach, necessity/opportunity, capable of interpreting the motivation of these new profiles of business creators? However, although the dichotomy between necessity and opportunity entrepreneurship offers an interesting interpretive model for the analysis of entrepreneurial motivation, the model has been criticized by some researchers.

(Rouse & Daellenbach, 1999) consider that the push/pull (or necessity/opportunity) model is weak and too simple is unable to explain the motivations of entrepreneurs, which are complex and not the same for all entrepreneurs. They are influenced by several factors, such as the culture, values, and ideologies of the society of origin, as well as the level of innovation in the country, among others. These factors make it very difficult to treat entrepreneurial motivations in a too simplistic way.

(Hughes, 2003) points out that the use of this model causes problems in the interpretation of research results on entrepreneurial motivations. This misinterpretation causes contradictions in scientific research, for example for some variables that researchers consider to be factors that attract individuals to entrepreneurship, i.e. "pull motivations", such as "the desire for independence", for others are interpreted by "the lack of independence in the previous job", that is to say, classified as factors that will push individuals towards entrepreneurship "push motivations". Similarly, in the classification of the GEM study, the factor "the desire to be your boss", is classified as a "pull" factor, while other authors consider it to be a "push" factor.

(Arias & Pena, 2010), criticized the static dualistic representation of entrepreneurs as being oriented only to opportunity or necessity. They consider that the boundary between "opportunity entrepreneurs" and "necessity entrepreneurs" is not always obvious, because their motivations are not two distinct or separate motivations, but rather a mixture of positive and negative motivations. On the other hand, (Verheul, Thurik, Hessels, & Van der Zwan, 2010) consider entrepreneurial motivation as a push/pull continuum and then propose to study and classify entrepreneurs into three groups: those under push motivation, those of the pull motivation and finally those whose motivations are mixed (mixed motivation).

To get out of ambivalence of the interpretation of the push-pull model (Gabarret & Vedel, 2015) tried to recompose it to make it more representative of the different entrepreneurial situations observed. For this, they proposed a double grid with many combinations of motivational factors. They have integrated other dimensions into the push-pull dichotomy to help better understand the motivation to start a business of a wider and more heterogeneous population. This grid offers a cross-reading of entrepreneurial motivations by distinguishing on the one hand economic and non-economic motivations, and on the other hand negative and positive motivational factors.

VI. CONCLUSION

In our article, we based ourselves on the necessity/ opportunity entrepreneurship classification, proposed by GEM, and we carried out, from a broad literature review, an analysis of the motivations relating to necessity entrepreneurs and those of opportunity entrepreneurs from the angle of the categorization "push and pull". Then, we presented the differences between the two types of entrepreneurship. Subsequently, we discussed the importance of distinguishing between the two entrepreneurial processes (necessity and opportunity) in designing policies and promoting entrepreneurship.

Indeed, in Algeria, like other underdeveloped countries, public policies do not take into account the motivational profiles of entrepreneurs. In other words, they do not distinguish between opportunistic entrepreneurial logic and those based on necessity. The programs of assistance and accompaniment followed, seem to be most often generalist and not specific to each type of entrepreneur. It is therefore very important to distinguish between these two types to develop adequate policies to support entrepreneurship of opportunity and necessity.

Therefore, our study gives keys to understanding the entrepreneurial motivation of necessity and opportunity, opportunity. This allows public policies, institutional bodies and private sector actors interested in business creation to more accurately analyze entrepreneurial motivation. By understanding the motivations that drive or attract individuals to start businesses, it is possible to explain and categorize the types of business creation, as well as the survival and performance of businesses created.

Thus, for greater effectiveness and relevance of public policies, entrepreneurial assistance programs such as support, financing, training, and management capacity building, should be significantly differentiated between these two types of entrepreneurs using a personalized approach adapted to each type of entrepreneur (by opportunity and necessity). It is therefore preferable to use a specific approach rather than a generalist approach that does not distinguish between opportunistic entrepreneurial logic and those based on necessity.

