



THE CONTRIBUTION OF TUNISIAN BUSINESS COACHES IN SOCIAL RESOURCES TO ORDERS OF INNOVATING PROJECTS

Samir AKACHI

ISET of Mahdia

Arbia AYED

ISET of Mahdia

ABSTRACT

If taking the initiative is thought of primarily as a matter of socialization, then the structures of business coaching, a crucial element in the entrepreneurial process, might foster entrepreneurship- along with the other factors of socialization, namely the family, the workplace, religion etc..

The data collected in the Tunisia context show that, in spite of their similarities across the country, the structures of coaching prospective innovative entrepreneurs are nevertheless disparately successful in terms of creating innovative companies. Access to social resources is a pertinent factor in explaining such varied performances. In this study, we analyze the social resources that might potentially benefit would-be entrepreneurs by means of their own social capital.

Key Words: entrepreneurial coaching, performance of the structures of business coaching, socialization, social capital, social resources

I-Introduction

If we consider that the entrepreneurship is the domain of study of the organizational emergence (Gartner, 1985, 1993; Verstraete, 1999) or of organizations creation (Gartner, 1985, 1990; Bygrave et Hofer, 1991; Verstraete, 2004), we notice that the researches approach this creation under various angles: the micro level, with as object of study the entrepreneur, considers the new business start-up as product of a particular individuality, and the macro level, or environmental, where factors are external to the entrepreneur but they determine this creation. However, this dichotomy was widely questioned, in particular after the founding text of Mark Granovetter (1985) on the social embedding of any economic activity, which criticizes as well the sub-socialization of the one as the sursocialisation of other one. In this new economic sociology (Swedberg, 19..), the new business start-up is put as a social phenomenon considering the share capital and the social networks of this entrepreneur. However, in spite of this new look on the entrepreneurship, dominate purely structural approaches of the embedding, so evacuating the

internal functioning of the social networks, both the nature of the exchanged resources and the underlying logics of this functioning were enough considered. It is thus to better understand the social construction of the innovative companies, and mainly the companies created to exploit results of a public research, that we were interested in the role of reception facilities and accompaniment as device of mediation in the access to the social resources and the nature of these exchanged resources, and it through semi-directive conversations on one tens of companies and accompanying persons.

The first results of our study indicate us clearly that the creation of an innovative enterprise is not simply the fact of an isolated individual but the outcome of a collective construction of several parts, which implies as well the project leader as structures of creation support. So, the social resources, not trade, are strategic resources which make a success of the creation. These resources are reached not only with his personal network but the accompanying persons have a mediation role.

II- Conceptual framework

2.1. The processuels models of the enterprises creation

The processuels models approach the new business start-up under the angle of the action (share): what makes the entrepreneur? What is the chain (sequence of movements) of the actions which leads to the creation of the company? It follows Gartner (1988) who calls to exceed the study of the entrepreneur to be interested in the entrepreneurial process, " research one the entrepreneurship should focus we what the entrepreneur does and not who the entrepreneur is " he writes, that several authors proposed models theoretical processuels.

Such a prospect attempts to describe the nature of the entrepreneurship by decomposing the process into several stages and by grouping the key actions. Among these models, we shall quote Gartner (1985), Stevenson et Gumpert (1985), Katz et Gartner (1988), Bygrave et Hofer (1991), Hofer et Bygrave (1992), Carland et al. (1995) Crankcase et al. (1996) Steyaert (1997), Hernandez (1999), Fayolle (2004).

Bygrave et Hofer (1991) identify nine factors which characterize an entrepreneurial process. For them, an entrepreneurial process is a voluntary human act, which occurs at the level of the sole proprietorship, implies a change of state, a discontinuity and is holistic, dynamic and unique. It contains several antecedent variables and generates results extremely sensitive to the initial conditions. With regard to the holistic, dynamic, unique, and intermittent of the activities and entrepreneurial process, its study, he adds, rests on qualitative data which are rich by their descriptive character of the situations and the phenomena.

Churchill (1996) decomposes the entrepreneurial process into five stages: 1) detect an opportunity, 2) estimate the potential of this opportunity 3) to gather the information, the human, financial and technical resources to seize and exploit the opportunity 4) plan and promote to get

on the market and 5) manager the creation of the value. For Gartner (1985), the enterprise creation is a complex and multidimensional phenomenon where four elements interact: the individual (or the individuals) implied in the creation of this company, the environment where is made the creation, the organization and the strategy of this new company and finally the process understood as all the activities which lead to the creation of the organization. However, Steyaert (1998) considers that in this model, the process is a "variable" separated from the actor, from the context and from the organization, and suggests exceeding the distinction between the micro level (the entrepreneur) and the macro level (the environment) for an approach where the interactions are described in their social and cultural contexts.

Finally, Katz and Gartner (1988) propose four properties which identify the entrepreneurial emergence: the intention to create a company, gather resources, define the borders of the organization, and realize an exchange of resources.

2.2. The reticular entrepreneur: network and social capital

2.2.1. The social networks

The notion of social network has a long history, anchored in the anthropology, the social psychology, the mathematical analysis of the graphs and the interactional sociology (Freeman, 2004).

One of the key moments of the constitution of a coherent, at the same time methodological, notional and theoretical corpus, on the social networks, is the work undertaken by Harrison White at Harvard in the sixties. The current development of the analysis of the social networks, with International Network of Social Network Analysis, their annual colloquiums and their magazines (Social Networks, Connect) is directly diverted from the orientations taken at this moment. Entailing with him young researchers (Mark Granovetter, Barry Wellman, Nicholas Mullins, Kathleen Carley and many others), White emphasizes the importance of social relationships and what takes place between the people, rather than on their individual attributes as it does the dominant functionalist sociology.

For him, the social structure is not a set of categories (professionals, of age, sex, etc.) as those who are for the principle of the questionnaires which train then the main part of the American empirical sociology. The social structure is the system of social relationships; it takes the shape of the network. The social world is constituted by network entities. Such as it is developed by the group of Harvard, the analysis of the social networks is at first a theoretical and methodological formulation of fundamental sociology which is going to be implemented in various domains of the social life (Mullins in sciences sociology, Wellman in urban sociology, etc.). One of the most invested domains is the one of the economic activity with the researches of Mark Granovetter (1974, 1985) and Harrison White (1981, 2002).

