



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

# **The way things are done here – Polish entrepreneurship - having endowed heritage or burden?**

Starnawska, Marzena

Gdansk University of Technology

2009

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/37991/>  
MPRA Paper No. 37991, posted 19 Apr 2012 00:54 UTC

---

# THE WAY THINGS ARE DONE HERE – POLISH ENTREPRENEURSHIP HAVING ENDOWED HERITAGE OR BURDEN?

*Marzena Starnawska, PhD  
Gdansk University of Technology*

Keywords: entrepreneurship, transition, culture

## 1. Introduction

The dominant paradigm of entrepreneurship in Western world puts us into a bit of quandary. Especially when we have seen entrepreneurship over the years in Poland. Western models of super-hero individual, with a portfolio of amazing personal features, following a classical model of entrepreneurial process makes us wonder to what extent Polish entrepreneurs should be really called entrepreneurs. Without doubt how we see entrepreneurship in Polish context has been a subject to a process of interplay between values, beliefs of anything related to entrepreneurship and us, social agents involved. How the culture and its artifacts in the context of the last 60 years of many difficult changes in social and economic has shaped entrepreneurship. Has this been the cultural burden or heritage?

Entrepreneurial process has attracted a lot of attention in the research. Many models evolve around so called stages approach, presented in **positivistic** approaches to ideal entrepreneurial model in research and teaching. Among many perspectives one of the most common approaches to entrepreneurship is emphasizing a **person** approach. These develop around the belief that entrepreneurs are born, have a special gene, a set of features. Based on that a plethora of definitions have been proposed, defining the one, what the

one is like, like Morris (1998) who provides 77 definitions of entrepreneur. The other common approach is a **behavioural** one, stressing the actions, behaviours of an entrepreneur. This approach has processual aspect and is often linked with a person approach. The last commonly undertaken perspective has its explanation in the division between **facilitating** or **constraining** environment for entrepreneurship.

There are many positivistic models of entrepreneurial process and one of such is provided in Kaplan and Warren's (2007) text where an entrepreneur follows: conducting opportunity analysis; developing the plan and setting up the company; acquiring financial partners/sources of funding; mobilizing the resources required and implementing the plan; scaling and harvesting the venture. Such differ, in terms of order, emphasis, and are dependent on many macro and microeconomic factors, linked to an entrepreneur or their environment. We know we explain models we are discouraged to challenge. But all models are contextualized and we put emphasis in this paper on the structure of culture.

## 2. Theoretical framework

The economy and society, which was *washed* in the **communist system** for more than 40 years of post-war period, and for almost another 20 years, functioning as a **market economy**, still keeps little splinters in people's hearts of how entrepreneurship is seen, constructed and enacted<sup>1</sup>. This is what we have inherited from war and post war periods, its political systems, and associated social and economic systems. Without doubt, there are many voices heard that **communist era** has made transition societies think of entrepreneurs in a **distorted** way owing to **propaganda** as well as **legal barriers**, as a tool for discouraging entrepreneurial spirit. barriers to entrepreneurship . Even in **market economy**, many institutional frameworks have discouraged entrepreneurship in its various forms.

The interesting question is how the culture has shaped and influenced business strategies of Polish entrepreneurs over the last 60 years? If they have inherited a conducive endowment or have been distorted while carrying the cultural burden. The research (Robert and Bukobi, 2000) emphasizes the difficult experience of private business owners in the transition countries during the communist regime. Private business ownership and running was prohibited and all its possible forms very strictly regulated. This had its implications in communist propaganda, discouraging any form of individual initiative, attempting to degrade the ethos of entrepreneur.

---

<sup>1</sup> The splinters' metaphor has its source in Andersen's tale of Snow Queen. The devil, who makes an evil mirror that distorts reality and later shatters it to infect people on earth with its splinters that distort their sight and freeze their hearts.