REFERENCES

- [1] Arias, A., & Pena, I. (2010). The effect of entrepreneurs' motivation and the local economic environment on young venture performance. *International Journal of Business Environment*, 3(1), 38-56.
- [2] Amit, R., & Muller, E. (1995). Push" and "Pull" Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*(12), 64-80.
- [3] Azmi, K. (2017). Exploration de l'acte de création d'entreprises à la lumière du continuum : « Entrepreneuriat de nécessité »-« Entrepreneuriat d'opportunité. *Moroccan Journal of Entrepreneurship, Innovation and Management (MJEIM)*, 2(2).
- [4] Bayad, M., El fenne, A., & Ferry, A. (2016). Porteurs de projet en recherche d'un nouvel emploi et entrepreneuriat : sortir de la dichotomie opportunité/nécessité. *Revue de l'Entrepreneuriat*, 15(3-4), 205-229.
- [5] Bergmann, H., & Sternberg, R. (2007). The changing face of entrepreneurship in Germany. *Small Business Economics*(28), 205–221.
- [6] Bhola, R., & Verheul, I. (2006, September). Explaining engagement levels of opportunity and necessity entrepreneurs. *Zoetermeer*.
- [7] Block, J. H., & Wagner, M. (2010). Necessity and Opportunity Entrepreneurs in Germany: Characteristics and Earnings Differentials. *Schmalenbach Bus Rev* 62, 154-174.
- [8] Carsrud, A., & Brännback, M. (2011). Entrepreneurial Motivations: What Do We Still Need to Know? *Journal of Small Business Management*, 1(49), 9-26.
- [9] Chabaud, D., & Jean-Michel, D. (2016). Croître ou ne pas croître : une question de dirigeant ? *Entreprendre & Innover*, 1 (28), 18 à 27 .
- [10] Fenouillet, F. (2016). Les théories de la motivation. Paris: Dunod.
- [11] Gabarret, I., & Vedel, B. (2015). Pour une nouvelle approche de la motivation entrepreneuriale. *La Revue des Sciences de Gestion*, 1(271), 13-20.
- [12] Galid, B. L., & Levine, P. (1986). A behavioural model of entrepreneurial supply. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 24(4), 45–53.
- [13] Gartner, W. (1989). Who is an entrepreneur? is the wrong question. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 13(3), 47-67.
- [14] Gódány, Z., Ladislav, M., Renata, M., & Tibor, Z. (2021, February). Entrepreneurship Motivation in the 21st Century in Terms of Pull and Push Factors. *TEM Journal*, 10, Pages 334-342..
- [15] Henrekson, M., & Steven, D. (2004). Tax Effects on Work Activity, Industry Mix and Shadow Economy Size: Evidence from Rich-Country Comparisons,". *NBER Working Papers* 10509.
- [16] Herzberg, F. (1959). The motivation to work. Wiley, NewYork.
- [17] Hessels, J., Van Gelderen, M., & Thurik, R. (2008). Entrepreneurial Aspirations, Motivations, and their Drivers. *Small Business Economics*, 323-339.
- [18] Hughes, K. (2003). Pushed or Pulled? Women's Entry into Self-Employment and Small Business Ownership. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 10(4), 323-339.
- [19] Lia, Y., Huangb, S., & Songc, L. (2020). Opportunity and necessity entrepreneurship in the hospitality sector: Examining the institutional environment influences. *Tourism Management Perspectives*(34).
- [20] Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. NY: Harper: NY: Harper.
- [21] McClelland, D. e. (1953). *The Achievement Motive*. NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- [22] McMullen, J. S., Bagby, D., & Palich, L. (2008). Economic Freedom and the Motivation to Engage in Entrepreneurial Action. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 5(32).
- [23] Reynolds, Camp, S. M., Bygrave, W. D., Autio, E., & Hay, M. (2002). *Global entrepreneurship monitor GEM 2001 summary report*.
- [24] Reynolds, P. D., Camp, S., Bygrave, W., Autio, E., & Hay, M. (2001). *GEM Global Entrepreneurship Report. Executive Report*, Babson College.
- [25] Reynolds, P., Bosma, N., Autio, E., Hunt, S., De Bono, N., Servais, I., & Chin, N. (2005). *Global entrepreneurship monitor: Data collection design and implementation 1998–2003*. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-00_3\(24\)](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-00_3(24)), 205–231.
- [26] Ritsilä, J., & Tervo, H. (2002). Effects of unemployment on new firm formation : micro-level panel data evidence from Finland. *Small Business Economics*, 19(1), 31-40.
- [27] Rouse, M., & Daellenbach, U. (1999). Rethinking research methods for the resource-based view: Isolating sources of sustainable competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 20, 487–94.
- [28] Shane, S. (2012). Reflections on the 2010 AMR decade award: delivering on the promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(1), 10–20.
- [29] Shane, S., Locke, E., & Collins, C. (2003). Entrepreneurial Motivation. *Human Resource Management Review*(13), 257-279.
- [30] Shapero, A. (1975). The displaced uncomfortable entrepreneur 1975, p. 83-88 et p.133. *Psychology Today*, 9, 83-133.
- [31] Shapero, A., & Sokol, L. (1982). The Social Dimension of Entrepreneurship. In : *The Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship* », in C. A. Kent, D. L. Sexton and K. H. Vesper (éds.), *Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship*, Prentice Hall.
- [32] Tessier-Dargent, C., & Fayolle, A. (2016). Une approche typologique de l'entrepreneuriat de nécessité. *RIMHE : Revue Interdisciplinaire Management, Homme & Entreprise*, 3(22), 74-92.
- [33] Vesper, K. (1980). *New Ventures Strategies*, 303 p.
- [34] Watkins, D. (1976). Entry into independent entrepreneurship : toward a model of the business initiation process. *Working Paper Series, Manchester Business School and Center for Business Research*, 1976, n° 24, 31 p. *Working Paper Series, Manchester Business School and Center for Business Research*, 24, 31.
- [35] Williams, N., & Williams, C. (2011). Beyond necessity versus opportunity entrepreneurship: some lessons from English deprived urban neighbourhoods. *Int Entrep Manag J*, June.
- [36] Yitshaki, R., & Kropp, F. (2015). Motivations and Opportunity Recognition of Social Entrepreneurs. *Journal of Small Business Management*.
- [37] Zoumba, N. B. (2017). Des motivations par nécessité et par opportunité aux comportements des entrepreneurs . XXVIe Conférence Internationale de Management Stratégique. Lyon, France. 2017.
- [38] Zwan, P. v., Thurik, R., Verheul, I., & Hessels, J. (2016). Factors influencing the entrepreneurial engagement of opportunity and necessity entrepreneurs. *Eurasian Bus Rev*(6), 273–295.