2.2.2. The social networks and the social capital

It is following the works of Mark Granovetter (1973, 1985, 2004) that a new look is carried to the economic activity in general, and on the entrepreneurship in particular. Granovetter (2004) wrote: " 1) the pursuit of economic objectives comes along normally with those of the other non-economic objectives, such as the sociability, the approval, the social status and the power; 2) the economic action (as any action) is socially situated and cannot be explained by simple individual motives; it is embedded in the network of the personal relations, more than it emanates from annihilated actors; 3) the economic institutions (as all the institutions) do not emerge automatically under a determined shape by the outside circumstances; they are " socially socially built " (Shepherd et Luckmann (1966)) ".

So, the notion of embedding cross-reference in the idea as the economic action is not an individual fact, carried by selfish beings, motivated by their only interests, but is a fact socially constructed. However, we observe a semantic sliding, or at least the dominance of a current, which, of the social embedding goes towards the relational embedding.

The relational embedding of the entrepreneur sends back to the influence which exercise social relationships (family, friendship, professionals ...) on the conduct of an entrepreneurial activity. This design of the embedding puts the entrepreneur in strategic actor who instruments his social networks to reach his goals of new business start-up. Although this form of embedding by-passes the atomization of the entrepreneurs, it risks however to lead to a dual atomization, reduced forms which consists in being interested in the relations which connect the entrepreneur to his interlocutors, to a bilateral level.

This new relational conception of the entrepreneurship knew a wide range of reserarchs, and under this angle of embedding, the researches concern unclearly both the social networks and the social capital, (for example: Baron et Markman (2000) ; Strike (1995) ; Hung et Hsiao (2004); Anderson et Jack (2002) ; Hansen (2000) ; Linen, Li and Chen (on 2006); Salaff, Strike, Wong and Ping (on 2003) ; Byers, Kist et Sutton (1998) ; Brüderl and Preisendörfer (1998) ; Ulhoi (2005) ; Jansen (2003) ; Strike et Salaff (2003) ; Bögenhold (2002) ; Liao et Welsch (2005) ; Neergaard et Madsen (2004); Aldrich et Zimmer (1986) ; Lechler (2001) ; Boutillier et Uzunidis (1999)).

Hung et Hsiao (2004) tried to show how the entrepreneurs mobilize their social capital to create their company, by a case study of two companies, Trend Micro, a family company specialized in the conception of antivirus software and TSMC (Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company). Steve Chang's social network (of Trend Micro) limited himself to a congenital network (family, friends, religion and class) and Morris Chang's social network (of TSMC) also included friendly entrepreneurs of school, the former colleagues, councillors, and business connections of its former employment (bankers, suppliers). In their study, they showed that the social capital had an influence on the international development of TSMC and in Taiwan of

Trend Micro. The origin environment of both entrepreneurs has an influence on their social network, and this social capital had an influence to seize the opportunities of the market and the access to the external resources. They assert that the social capital can really decrease transaction costs and risks.

Hansen (2000) examines how the volume of the social capital of an entrepreneur changes along progress in the phases of starting up of a company. On a sample of 52 entrepreneurs in phase of entrepreneurship, and basing itself on the work of Reynolds et Miller (1992) which decompose this process into four stages: commitment, first financing, first recruitment and first sale, he measures the characteristics (size: number of people who cooperate or contribute to the starting up of the company, the degree of interconnectivity: average number of links which every individual had with the other members, and finally the frequency of the interactions) entrepreneurial actions along these four various stages. He concludes that those who make a success of the creation of their company are the ones who know how to increase the volume of their social capital along these phases.

In another case, Anderson et Jack (2002) explore, by a participating observation technique and interviews, the nature of the social capital in an entrepreneurial network. For them, the social capital is presented at the same time as " a glue " which assures the shape of the structure of the network, and at the same time as " a lubricant " which facilitates the operations (or flow) on networks. They show that the formation of social capital is a negotiation process which allows to fit in an appreciative relationship with the others. And the entrepreneurs use this process as means to reach information sources and to acquire resources. For it, they assert that these two forms (glue or lubricant) are only the expression of the social capital, and that this social capital is a process of creation of the conditions for a real exchange of information and resources.

Finally, on a sample of 125 high-technology Taiwanese companies, Linen et al. examined the effect of the social capital, the skills of the entrepreneurs and their entrepreneurial strategy on the performance of these companies. They conclude that the entrepreneurship is a social complex phenomenon, that the developed theories in the western countries cannot be applied in the Asian countries. For them, the social capital has no direct effect on the performance of these companies, but is a lever which allows to reach the resources and to surpass the obstacles met during the entrepreneurial process.

In this perspective of the embedding, the entrepreneurship researches suppose a positive link between the social networks and the new business start-up, and from this postulate, explore the nature of the links and the structure of the social network of the entrepreneur. These researches concern essentially egocentric networks of the entrepreneur and limit themselves to dual relations. The social embedding is then reduced to the inclusion of a new mobilizable resource by the entrepreneur: the social networks and the social capital. As for the contents of these studies, they concern in particular the nature and the structure of the network: the strength of the ties, the horizontal or vertical nature of the links, the existence or not of structural bridges, etc. However, certain authors, (for example, Grossetti et al., 2006 ; Baret et al., 2006) call out to us

on the limits of this approach and invite us to overtake the purely structural analysis of the social networks for a better consideration, on one side, the process of decoupling, which concerns the process of empowerment of organizations create with regard to the social networks, and on the other hand, on the internal functioning and the nature of the resources exchanged on these networks.

So, for Grossetti and al. (2006: 48) " the primacy of the social networks can be seen as a shape of reduced interpersonal skills ignoring the reality of the groups and the organizations ". And in the same critic spirit, Baret and al. (2006: 100-103) lift four gaps:

"1- The dominance of an instrumental and utilitarian prospect: (...) If we return to the theoretical genesis of the social networks, and in particular in the body of the economic sociology, the idea of reticular embedding allows to enrich, even to exceed the " pure trade logic ". Yet, the characteristics of logic of action prevailing within the social networks, presented in most of the works are often of utilitarian inspiration. 2- a low consideration of institutions : 3-The required topographic approach: (...) Most of the works, very directed around the structural dimension and the organizational arrangements, indeed omit to study the internal principles of functioning of the social network. 4-the "black" face of the social networks: (...) The consequences unwanted of the social networks are often untold ".