The common stereotype of an entrepreneur is that such a competitive individual runs a successful firm. Casson (2005) asks if such view should be so freely accepted in the eyes of statistics which say that abundance of small firms fail. Quite often this contravenes, individualistic, and self-made entrepreneur, paragon in Western business literature. Though such “positive” stereotypes are quite misleading and do not reflect the reality of numbers. Western world cultivates the image of **superhero**, bookshops are full of biographies and autobiographies of successful entrepreneurs. At the same time, when we encounter stereotypes of entrepreneurs in Polish context, few successful stories are evident in the public domain like discourse or in narratives. When looking for metaphors and social constructions, there is some evidence of a regarding entrepreneurs as spivs, exploiters or large capitalists. But when we look at entrepreneurship we should take much **wider**, complex **perspective**. That incorporates not only one determinant of entrepreneurship phenomenon. The observation of their context, their relationships with environment and its cultural framework is crucial. Some authors call it biographical approach (Bławat, 2003), but such still narrows the perspective to a person and their story. Many of today's attitudes towards entrepreneurship and entrepreneurs, exemplified in entrepreneurial strategies undertaken as well as constructions of entrepreneurship, people's beliefs, morality, have been influenced by the previous political, economic and social systems. Socio-**cultural** context, which shapes an entrepreneur and entrepreneurial actions encompasses both agency (human action) and the whole **structure** (Giddens, 2003). For us, Giddens's framework of **structuration** encompasses the idea of culture. The **structure** consist of rules and resources. The **agency** is human action. Human action is shaped by the context in which one operates but human agents have the knowledge of their society. Such knowledge informs their action, which reproduces social structures, which in turn enforce and maintain the dynamics of action

This structure is constantly reframed and fluctuates, it is not stable, and is being recreated and redefined by the social actors creating it. This means that we as a society's agents, together with entrepreneurs, generate our own structure of meanings and interpretations. We all share the structure, constantly shape it. The structure gets back to us and makes us interpret, understand what entrepreneurship and entrepreneurs are.

As a canvas for the understanding the constructivist approach to entrepreneurship as suggested by some authors (Bouchiki 1993; Anderson and Starnawska 2008) we would use the **culture** in which one exists or operates. The reason for the **constructivist** approach is that an entrepreneur have their own story, produce their own narrative. There is no universal gene or pattern. Taking positivistic approach into analyzing determinants of entrepreneurship, we quite often feel confused seeing complexity and chaos of the world of an individual entrepreneur. We return to Bouchikhi's (1993) work, that Peterson

and Meckler (2001) referred to while discussing the issues of complexity and chaos in their work, and we extend it by adding additional culture canvas.

There are many various contexts in which entrepreneurship emerges. Each of the cases has a different story to tell, and there is no universal gene or pattern that could be repeated. The chance, as an effect of chaos and complexity, and constant reframing of the structure through the process of structuration, allows each voice to play on their own instrument, not always well tuned, their own scripts to follow. We can only hope that the tunes combined have something interesting to listen to. (Von Balthasar, 1989). That is why it is important to emphasize social constructivism approach while making an attempt to define an entrepreneur or entrepreneurship – there are too many different contexts and cultures where entrepreneurs and their companies operate. One of such contexts is a nation/country one and our focus is to look at its cultural aspects. These encompass one's social context. Therefore, it would be better to avoid linking only personality explanation of entrepreneurship. There are contexts in which the universal and all-applicable formula for an entrepreneur would not work at all.

Some authors discuss relevant causal linkages between culture and entrepreneurship activity or entrepreneur profiles (Lavoie and Chamlee, 2001; Boettke i Storr, 2002; Granovetter 2004). The institutional approach encompassing the culture context, emphasizes the need of a person or an organization (here an entrepreneur) to institutional pressures and expectations present in social norms, values (Goodstein, 1994). There are studies referring to special features of entrepreneurship in transition economies (Smallbone et al, 2006). The consideration of culture has its roots in institutional theory which emphasizes the need of an organization's (in the case of this paper - entrepreneur or their business) reaction to institutional pressures and social expectations (Goodstein, 2005). Culture reflects a shared or as Casson (2005) puts it collective subjectivity. The main elements of culture are values and beliefs. Casson reminds that people are not aware of its influence and therefore not critical of such beliefs, values or norms. Values and norms reflect the importance placed on different roles. They also legitimize certain objectives as important in particular cultures - beliefs about, beliefs of – individual or collective constructions. For example “that only few people of a certain type are well-informed” (Casson, 2005). When building culture in this way, we all become trapped in our own interpretations. Of course, the structure is flexible and changes overtime. But this allows us to think that Western-world super hero entrepreneur might not necessarily ever be the case in a transition economy and society like Poland. Second World War has not given space and opportunity for what we understand as classic superhero entrepreneur. The afterwar, more than 60 years of communist regime hindered any form of “private business” (with some fluctuations in between). Many of today's entrepreneurs were born and brought up or operated in those times and this has strongly shaped the programming of the mind, the mindset of Polish entrepreneurs.