2.3. Limits of the individualistic models: mediation and social resources in the creation innovative enterprise

The approach which I present here very briefly is developed more in detail in a work of synthesis (Grossetti, 2004). The starting point of this approach is a classic division between actors and resources. As in the analysis of the social networks, the actors are always human beings, or compounds containing human beings. The resources are also according to the situations of the constraints or the stakes. The not human beings thus have the status of resource. The actors have between them relations, as in the analysis of the social networks. But they can also belong to groups, the forms of the network (simple collection of relations) and of the group (resource sharing) interacting permanently.

The interpersonal relations are defined as in the analyses of social networks. There is no unique definition accepted by all the analysts of networks, but there is a common bottom which I share. A possible synthetic definition of a relation between two people would be a mutual knowledge and a commitment based on interactions and allowing the transmission of resources. The mutual knowledge is one of the empirical criteria the most used to spot the interpersonal relations. I added the idea of commitment because generally we consider that there is relation only as far as both concerned people are de facto committed to a minimum of cooperation (thus also the transmission of the resources). The definition can become widespread in the relation between an individual and a group or a collective, on the condition of seeing the knowledge near the group, as a formal memory (recording in customers' files for a company for example) if it is about an

organization, or, if it is about an informal collective, as the attribution of an identity (White, 1992), but it raises some problems of empirical feature. In the case of the relations between two people, this definition finds four criteria of Granovetter for the strength of the tie (frequency of the exchanges, the reverses services, intimacy, emotional intensity): the intimacy sends back to the mutual knowledge, the emotional intensity to the commitment. Wireless, the emotional intensity does not become widespread in the collective entities, except for being situated on a totally metaphoric register, which I wish to avoid here. In all cases, the relations are very mutual, even if they are not inevitably symmetric.

In the social activities and the interactions between relations and memberships of group, the levels of action move, new actors emerge, others dissolve or lock themselves more and more into binding forms which include them. To emphasize this dynamics, I resumed, by redefining them partially, the notions of embedding and decoupling, used by Harrison White (1992, 2002). In what follows, I begin by defining these notions.

2.3.1. Embedding and decouplings

For White, the embedding is not an established fact, but rather a process, just like its reverse, the decoupling. The embedding is the dependence of one identity towards the links which it has with the others. The decoupling is on the contrary the empowerment of the identity, and thus its assertion as such, but this assertion goes hand in hand with the creation of new links and thus the establishment of a new embedding, situated at a different level. For White, " the processes of embedding and decoupling take the place of the birth and the death of particular actors as center of the analysis. " (White, 2002, 215), what defines a kind of ontology of process and passing states (which are transformed), which substitutes itself for an ontology of beings (which exist or do not exist, live or die). To make them more general, I was forced to adjust slightly the definitions which attribute.

For the embedding and the decoupling, we consider three basic types of social entities: the actors, the resources, and the social forms (relations, networks and groups). Each of them emerges from sequences of actions, modifies, disappears. Each of them depends on other entities, of which some constitute it, others include it and others else, which are situated on the same level, are simply bound to it. The question of the specificity of an entity with regard to the entities to which it is bound permanently put by the observer, but also for itself when it is about an active entity (a social actor). Thus, there is a tension between its existence as autonomous entity and the dissolution "downward" in a series of constituents, "upward" as constituent of a vaster set, or still at the same level, through the binding relations which connect it to entities of the same level. This tension between the autonomy and the dependence is exactly what the notions of embedding and decoupling can report. The embedding is the process of increase of dependences, and decoupling, the process of empowerment, strengthening of the specificity.

Both extremes of these processes are mortal, each in their way. The maximum decoupling would be the loss of all the links with the rest of the company and the world, which is translated by a kind of social death. On the other side, the maximum embedding would be translated by the complete dissolution of the entity considered in other entities, what we can consider as the usual end of the collective entities. The decoupling of an entity is thus relative always. It is a precarious balance between necessary embeddings and preservation of autonomy with regard to the other entities.

To illustrate the notion of decoupling and what it implies, we can use the model the formation of the scientific specialities formalized by an analyst of networks follower of White, Nicholas Mullins (1972). We remind briefly four stages which constitute the model. In the first stage, scientists who do not maintain direct relation are interested in similar problems, sometimes because they were marked by the same reading. This is the stage that corresponding to the fact that Mullins calls the "paradigmatic group". Connected by the system of specific communication to this world (the publications in this case), those who are interested to the "secrets of the life" begin to find a way mutually and come into contact, enter into relationships "dual" (for two) or "trial" (for three).

Some people spell or see themselves; others go as far as writing articles together. By systematizing these relational indications, Mullins, revealed what constitutes its second stage, that of the "communication network". It is thus a social network. In pairs or three, the scientists begin to homogenize their vocabulary, to build fragments of paradigm. So, they build new resources, which contribute to the dynamics of their relations. The network is fragile: if certain participants stop their activities, if certain relations break, it can disappear. The participants are little substitutable. Due to publishing convergent articles, of strengthening their relations and of creating it of news, the researchers eventually became aware about training a collective. It is the phase of the "grouping" (or "cluster"): "a grouping is formed when the researchers become aware of their structures of communication and begin to trace borders around those who work on their common problem. It is developed by recombination of the pairs and the sets of three in answer to favorable conditions, e.g. the chance, the leadership, the substantial problem of research, one or several support institution (s).

These groups are often identified by a name, at the same time by those who are inside or outside, are more stable than the pairs or the sets of three which constitute them, have a specific culture and are capable of obtaining means. "(69). In this phase, decisive changes occur. We cross from the network, only observable analytical structure from the outside, to a collective entity recognized and established by its members.. These groups are often identified by a name, at the same time by those who are in the inside or outside, are more stable than the pairs or the sets of three which constitute them, have a specific culture and are capable of obtaining means and students".