There is an old propaganda poster that we have encountered. On the bottom it says: “‘Good’ kulak. Old wisdom says: do not trust the rich man, they will shake one hand with you but will take something away from you with the other”. *Kulak* means “a fist” or tight fisted (from Russian). *Kulak* was also a category of affluent and well-endowed peasants in the later Russian Empire, Soviet Russia, and early Soviet Union. *Kulaks* were a class enemy under the communist regime and their ownership was prosecuted. Although *kulak* did not directly refer to private business ownership, we suggest that farmers are an example of individual undertaking which is a sort of enterprising.

Though propaganda and its role in shaping attitudes towards entrepreneurship is not the focus of our paper, but we may only try to wonder why there is so little positive discourse in the public domain today on entrepreneurs and what they do.



**Picture 1.** “Dobry kułak” (good kulak) – a propaganda poster from socialist economy. Source: [http://www.echoslonska.com/0112/zarchiwum/011202fm\\_Lucas\\_DokumentyepokiI.htm](http://www.echoslonska.com/0112/zarchiwum/011202fm_Lucas_DokumentyepokiI.htm) -author unknown.

### 3. Outlining the glass splinters

Today we are almost 20 years old as a market economy, and still entrepreneurship culture, how we think of entrepreneurs as a society – in public discourse, in media, in jokes, books, movies, reflects what peculiar evil glass splinters we have in our hearts and eyes. It is also reflected in how formal market institutions approach entrepreneurs.

The propaganda, no matter how effective, must have left some of its **splinters** - attitudes towards entrepreneurs and any form of entrepreneurial undertakings were distorted. The magic devil mirror distorted the appearance of things reflected in it. It fails to reflect all the good and beautiful aspects of people and things and at the same time it magnifies all the bad and ugly aspects

so that they look even worse than they really are. Would it be appropriate to say that we have inherited an increasingly heavy burden? Perhaps an entrepreneur has rarely been associated with bloodsucker, spivs or *Geschäft* man which were common for propaganda language. The most common one that brings neutral associations was “private men” and perhaps that is why it has survived. Such splinters are not easy to be taken out. They shape both how entrepreneurs act, what entrepreneurial process looks like and the way we perceive entrepreneurs. Baumol (1990) reminds that the definition of an entrepreneur should reflect his local context i.e. local structure determining entrepreneurship. In the emerging, transition economies, the structure bends under the burden of sudden changes (in legal system, in economic) and generates a lot of uncertainty. Institutions are fragile, often underdeveloped.

We should not forget that with the beginning of market economy, institutions were quite often substituted by informal rules and behaviors, typical for the previous regime (where informal rules of the game for illegal private business were replacing non existing market institutions). There are many sources of uncertainty for today’s enterprises in many countries. It is even more the case in Poland’s economic and social system, which still generates a lot of uncertainty for businesses. According to Starczewska-Krzyszotek (2007) report, the list of external factors negatively influencing the opportunities for enterprise development, has not changed for many years. Entrepreneurs mention: lack of clear and many unambiguous legal regulations, lack of flexible employment opportunities, strong competition on the side of shadow economy. Sobel (2008) mentions that in the bad institutional environment make people move to unproductive and destructive entrepreneurship, because of many administrative procedures which are too costly and too time-consuming. For many years, there has not been much change in legal framework for business. Enterprising is regulated by almost 800 legal acts. Lack of clarity and different interpretation of such, do not allow entrepreneurs to plan in long-term perspective (Doing Business 2009). Even in the positive business climate in 2007 has not change entrepreneur’s attitude to long-term planning.

Also weak social framework, expressed in low level of trust, weak social capital among Polish entrepreneurs, generate another stream of uncertainty about present and future as regards getting access to resources. The networking culture is low, not popular, there are few initiatives providing opportunities for networking (Starnawska, 2006). Entrepreneurs display a limited collective orientation (Konecki, 2006), and it is usually very individualistic one, directed at close ones –either relatives or close network of friends. Kubiak and Miszalska (2000) mention that ‘social vacuum’ and strong atomization of people in PRL (Polish People’s Republic – an abbreviation for the name of the country in the communist regime) has been replaced today by ‘social vacuum’ and atomization in a democratic state. They conclude that social phenomena have crossed the borders of only one socio-economic system. For them also *dirty togetherness* have soaked the private sector by entering the shadow

economy and shaping entrepreneurial strategies among today's entrepreneurs. Such patterns of behaviour, distorted enterprising forms, strongly shape the way we think of entrepreneurs and how entrepreneurs operate. Polish entrepreneurs today, in Poland or abroad, seem to pride themselves on their resourcefulness<sup>2</sup>. So how should we view the culture of former system and its role in thinking of entrepreneurs and acting in entrepreneur roles in the framework outlined above? Is this a **unentrepreneurial type** (negative connotation) or a **skilled spiv** (positive connotation)? What glass splinters are doing in the culture today?

We would propose to incorporate in our discussion a **portfolio** entrepreneurship aspects as well. Carter and Ram (2003) skillfully put forward a summary of portfolio entrepreneurship explanations by mentioning "an individual(s) simultaneously owning and engaging in a portfolio of entrepreneurial interests". Long (1979) notes that it is particularly typical for developing economies where people engage in various jobs and businesses at the same time. We would suggest here to talk about portfolio enterprising, as all sorts of attempts at venturing or enterprising, where certain contexts make many ventures fail, therefore determine a mastery of skillful *bricolage*.

Another useful framework on which we would put most emphasis in this paper is *bricoleuring*. The entrepreneurial process does remind the process of constructing a collage, from a variety of glass pieces, the pieces which an entrepreneurs has to hand regardless of their original purpose. Levi-Strauss (1956) talks about a *bricoleur*. The collage happens to be a very beautiful piece of artwork. Our entrepreneur-*bricoleur* has inherited a skillful way of coping from the previous socio-economic systems and has been shaped strongly by many market barriers inhibiting entrepreneurial process. The access to pieces of glass which are by his hand is nothing else but a personal network of an entrepreneur. *Bricolage* is like an improvisation in an undertaking. The entrepreneurial process is not linear, there may not be an ordered, stage by stage acting of opportunity identification, resource organization. An entrepreneur uses what he has to hand. There, to his hand, is a network of strong relations with 'close ones'. The French meaning of the word *bricoleur* describes someone who is very skilful or sly. The collage created by a *bricoleur* can have a very significant value. This reminds one of the famous definitions suggested by Timmons (1994) that "entrepreneurship is about creating something of a value from practically nothing". *Bricolage* is a process of coping behaviour, way of gaining access to resources, identifying an opportunity without structured order or plan, with what entrepreneur has to hand. Neace (1999) compares the opportunity identification in the context of command economy and existing political regime more than 20 years ago with: an adventure, deduction and low experience of an entrepreneur. In the process of supply and demand adjustments, he talks about being in the right place at the

---

<sup>2</sup> Own unpublished research results on entrepreneurial strategies in Poland and Scotland among Polish entrepreneurs, mimeo.



right time. And this does not necessarily mean that an entrepreneur has sufficient experience, skills or resources relevant for enacting market opportunities. They take any opportunity to earn money, for creating a value.

It would be valuable to incorporate in our discussion here a well-known aphorism “*Jack of all trades, master of none*” describing a person with multiple skills, but no expert proficiency. Although research so far has progressed explaining the Laeazar’s (2002) thesis that those with many skills would be self-employed, we think that *Jack-off-all trades* puts more insights into the explanation of *bricoleuring*, skillful type, doing a very hard job in many unfavorable circumstances either in the communist regime or in difficult institutional realia of today’s market economy. This is particularly exemplified in the cases of entrepreneurs who made their fortunes starting the businesses by embarking on opportunities related to supply-demand adjustments.

#### 4. Research results

The data for the analysis has been gathered on the basis of extensive case study approach (Stoecker, 1991) among 7 Polish entrepreneurs, based on observation, unstructured and semi-structured interviews. The sampling method was not random, the researcher approached entrepreneurs with different profiles, and was mainly determined by their agreement to become subjects to research and the authors own social capital. The provided analysis employs descriptive approach to case study research (Yin, 2003) and the results outline the entrepreneurs and the way their businesses are run.