In this phase, decisive changes occur. We pass from the network, analytical structure

only observable from the outside to a collective entity recognized and established as such by its members. In the passage from a shape to the other one, specific resources were constructed: a name, criteria of membership, a narrative on the history of the group. Simultaneously, the fragments of paradigm (methods, common notions, research material) which were constituted within the small groups existing in the phase of the network are put under challenges in the new collective context (it is the time of the colloquiums founders, programmatic numbers of reviews, etc.). The created resources become more and more collective and consubstantial with the existence of the group.

We see clearly in this example that the resources which allow the group to exist are two different types: on one hand those who are essential of any human grouping (name, criteria of demarcation of an outside, internal rules), and of the other one, those who are specific the activity (theories, methods, materials, etc.). Mullins underlines that, in this phase, the participants remain little substitutable. But, if the group succeeds to be stabilized and developed, to recruit new members, to homogenize the methods, the notions, the theories, it tends to be equipped with more formal means of exchange (with mediation resources), and so to become a speciality: " a speciality (...) has thus many aspects of a formal organization"(Chen, 2006). The notions of embedding and decoupling are applied well to this example. Actors who have between them relations, whom we can describe by the shape of the network, are equipped at some point with specific authorities of coordination, get used to being collectively designated, discussing the borders of the collective which they constitute (that I call group). The group decouples gradually of the network, and its members. By being equipped instruments which allow to identify it from the outside and to regulate the exchanges inside, it makes less dependent on members and on their relations. We can integrate the network only by entering into relationships with members. We can integrate the group on the basis of more or less formalized procedures. The group became a collective actor.

*

2.3.2. The resources of mediation as resources of decoupling

The decoupling of a group thus implies the creation of what I shall call resources of mediation, which are of the same nature as the " intermediate objects " described by Vinck (1999) and which allow the actors to coordinate. These resources include not human beings (name, rules of membership, procedures of regulation, specific devices(plans) of communication, etc.) but sometimes also human actors who assume a role of mediation (coordinators, persons in charge, intermediaries of all kinds). Everything can make resource, and everything can make resource of mediation. It is enough for it that the actors mobilize these resources to coordinate. In certain cases, the resources are built in this objective, and we can speak about devices. The creation of mediation resources is thus a central aspect of any process of decoupling.

The decoupling processes don't spread only within organizations, they also structure the exchanges in other collective forms, that it is emergent, weakly formalized groups, arousing diffuse feelings of membership and very vague borders, or more massive collectives as are markets, spheres of activity or territorial entities. For example, if we keep the example of the labor market, to send an unsolicited application suppose that we have information on a company (address, activity, etc.). If this information is not obtained by relations, they can be obtained by the consultation of directories or the economic press for example. They are two examples of devices structuring the labor market, just like an agency of investment or recruitment.

I consider as resource of mediation all which allows an exchange without passing by chains of personal relations. The development of such devices in a given market is a process of decoupling because he allows the actors to free themselves, at least partially personal relations.

It is thus necessary to us to exceed(overtake) the individualistic and linear conception(design) for a social construction of the entrepreneurship, where, by one side, as well the entrepreneur as the other structures of helps and support interviewer in the new business start-up innovative, and by the other side, the social resources will be considered as strategic for the creation of these companies. What are thus the social resources mobilized in the new business start-up? And how structures of support play the role of mediation in the access to these resources?

And to answer these questions, we are in two phases going to proceed and to show that:

- 1-The creation of an innovative company is not simply the outcome of an individual action, but it is a collective construction which implies several parts.
- 2-The social resources are non-market but strategic for the creation of an innovative company.
- 3- Operating frame of the research in what follows, we present the operating frame of our research to outline intermediary's role of the guides and social resources which favor the positive outcome of the innovative projects.

III- Methodological aspects of research

To understand the process of creation, we were interested to innovative entrepreneurs which are in phase of creation and accommodated in the accompaniment structure and not still registered on the commercial register; entrepreneurs recently create whose creation date goes unless three years, and finally the structures of support of these companies. We were able to have the braided of these companies via the web sites of the Industry Ministry. The first contact is made by the sending of an e-mail and a contact by telephone.

We realized semi-directive interviews with about ten project leaders, the directors of two accompaniment structure. The interviews have an average duration of one hour and twenty minutes. The interviews were recorded, then totally retranscribed and validated by the

interviewees. These interviews concerned the process of creation of the start-up: of how was born the idea of creation until the day from the interview; on the role of reception facilities and support to creation: the resources, the conditions of the exchanges, The climate which reigns it and the nature of the relations interns between the project leaders and between the project leaders and the reception facilities administrators, etc.; the nature of the resources mobilized in the enterprise creation and their importance, etc.

Although our aim is not to end in a theory, our methodological anchoring joins in the grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). The analysis of data followed the method of coding and continuous comparison proposed by Strauss and Corbin (1998, 2003). We succeed on proposals, because our investigation is in progress, and alleys-returns between the emergent concepts and the reality will allow us to confirm or to counter these proposals.

Being little of studies carried out to understand this input and its contributions in support of the innovative project leaders, and, specifically, their absence in the Tunisian context, it seemed interesting " to hand over " to the Tunisian innovative entrepreneurs and to the guides by adopting an understanding approach, characteristic of an interpretative approach, to bring to the foreground possibly a vision of the studied phenomenon. As regards our methodological choice, we opted for a hybrid exploratory qualitative approach.

The exploratory character of our study is justified by the report of absence of previous studies in the Tunisian context. To bring to a successful conclusion, our campaign of data collection was made during year 2014 in two phases, by adopting the same protocol of interview. The qualified first one of totally exploratory is based on not structured interviews. The second is qualified as confirmatory and semi-structured, because it rather based itself on interviews half directive and structured around the themes which we beforehand identified from the analysis of contents of the first phase.

In our approach of understanding of the contribution of the guides regarding social resources, we opted for a strategy of replication and variation of context. So, to see how the contribution of the guides is lived by some is the others,(a big variety of situations was looked for business sectors, innovative project leaders in full phase of support, project leaders at the last moments of the phase of support or recently taken out of this phase, of creators of innovative projects who are less than three years old of exit, innovative project leaders of different kind, having different ages and accompanied in various contexts (geographical location of the structures of support, age of the structure, the kind of the person in charge of accompaniment, setting-up near a university space or in a high-tech city).

The same approach was adopted to assure a variety of questioned guides. Indeed, we cannot say that the contribution of the guides is the same, although we can assert that their skills and their profiles are similar in all the Tunisian accompaniment structures. However, we noticed that every guide has its unique contributions in resources thanks to its networks and to the nature of the developed personal links, and also because of its experience and of its professional histories.

All these factors have an impact determining in the contribution in social resources to the project leaders. After all, the constitution of the sample of the first totally exploratory phase held the various criteria announced above. The latter were a priori defined or during our presence on the ground. However, we insist on the fact that this sample respects the following criteria:

- The criterion of the innovation adopted is based on elements of the study of GMV Council(Advise) which considers as innovative: " any creation ex--nihilo based on a main activity having an innovative aspect (technological, commercial, organizational), that it is translated in a product, a process or a service"

_ The innovative project leaders or the accompanied entrepreneurs who appear in our selection had to be creators ex-nihilo. In other words, we ruled out all the cases of resumption of company; We ruled out all the accompanied innovative project leaders who have recently settled down in a structure of support, due to the fact that the experience of support is there only in its early stages. The same principle was adopted for the selection of the guides; The selected guides are the ones who are in direct responsibility of the success or not the realization of corporate development plans.

Indeed, we are with full knowledge of the facts that the mission of support is pulled between several participants. The legal responsibility and of management of the support structure consolidates our choice of the leader of the support structure as being the unit of the most representative analysis in the face of this situation of mixture. Our knowledge and professional closeness of the structures of support supports this approach. We call here "guides", the people who manage these structures. They are also sometimes called " responsible for structure " or "director guide".

Our approach to contact every person to question was to contact him beforehand by email, then by telephone and a meeting was fixed following every call. Our sample includes: Six innovative project leaders in phase of support of which a case of équipreneuriat (in trinomial), what gives us 6 cases of support; Three creators of innovative companies (the one recently taken(brought) out and 2 others who are less than 3 years old since their exit(release) of the phase of support(accompaniment)); Five responsible for structures of support. The second phase of our investigation was also driven during a duration of approximately two months (in March and April, 2014).

We respected the same procedure of sampling and investigation adopted during the first phase of survey. We also adopted the same protocol of interview by taking into account specificities of the semi-managed conversations. It is about semi-directive conversations for which the realized guide(s) allow to approach themes beforehand defined with questions of presentation and introduction, main questions concerning the tackled issue, questions of investigation allowing to clear up indistinct notions and questions of implication to specify an idea (Thiétart, 2003). We present this phase as a confirmatoire phase as far as the made semi-directive conversations, and

the interview is structured around the themes which we beforehand identified in the first totally exploratory phase.

We met ten project leaders or entrepreneurs innovative and four directors of structures of support. This theoretical sample better established this time, by including a creative innovative project leader who failed during a previous support, although his innovation is patented.

3.1. The of guides as the mediator function to access to the social resources

Often we present the innovative entrepreneurship as the outcome of the actions of the only entrepreneur: he is the initiator of the project, who knew how to take advantage of an opportunity to mobilize and coordinate resources, he instruments his social network to gather resources and convince financiers ... However, speeches of the creators, gets free another version.

3.2. The creation of an innovative enterprise is a collective process

In a founding text, Robert Reich (1987) questioned the myth of a solitary and heroic entrepreneur. He notes that to compete in the current world, we have to begin by celebrating the collective entrepreneurship, where the effort is more big than the sum of the individual efforts (translated by us, p. 78). Bengt Johannisson (1998) also pleads for a collective conception of the entrepreneurship. He notes that the entrepreneurship is 'generically' a collective phenomenon. So, for this author, this image and collective design of the ready entrepreneurial activity for three interpretations: a) the collective entrepreneurship is one of form of the entrepreneurship; b) the entrepreneurship is generically collective and c) to adopt paradigm of the social constructivism as the prospect for all the real phenomena including the entrepreneurship. This collective design of the entrepreneurial activity seems to take more and more importance (see for example the special number of Magazine of The Entrepreneurship, the flight 5 N 2, 2006). We find this design in our investigation. Indeed, the idea of creation of a company does not always emanate from the carrier of the project, it can be the outcome of a meeting within a research laboratory, which by mutual agreement, decides to make so that the project ended in a new business start-up. This is the way a company French pioneer of the technologies and the devices of audiovisual auto production was born following a research program led by the laboratory of the university. A professor put in relation the engineer who be in charge of the study with another frame of a public enterprise to establish a team who, in the training of the company, will become the persons in charge of this start-up.

Another actor, who inspired the project, is a professor of philosophy who gave courts (courses, prices, yards) onto the acculturation of the communication, who inspired as well this engineer to integrate this research team and develop the product, that the program of search. Also for another company specialized in the software conception of risk analysis. A former senior executive from a big company, who afterward joined « Tunisie Télécom » company, and within the framework of a swarming encouraged by this company, benefited from a substantial help to create his company. A help which consists of six months of salary, of three months of logistic assistance (use of offices, telephone, office automation, etc. company) and the possibility of finding its employment if he does not make a success his creation. These entrepreneurs admit that their new business start-up is not their only one works staff, he underlines it moreover: " if I had no this parachute to be able to find my employment if I fail in the creation of my company, ever I could not leave my project director's post to dash into the creation of a company ", tells us this entrepreneur, " my company (Tunisie Télécom) considerably helped me to throw to me ". Several times, the developers of the product or the service do not even find themselves in the new created company, but prefer to keep their academics' jobs.

It is the case for example of this company which produces molecules of pharmaceutical interest from plants. Both professors who developed the process kept their post offices in the university but committed the third person to manage the company. It stands out thus from the narrative of these creators, that the creation of a company is not the outcome of an individual work, but are only representatives of a constructed project collectively. We can thus make this proposal:

Proposal 1: the creation of an innovative enterprise is a collective phenomenon, socially constructed.