The entrepreneurial process looks very interesting when we keep in mind the cultural influences mentioned earlier on. The analysed cases present a very low propensity to undertaking risk, avoid uncertainty. They often employ coping way of doing things confirming that they are able to live by their wits. They *bricolate*, using the existing close and strong personal networks. They show little interest in extending their social capital. Konecki (2007) confirms this when he suggests that the collectivism of Polish entrepreneurs is individualistic one. Collective orientation of an entrepreneur is reflected in the relationship and cooperation with the “close ones” in the nearest circle and in their strong familism. As mentioned earlier, low trust society which Poland has been generates such attitudes. A Polish entrepreneur is not a classical superhero entrepreneur.

The analysed entrepreneurs have used strong trust in their relations with the ‘close ones’: relatives, close friends, recommended mentors, as a substitute to either poor or non existing, very often non efficient institutions regulating the market. Lack of trust to governments and their corruption, lack or weak support for entrepreneurs, complex legal regulations, poor networking culture are all offset by the substitute which is a personal network of close ones. Similarly the Chinese have worked out their own substitute of *guanxi* networks as Lee and Anderson (2007) remind.

**Table 1. Entrepreneurs and their business - profiles**

case	SYNT	NETA	PWE	WAK	BUD	PUB	COUR
<b>Entrepreneur</b>	2 entrepreneurs, in their 30s, university degree,	2 entrepreneurs, in their 30s, one management degree and the other comp.science degree, began PhD degree but stopped	1 entrepreneur, in his early 60s, engineering degree	2 entrepreneurs, a marriage, in commandite limited company, in their 40s	2 entrepreneurs, in their 60s, 1 formal owner, the other in the shadow economy, lower high school level in Telecommunications	2 owners, one Pole higher university degree in Humanities, in his late 20s	2 self employed entrepreneurs in partnership(in their 30s), one university management degree, other lower high school in Construction
<b>Location</b>	Poland	Poland	Poland	Poland	Poland and Scotland	Scotland, Partnership with a Scott	Scotland and Poland
<b>Relationship between entrepreneurs</b>	University friends	University friends	Colleague from industry – another partnership	A marriage, other partners of a commandite partnership are his 4 brothers	Two brothers	A colleague from a wider circle of friends	Friends from work in Scotland
<b>Industry</b>	Website design, web positioning, wholesale trade on-line, diving equipment on-line	Speech sythesizers and their application	Scales setting	Wholesale stationery	Construction building (subcontracting)	Business closed Pub and restaurant and club (all in one)	Business formally suspended Courier
<b>Job experience</b>	A lot of experience direct sales and event marketing, own shadow enterprising as well	Previously employed by large Internet portal where some opportunities have emerged	Long work experience on contracts in Middle East, worked also for a university at the same time in Poland	Employed at school and in hospital,	Since their childhood helped parents in their business and in building houses, worked for large Polish Telecom. Comp. but sacked, own business run by one officially in Poland,	Employee on a few senior positions in catering business in Scotland, unofficial employment in family business in Poland	Still worked for someone else when running COUR at the same time, long history of being employment, one of them helped his uncle in running his businesses in Poland as far as 95.

Source: Own analysis

The cases provide us with some of the following conclusions<sup>3</sup>:

- Egocentric personal networks of entrepreneurs consist of a few contacts, which are strong. Such networks are used as a leverage for their entrepreneurial process. (SYNT, NETA, WAK, PWE, BUD, PUB, COUR)
- Our cases rely on the closest friends and relatives, with whom they started the business or have worked together so far. (SYNT, NETA, WAK, BUD, PUB, COUR)
- Based on the personal contact network, they have gained access to their first clients, very often from the previous job or from their activity in the shadow economy (BUD, SYNT, NETA, PUB, COUR).
- Opportunity identification was a matter of chance, and opportunities have been enacted without securing the resource access (SYNT, PWE, NETA, BUD)
- Their entrepreneurial process has not followed any closed pattern, they have leveraged themselves by their network, took whatever was to hand (PWE, SYNT, NETA, WAK, PUB, COUR)
- They have changed the nature of their enterprise or closed and opened it at times (BUD, WAK, PWE, NETA, PUB) in the face of changing tax regulations or insurance, to pay lower taxes and contribute less.
- They rarely undertake any broader networking activity, to reduce uncertainty deriving from lack of resources, their newness, complexity of information. They do not consider networking as a useful tool or activity, and involvement in such regard as waste of time (NETA, SYNT, BUD). The only exception here is an entrepreneur from PWE who has established a formal association in the industry and is an active member. The interesting case are two entrepreneurs from SYNT (leader in the industry in Poland, competitive on the world scale) who regard their location (in Pomeranian Technological Park in Gdynia) as a place with cheap business infrastructure and strengthening their image on the market, but do not regard it as a networking platform.
- Also younger entrepreneurs (SYNT, PUB, NETA, COUR) undertake improvising approach in running their ventures. We could therefore assume that the cultural programming of a mind, has been passed to next generations. This implies the specific nature of entrepreneurial process across different age groups, inheriting entrepreneurial attitudes from previous systems.

We could discuss that each small firm, or self-employed starts their venture in quite often improvising way because of liabilities of smallness and newness (Aldrich and Auster, 1986). But we should remind that analysed entrepreneurs and their ventures in many cases have existed on the market

---

<sup>3</sup> More data and information on the analysed cases in the Appendix 1.

longer than 1-2 years, so we could expect the growth of their business position and larger extent of employing their networks. Obviously the analysed cases do not focus solely on the start-up process but they confirm that they are taking whatever is at hand, making a lot of effort to end up with a successful venture via portfolio enterprising, like *Jack of all Trades* but master of none.

As we can see the cases incorporated are related to Polish entrepreneurs operating in Scotland. One could argue, that the specifics of entrepreneurship in immigrant context make the enterprising process even more challenging. Especially, when we include factors such as language problems, many difficulties that migrant entrepreneurs encountered when they moved and started businesses. Such arguments are valid and important, but paradoxically, in our research, it has turned out that Polish entrepreneurs regarded working and starting a business in Scotland much easier, less hindered by many institutions, and have encountered very positive attitudes from the agency in (Giddens's understanding) in Scotland when compared with cases of entrepreneurs operating in Poland.

## 5. Conclusions

In this paper we do not aim to propose **generalizations** on Polish entrepreneurs. Neither we provide a succinct fundamentals of entrepreneurship theory for Eastern and Central European context. But our propositions are revolving around Javinollar and Peter's (1973) doubts, why McClelland or Weber's theories of entrepreneur and entrepreneurship would be able to explain entrepreneurship in Africa or Latin America, if they were based on the research conducted among American and European entrepreneurs. Of course, many authors provide robust evidence of specifics of entrepreneurship in transition context (Smallbone et al, 2006). But we somehow still in our Polish research field employ Western or North-American models of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurs. Poland is more than just a few years after the transition period, and we still observe cases of enterprising portfolio *bricoleurs*, like *Jacks of all Trades* but masters of none. Entrepreneurs live by their wits and they seem to pride themselves on it. There is an old saying in Polish "**the one who lives by their wits lives indeed**". Perhaps **models** of entrepreneurial behaviour are not perfect as they do not embrace and reflect the whole population of entrepreneurs and their ventures

The framework we are talking about is important and should be subject to further **rigorous** research. The framework is acting like a **vicious circle**. Culture shapes attitudes to entrepreneurship, entrepreneurs in the process of venturing generate culture of how things are done here or there. The process of structuration confirms that entrepreneurs as agents are skilled learners while incorporating and reshaping the culture. We therefore regard constructivist approach to entrepreneur, enterprising and entrepreneurship. This is not aimed to be particularly right if we attempt to broaden the existing discussion of

enterprising by transition economies context. Each entrepreneur have their own story, there are many intertwined determinants of entrepreneurial process. Closed and clear models of enterprising do not meet the complexity and uncertainty of the changing world. The Gidden's framework allows us to postulate that it is for agents, to reproduce the structure. The human action, expressed in how we see, perceive entrepreneurship shapes the structure, the rules and resources we use to reproduce entrepreneurship. The structure we have carried with us is subject to changes, but it has made Polish entrepreneurship a skillful act of enterprising, not necessarily reminding Wester super-hero models. Is this a burden or endowment? Without doubt, living by one's wits is an act of enterprising.