3.3. Mediation and resources access

If the idea of creation is not always individual, the process of creation is not individually also carried. It remains indisputable for these entrepreneurs that these reception facilities and of help returned their projects practicable, what we can notice by comparing enterprises incubated with those which did not pass by these structures. Thus, this mediation proposed by these structures makes possible the outcome of their project.

The mediation is " the action to put in relation [...] two persons or institutions, called " mediated ", on the basis of rules and of means freely accepted by them, in sight either of the prevention of a disagreement or its resolution, or an establishment or a restoring of a social relationship " (Briant et Palan, 1999, p. 11). It is also " a mode of construction and management of the social life thanks to the intervention of a third " (Guillaume-Hofnung, 1995, p. 74). Finally, for Grossetti et al. (2006: 49), a device of mediation is " all which allows an exchange without passing by chains of personal relations ". And for these last authors, the mediation sends back to

a process of decoupling, because " it allows the actors to free themselves, at least partially, of personal relations " (Grossetti et al. 2006, p. 49). Yet, in our case of the start-up creators, they are not the entrepreneurs who decide to free themselves from individual relations to reach resources but although a) they are incubators and accompaniment structure that take the initiative to put in relation these entrepreneurs with potential suppliers of resources; b) these entrepreneurs ignore until the existence of some of these resources, and finally c) this mediation allowed certain entrepreneurs basing new relations. Indeed, in the opinion of all these project leaders, the passage by the accompaniment structure was determining, because he allowed them to reach resources of which they ignored until the existence, and therefore, this structure played the role of bridge between the academic community and that of companies. If all the accompanied enterprises benefited from several opportunities, it is not the same for this enterprise which did not pass by this structure. " At the moment when I launched this project, I did not know that there is an accompaniment structure, (...) I believe that these institutions self-feed between themselves, because when I crossed bankers, none agreed to study my file, they promised me, but never of favorable suites. I received no help and I am not on to be able to take out there alone ".

The access to resources is not thus simply possible by personal networks, but the structures of accompaniment play the role of intermediation to reach often inaccessible resources by his only personal network. It is that Grossetti et al. (2006) call " mediation devices ", which they define as " all which allows an exchange without passing by the personal relations chains ". We can thus make the proposal:

Proposal 2: reception facilities and of support (accompaniment) are a device of mediation in the access to social resources.

3.4. Social innovative resources and innovative enterprises creation

These structures of accompaniment allow these entrepreneurs to reach several strategic resources for the success of the creation of their enterprises. Among the main the most important and most quoted resources, we find the financial support, the logistic support, the training to the management techniques, the legal aid, the technical or technological help on the product itself, the study of feasibility and market, the recommendation and the structure of accompaniment legitimacy to support the project and finally the emotional and moral support. All these entrepreneurs admits that the product or the service which they market has a vague resemblance with the original idea which they had by arriving in these structures. " Between the product which we developed in the laboratory and the one that we market at present, we have of to make a series of modifications and adjustments to make him(it) operational and simply usable by the farmers ", confides us this person in charge of a company who developed and markets, with her husband, a movie warming for plants. What confirms moreover the accompaniment structure director " these researchers arrive with ideas and very sophisticated products but which the

market does not need absolutely as is. It was thus necessary to redefine the characteristics, by working with the researchers but also one submitting the projects to our specialist's partners who advise us and express us their opinions. We manage finally to repeat the product so that finds a market ".

If the project presents a real innovation and a trade interest, the researcher is welcomed within the structure accompaniment where he benefits from an important material support: a working office, a secretarial department, but especially financial supports: the coverage by the accompaniment structure of the study of feasibility and of market, the legal aid. It also organizes mini-conferences in the form of Round Table where entrepreneurs are invited to expose their route of creation and administrator, but also trainings to the management techniques. This is the way a researcher who designed a system of storage of computing data benefited from one year of training, at the rate of a week a month, to HEC Carthage on the management techniques of an enterprise (finance, human, marketing resources, strategy, etc.). These support creation structures allowed "to arm themselves to face the enterprises world", as indicated him an entrepreneur, and not only, because, as will say it an other one "we put me on tracks of which never I would have before thought".

Besides this help material, they recognize that the moral and emotional support was determining in the obstinacy, in spite of the obstacles, in the creation.process " We find here a space of dialogue, exchange to break our feeling of isolation, and feel that we are not alone ", " when we stumble over a difficulty, we always find those who preceded you to help you to find the solution, tells us a project leader in accompaniment stage, for such problem, ask so-and-so, it is him who helped us all here ". It seems so important, that, will tell us the structure accompaniment manager " when I wanted to make an isolated office for every project leader whom we welcome, all got up to say no! We prefer this opened space (a big room with a workspace for every accompanied), because it allows them not only to discuss between them and to exchange but especially, when somebody discusses by the telephone about something, for example, the others gain advice or simply take advantage of a subject or a problem of which they did not think before ".

Besides this help which they receive directly from the accompaniment structure, they also benefit from the legitimacy and from the fame of the institution. " When we come from the accompaniment structure, we benefit widely from the legitimacy of the institution, that becomes something very serious in the eyes of our interlocutor, it is when even a structure creates by the Ministry of Research " confirm all the creators who passed by this structure. The same speech highly-rated entrepreneurs taken place by another accompaniment structure of Sfax Innov I.

This legitimacy is most probably of a not insignificant importance, confirmed by one against example, this designer of risk analysis software, stemming from the swarming of TunisieTélécom, which did not pass or supported by these structures, was able to benefit from no

help. " When I presented my file to the competition of new business start-up innovative organized by INJEZ, my candidacy was not even able to be studied. (...) These institutions self-feed between them ", he tells us.

Thus, the innovative entrepreneurs are not solitary and individualistic beings which know how to instrument their social networks to gather the information. These reception and support structures are devices of mediation which allow them to reach strategic social resources. Thus, we can make this proposal:

Proposal 3: the reception and support structures bring strategic and not trade social resources for the innovative entrepreneurship.

3.5. Embedding, decoupling and accompaniment structure intern network

The internal networks of the accompaniment structure which be build up between the project leaders themselves and between the project leaders and the accompaniment structures managers and other reception structures allow these entrepreneurs, of one hand 'to be decoupled ' from their initial network, that is the university network which be dense but often closed network, and of an other hand, a knowledge sharing, councils and other social resources in which they have no access previously. It is the space which thus allows the decoupling of the former network to build a new.