## REFERENCES

- Aldrich H. and Auster E. R.: *Even dwarfs started small: Liabilities of age and size and their strategic implications*, Research in Organizational Behavior 8 (1986) 165-198.
- Anderson A.R. and Starnawska M.: *Research practices in entrepreneurship Problems of definition, description and meaning*, The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation 9 (2008) 221-230.
- Baker T., Miner A.S. and Eesley D.T.: *Improvising firms: bricolage, account giving and improvisational competencies in the founding process*, Research Policy 32 (2003) 255-276.
- Bławat F.: *Przedsiębiorca w teorii przedsiębiorczości i praktyce małych firm*. Gdańsk : Gdańskie Towarzystwo Naukowe, 2003.
- Baumol W.L.: *Entrepreneurship: Productive, Unproductive, and Destructive*, Journal of Political Economy 98 (1991) 893-921.
- Boettke P. J. i Storr V.: *Post Classical Political Economy*, American Journal of Economics and Sociology 61 (2002).
- Bouchiki. H.: *A constructivist framework for understanding entrepreneurship performance*, Organization Studies 4 (1993) 549-570.
- Carter S. i Monder R.: *Reassessing Portfolio Entrepreneurship*, Small Business Economics 21 (2003) 371-380.
- Casson M.: *Entrepreneurship, Business Culture and the Theory of the Firm* in: Handbook of Entrepreneurship Research (red. J.A. Zoltan and D.B. Audretsch), Kluwer, 2005, 223-246.
- Doing Business 2009, *Comparaison des Réglementations dans 181 Pays*, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, The World Bank, 2008, na stronie: [http://www.doingbusiness.org/documents/fullreport/2009/DB\\_2009\\_Francais.pdf](http://www.doingbusiness.org/documents/fullreport/2009/DB_2009_Francais.pdf) accessed 28 July 2008.
- Giddens A.: *Stanowienie społeczeństwa*. Poznań: Zysk i S-ka, 2003.
- Granovetter M.: *Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness* in: The New Economic Sociology: A Reader (red. F. Dobbin) Princeton University Press: Princeton, NJ , 2004.

Javillonar G.V. and Peters G.R.: *Sociological and social psychological aspects of Indian entrepreneurs*, The British Journal of Sociology 24 (1973) 314-328.

Kaplan J.M. and Warren A.C.: *Patterns of entrepreneurship*. John Wiley&Sons Inc. 2007

Konecki K.: *Działanie przedsiębiorcze. Auto - praca nad tożsamością a społeczny proces konstruowania motywacji do działania przedsiębiorczego* in: *W kręgu socjologii interpretatywnej. Badania jakościowe nad tożsamością* (red. J. Leoński, U. Kozłowska) Uniwersytet Szczeciński – Economicus, 2007.

Kubiak A. and Miszalska A.: *Czy nowa próżnia społeczna czyli o stanie więzi społecznej w III Rzeczpospolitej*, *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* 2 (2000) 19-43.

Lavoie D. and Chamlee-Wright E.: *Culture and Enterprise: The Development, Representation, and Morality of Business*. New York: Routledge, 2001.

Lazear E.P.: *Entrepreneurship*. National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 9109 August (2002).

Lee E. Yiu-chung and Anderson, A. R.: *Role Of Guanxi in Chinese Entrepreneurship*, *The Journal of Asia Entrepreneurship and Sustainability* December (2007) accessed on 12 July 2008 at <http://www.asiaentrepreneurshipjournal.com/>.

Lévi-Strauss C.: *The Savage Mind*. University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Morris M.H.: *Entrepreneurial Intensity: Sustainable Advantage for Individuals, Organizations and Societies*. Quorum, Westport: CT. 1998.

Morrison A., Rimmington M. and Williams C.: *Entrepreneurship in the Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure Industries*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 1999.

Murray J.A.: *A Concept of Entrepreneurial Strategy*, *Strategic Management Review* 5 (1984) 1-13.

Neace M.B.: *Entrepreneurs in Emerging Economies: Creating Trust, Social Capital and Civil Society*, *Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science* 565 (1999) 148-161.

Peterson M.F. and Meckler.M.R.: *Cuban-American Entrepreneurs: Chance, Complexity and Chaos*, *Organization Studies* 1 (2001) 31-57.

Robert P. and Bukobi E.: *Who are the Entrepreneurs and Where Do They Come From? Transition to Self-employment Before, Under and After Communism in Hungary*, *International Review of Sociology*10, (2000) 141-171.

Smallbone D. Welter F., Estrin S, Meyer K.E. and Bychkova M.: *Entrepreneurship in Transition Economies*, in: *Oxford Handbook of Entrepreneurship* (red. M. Casson) Oxford University Press, 2006.

Sobel R.S.: *Testing Baumol: Institutional quality and the productivity of entrepreneurship*, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 23 (2008) 641-655

Southern, A.: *The Enterprise Culture: The Socio-economic Context of Small Firms* in: *Enterprise and Small Business: Principles, Practice and Policy* (red. Sara. Carter and Dylan Jones-Evans) Harlow 2000.

Starczewska-Krzysztozek M.: *Konkurencyjność sektora MSP 2007, Raport z Badań*, Lewiatan, Warszawa, 2007.

Starnawska M.: Sieci MSP jako alternatywa dla niezależnej działalności małego przedsiębiorstwa, praca doktorska, Politechnika Gdańska, 2006.  
Stoecker R.: *Evaluating and rethinking case study*, Sociological Review 1 (1991) 88-112.  
Von Balthasar H.U.: Prawda jest symfoniczna, Kraków: W drodze, 1989.  
Yin, R.: Case Study Research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2002.

## Appendix 1

case	SYNT	NETA	PWE	WAK	BUD	PUB	COUR
Role of personal networks	limited networking in a wider socio-economic context making contacts during international conferences to see what other leaders in the industry do (to imitate their products)	some networking in a wider socio-economic context, thanks to the previous job experience of one of the entrepreneurs using contacts as clients and legitimacy building to other clients one entrepreneur is in an informal club for divers where he connects with other clients (other young people running their businesses)	The idea of opening a business emerged while a neighbor encountered foreign partners interested in a contract with Scales leveling  Established a formal association in the industry to share his own knowledge, to share experiences, to lobby for the industry interest	Lack of networking in a wider socio-economic context They do not talk to their competitors about business related issues during informal meetings	Lack of networking in a wider social economic context, using migrant social capital for job related admin issues, One brother settled as first in Scotland and then encouraged the other to move there as well	Wide networking attitude, a lot of trust expressed in partnerships and working with Poles and Scots, the pub was set up by him and his Scottish colleague from the previous catering employment	Wider networking – especially one of the entrepreneurs, providing the business with other clients, many different social and business contacts. Quitted the business in the time of research and embarked on developing his language skills to get a well-paid job in oil and gas sector.
<b>Images of bricolage and portfolio enterprising</b>	Various ad-hoc support during the establishment of the business from relatives Despite the bright idea the main reason for settling in the park was cheap rent and business infrastructure Imitating leaders'	Running many ventures at the same time and using clients from them in other ventures Lack of clear strategies for the future, many ideas revolving in entrepreneur's mind, based on the nature of the	The business was closed a couple of times, changing its legal form to adjust to less supportive law. Establishing another company aimed to work as Industry Standards institution, with exactly the same abbreviation in the	The business was closed a couple of times, changing its legal form to adjust to less supportive law. The entrepreneurs were running their own businesses and at the same time operated in a commandite partnership for	The business was closed a couple of times, changing its legal form to adjust to less supportive law. During their holiday or unpaid holiday, the two brothers go to Poland and work in a shadow economy when	Many events and running of the business was a huge learning curve for the entrepreneur. Paradoxically, they stopped working together because the employees interest was of the most importance for the	By working for the same employer on the shift basis, the two entrepreneurs had a shift system of customer service. It made the venture running very chaotic. They were planning to finally go on their own,



	products Taking advantage of the parks legitimacy for business operation	business as well – Internet related ventures make portfolio advertising a natural approach	name like the same one, run by the state. Using the garage in the house as the office for 2 ventures for many years. Accidental recruitment of a personal assistant who was doing direct insurance sales from home to home.	some time.	there is a good contract opportunity.	Polish owner. He always pressed on paying them their wages despite difficult times. The Scottish partner did not agree to that.	but did not have a clear criteria under what circumstances to do so.
<b>Enterprising process order</b>	Wasted a lot of time in designing the product without consulting his mentors	Many website service opportunities emerged and were tested in the process serving one client	An entrepreneur had know-how but had not been planning to take advantage of it having returned from Middle East to communist Poland.	Buying a warehouse in the middle of nowhere just because it was cheap and learning the lesson afterwards.	Did not realize they were going to have their own equipment when moving to Scotland, and had it sent from Poland by family rather than buying it there.	Not realizing that the licence was required for selling alcohol in a pub during the opening night.	Catching a client without a following up structured service.

Source: own analysis