Indeed, if these reception and accompaniment structures allow the entrepreneurs to reach social resources, they are also spaces of socialization for the new entrepreneurs. They their allow to tie new relations with other spheres, or to to take back the networks vocabulary, we shall say that these structures play the role of bridge between the entrepreneur and its social network with other social or professional networks, that of the bankers, the investors, the other companies passing orders, other companies of the same sector or the same business sector etc. Almost all of the met entrepreneurs evoke the interest to reach other networks. " By means of the trade show which organizes every year our accompagnement structure, I was able to meet other companies which work in the same domain of the computing and the broadcasting as us. It allowed us not only to exchange on the developed products but also to bind a friendship which, afterward, allowed us an exchange of knowledge, information, news, and to benefit from a shape of technology watch ". Same story by another entrepreneur " I kept a contact with an avocado which I am used to meeting in the accompaniment structure where I was accommodated during the phase of creation. Several times, I receive from him e-mails to inform me about a legal novelty, that I make circulate with the entrepreneurs that I met during a fair on the new business start-up that our accompaniment structure". " My first customer, will tell us an other one, I had him thanks to a contact that I set during a training seminary. By discussing our mutual projects, he promised to speak about me to somebody who can be interested by what I'm doing " .

The accompaniment structures are thus a space of exchange and socialization for the new entrepreneurs, where new contacts are tied and new relations are bound. We can finally make this proposal:

Proposal 4: the reception and support structures are a space of exchange and socialization for the new entrepreneurs

IV- Conclusion

The specificity of innovative enterprises creation, due to the uncertainty and to the complexity of the innovations, does not plead for their study from the point of view of paradigm of the opportunity, because the starting point of the creation of these enterprises is not the market but well the object of innovation. It is from the outcome of a It is the result of a new or existing innovation (Paturel, 1997) that a company could arise which would propose its services and/or products.

So, if in the literature on the new business start-up, we often present us the entrepreneurs as the strategists who know how to mobilize their networks to benefit from it (for example Burt, 1995), the entrepreneurs whom we met recognize that they did not make a success of their creation in solitary heroin. The outcome of a new creation of start-up is a collective phenomenon which involves as well the innovative entrepreneur as the other stakeholders, such as the accompaniment structure, the services of valuation of search for universities, etc. Even if often we identify the entrepreneur with his company, without whom the project would not have been born, the process of creation such as lived by our interlocutors pleads for a complex and not linear design where the project leader is incapable to plan the sequences of future actions, a process of apprenticeship, exchange and social construction, where the access to the various resources so trade as social is not only possible by its only social networks, but the accompaniment and support creation structures play the role of mediation.

This notion of mediation finds its origins in Georg Simmel's sociology. If Burt (1995) theorized about it with the structural holes, others (for example Baker et Obstfeld, 1996 ; Obstfeld, 2005) defend a cohesive conception of networks to fill these structural holes. In particular, in the case of transfer of the complex knowledge and the search results which commit heavy means, the confidentiality cannot be guaranteed without the confidence. And this mediation assured by a neutral body, in this particular case accompaniment persons, allows these transfers and exchange.

The logics which underlie these exchanges are not purely trade, there are really social relationships which are livened up by Don et Contre-Don.. However, our work is in progress, the small number of the conversations which we realized does not allow us to formulate firm and settled conclusions but proposals which we shall verify by alleys-returns between the reality and

the literature. We thus have to refine our proposals to better understand the process of innovative enterprise creation and the way of functioning interns of these social networks.

Bibliography

Ahuja, G. (2000), Collaboration networks, structural holes, and innovation: a longitudinal study, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45, 425-455.

Aldrich H. and C. Zimmer (1986), Entrepreneurship through social networks. In Sexton & Smilor (eds.) *Art and science of entrepreneurship*, Cambridge: Ballinger, 3-23.

Anderson A. and Jack S. (2002), The articulation of social capital in entrepreneurial networks: a glue or a lubricant? *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 14, 193-210.

Baret C., I. Huault et T. Picq (2006), Management et réseaux sociaux. Jeux d'ombres et de lumières sur les organisations, *Revue Française de Gestion*, 32 :163, 93-106

Bögenhod D. (2002), Social capital as strategic element of venture creation, Presentation at the 2nd Annual conference of the European Academy of Management, Stockholm, May 9-11.

Bouchikhi H. (1993), *A constructivist framework for understanding entrepreneurship performance*, *Organisation Studies*, 14:4, 549-570.

Brüderl J. et P. Preisendörfer (1998), Network Support and the Success of Newly Founded Businesses, *Small Business Economics*, 10, 213-225.

Burt R. (1995), *Le capital social, les trous structuraux et l'entrepreneur*, *Revue Française de Sociologie*, XXXVI, 599-628.

Byers T., H. Kist, et R. I. Sutton (1998), Characteristics on the Entrepreneur: Social Creature, Not Solo Heroes. In, R. C. Dorf (dir) *The Handbook of Technology Management*, Boca Raton: CRC Press LLC: 1-5

Bygrave W. (1989), The Entrepreneurship Paradigm (I): A Philosophical Look at Its Research Methodologies, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 14 :1, 7-26

Bygrave W. (1989), The Entrepreneurship Paradigm (II): Chaos and Catastrophes among Quantum Jumps? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 14:2, 7-30
Bygrave W. et C. W. Hofer (1991), Theorizing about Entrepreneurship, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 16:2, 3-22.

Carland J, J., A. Carland et T. J. Carland (1995), A model of entrepreneurship: the process of venture creation, Proceedings 1995 SBIDA Conference.

Carter N. M., W. Gartner et P. Reynolds (1996), Exploring Start-Up Event Sequences, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 11:3, 151-166.

Churchill N. C. (1996), The entrepreneurial process: why it is important and how it functions in small and large organizations, 13th Annual Conference CCSBE-CCPME, November 1 & 2, Montréal, Quebec.

Elfring T. et W. Hulsink (2003), Networks in Entrepreneurship: The Case of High-technology Firms, *Small Business Economics*, 21, 409-422.

Fayolle A. (2004), Entrepreneuriat et processus: faire du processus un objet de recherche et mieux prendre en compte la dimension processus dans les recherches, Communication au 7ème Congrès International Francophone en Entrepreneuriat et PME. 27 – 29 Octobre, Montpellier.

Fayolle A., A.Vernier et B. Djiane (2004), Les jeunes diplômés de l'enseignement supérieur sont-ils des créateurs d'entreprises comme les autres ? *Gestion 2000*, 22 : 5, 39-55.

Gartner W. (1985), A framework for describing the phenomenon of new venture creation, *Academy of Management Review*, 10:4, 696-706.

Gartner W. B. (1989), "Who is an Entrepreneur?" Is the Wrong Question, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 13:4, 47-68.

Gartner W., K. G., Shaver E. Gatewood et J. A. Katz (1994), Finding the entrepreneur in entrepreneurship, *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, 18:3, 5-9.

Glaser B. et A. Strauss (1967), The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research, New York: Adline de Gruyter.

Granovetter M. (1973), The strength of weak ties, *American Journal of Sociology*, 78: 6, 1360-1379

Granovetter M. (1985), Economic action and social structure: the problem of embeddedness, *American Journal of Sociology*, 91: 3, 481-510.

Granovetter M. (2004), Les institutions économiques comme construction sociales: un cadre d'analyse, In A. Orléan (sous la direction de) : *Analyse économique des conventions*, 2ème édition, Paris : PUF Quadrige, 119-136.

Granovetter M. (2005), The Impact of Social Structure on Economic Outcomes, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 19: 1, 33 – 50.

Greve A. (1995), Networks and Entrepreneurship – An Analysis of Social Relations, Occupational Background, and Use of Contracts During the Establishment Process, *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 11:1, 1-24

Grossetti M. (2006), Relations et médiations dans le processus de création d'entreprises. Communication au 2ème Congrès de l'Association Française de Sociologie, Bordeaux, 5-8 Septembre,

- Grossetti M. et M. P. Bès (2001), Encastremets et découplages dans les relations science-industrie, *Revue Française de Sociologie*, 42 : 2, 327-355.
- Grossetti M., J-F. Barthe et C. Beslay (2006), La mobilisation des relations sociales dans les processus de création d'entreprises. Aperçus à partir d'une enquête en cours, *Sociologies Pratiques*, 13, 47-59.
- Guillaume-Hofnung M. (1995), La médiation, Paris: PUF, QSJ?
- Hansen E. L. (2000), Resource acquisition as a start up process: initial stocks of social capital and organizational foundings, *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, Babson, Babson College.
- Helle N. and H. Madsen (2004), Knowledge Intensive Entrepreneurship in a Social Capital Perspective, *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 12: 2, 105-125.
- Hernandez E. M. (1999), Le processus entrepreneurial. Vers un modèle stratégique d'entrepreneuriat, Paris : L'Harmattan.
- Hoang H. et B. Antoncic (2003), Network-Base Research in Entrepreneurship. A Critical Review, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18 : 2, 165-187
- Hofer C. W. et W. D. Bygrave, (1992), Researching Entrepreneurship, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 16:3, 91-100.
- Hung S.C. et Y.C. Hsiao (2004), Mobilizing social capital to pursue entrepreneurship, *IEEE.2004 International Engineering Management Conference*.
- Jack S. et A. Anderson (2002), The effects of embeddedness on the entrepreneurial process, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 17, 467-487.
- Jansen D. (2003), Supporting Newly Founded Firms – Personal and Professional Networks, Discussion Papers 3. Forschungsinstitut Für Öffentliche Verwaltung, Speyer.
- Jenssen J. I. et H. Koenig (2002), The effect of social networks on resource access and business Start-up, *European Planning Studies*, 10: 8, 1039-1046
- Johanisson B. (1998), Personal Networks in Emerging Knowledge-based Firms: Spatial and Functional Patterns, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 10, 297-312.
- Katz J. (1993), The dynamics of organizational emergence: a contemporary group formation perspective, *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, 17:2, 97-101.
- Liao J. et H. Welsch (2005), Roles of social capital in venture creation: key dimension and research implication, *Journal of Small Business Management*, 43: 4, 345-362.

Licht A. et J. Siegel (2006), The Social Dimensions of Entrepreneurship, In M Casson et B. Yeung (eds.) *Handbook of Entrepreneurship*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. Lin B-W., P.C. Li et J.S.

Chen (2006), Social capital, capabilities and entrepreneurial strategies: a study of Taiwanese high-tech new ventures, *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, 73, 168-181.

Marchesnay M. (2000), L'entrepreneuriat: une vue kaléidoscopique, *Revue Internationale P.M.E.*, 13:1, 105-116.

Palan Y. (1999), La médiation. Définition, pratiques et perspectives. Paris : Nathan Université.

Rasmusen E. (2005), The process of new venture creation in a university setting. Paper presented at the conference "Accompanying measures & survival of new firms: between Darwinism and assistance". Montpellier (France), May, 26.

Steyaert C. (1998), A qualitative methodology for process studies of entrepreneurship. Creating local knowledge through stories, *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 27: 3, 13-33.

Strauss A. et Corbin J. (2003), L'analyse de données selon la grounded theory. Procédures de codage et critères d'évaluation. In. C. Daniel (textes réunis par) *L'enquête de terrain*, Paris : La découverte-Mauss, 363-379.

Strauss A. and Corbin J. (1998), Basics of qualitative research, Thousand Oask: Sage Publications.

Swedberg R. (1994), Une histoire de la sociologie économique. Paris : Desclée De Brouwer.

Ulhoi J.P. (2005), The social dimension of entrepreneurship, *Technovation*, 25, 939-946.

Van de Ven A. et R. Engleman (2004), Event- and outcome-driven explanations of entrepreneurship, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19, 343-358

Verstraete T. et A. Fayolle (2005), *Paradigmes et entrepreneuriat*, *Revue de l'Entrepreneuriat*, 4 :1, 33-52

Wacheux F. (1996), Méthodes qualitatives et recherché en gestion, Paris : Economica.