



The Sharing Economy's Impact on Motivations to Enter Hybrid Entrepreneurship: Using Self-Determination Theory as an Explanatory Framework

Caitlin Ferreira¹

Luleå University of Technology, Luleå, Sweden and Red & Yellow Creative School of Business, Cape Town, South Africa

Leyland Pitt²

Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University, Canada

Jan Kietzmann³

Peter B. Gustavson School of Business, University of Victoria, Canada

Abstract. The expansion of the sharing economy has significantly disrupted industries and transformed classifications of employment. The sharing economy has reduced barriers to entry for entrepreneurs, however the decline in entrepreneurship in many countries seemingly contradicts this. Hybrid entrepreneurship (HE), however, has seen substantial growth aligned to the sharing economy's development. This paper explores the link between the sharing economy and motivations for pursuing HE, in particular using self-determination theory as a theoretical framework. Through the use of semi-structured interviews with 20 hybrid entrepreneurs, four extrinsic and four intrinsic motivations were identified. The research highlights the extent to which the sharing economy has changed the path of entrepreneurial venture development, easing the accessibility thereof. This research has implications for many stakeholders in the sharing economy. Future researchers should consider whether an individual's industry of salaried employment impacts their primary motivation for pursuing HE, examine the impact of regulation on the sharing economy and develop strategies for established businesses under threat as a result of sharing economy business models.

JEL Codes: L26, O14, O15, M13.

Keywords: sharing economy, hybrid entrepreneurship, motivations, self-determination theory.

-
1. ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9575-6676, Luleå University of Technology, Luleå, Sweden, Email: caitlin.ferreira@ltu.se, Tel: +27-83-411-4525.
 2. Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University, Postal address: 500 Granville Street, Vancouver BC V6C 1W6, Canada, Email: leyland_pitt@sfu.ca, Tel: +1778-782-7712.
 3. Peter B. Gustavson School of Business, University of Victoria, Postal address: PO Box 1700 STN CSC, Victoria BC V8V 2Y2, Canada, Email: jkietzma@uvic.ca, Tel: 250-472-5996.

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

1. Introduction

“We used to live in a world where there were people, private citizens, and a world where there are businesses. Now we’re living in a world where people can become businesses in 60 seconds.” - Brian Chesky, Airbnb CEO (Ferenstein 2014)

The drastic growth of the sharing economy, referred to by a multitude of other names including the collaborative, gig, or on-demand economy, has significantly disrupted industries and transformed traditional classifications of employment (Ahsan 2018). The operationalisation of the term sharing economy remains in some instances ‘fuzzy’ given the broad application of the term to a number of different contexts (Ahsan 2018, p. 19; Frenken and Schor 2017). The sharing economy allows individuals to offer and share underutilised resources in creative ways (Cohen and Kietzmann 2014). Commonly cited examples, such as Airbnb allows individuals to rent out their homes to strangers, while Uber allows for real-time location-based ridesharing (Cohen and Kietzmann 2014). The assets that are commonly shared need not only be physical assets, but also include human resources (Elert and Henrekson 2016). Ravenelle (2017, p. 281) suggests that the sharing economy has allowed for ‘the masses’ to enter entrepreneurship, offering platforms that readily facilitate the exchange of goods and services. To those beginning their entrepreneurial journeys, the sharing economy offers a plethora of opportunities to outsource business functions, develop a client network and upskill oneself. Schurenberg (2016) suggests that the start-up has been democratised, with the cost of launching a tech business decreasing by approximately ninety percent since 2000.

Whilst all of these advances in technology have made it easier than ever to become an entrepreneur, it doesn’t suggest that being an entrepreneur has been made any easier. In fact, global entrepreneurship in developed economies is in decline (Naudé 2019), possibly indicating a reluctance for engaging in the riskiness of entrepreneurship during uncertain economic conditions. However, it is important to be cognisant of the fact that global entrepreneurship statistics adhere to a traditional definition of entrepreneurship, an apparent dichotomous classification (Folta, Delmar and Wennberg 2010). Theories of entrepreneurial choice propose that individuals choose between salaried employment or self-employment. Recent literature, however, has seen the introduction of a new type of entrepreneur, a hybrid entrepreneur, one that seemingly blurs the boundaries of traditional entrepreneurship. These individuals maintain salaried employment while engaging in some kind of entrepreneurial venture (Luc et al. 2018; Solesvik 2017; Thorgren et al. 2014). The rising popularity of hybrid entrepreneurship

(hereafter referred to as HE) has seemingly piqued the interests of both academics and policy makers as the search for further knowledge to expand traditional conceptualisations of entrepreneurship continues. Increasing rates of HE, aligning to the expansion of the sharing economy, is not surprising given the reduction in barriers to establish an entrepreneurial venture offered by the sharing economy. However, declining rates of entrepreneurship (Naudé 2019), coupled with increasing rates of HE (Solesvik 2017) prompt us to examine how and why the sharing economy is contributing to this changing employment landscape. In light of this, the current research assesses the motivations for entering HE, with a particular focus on how these motivations have been affected through the expansion of the sharing economy. The research question that guided the development of this research is as follows: *How does the sharing economy influence the factors that motivate individuals to become hybrid entrepreneurs?* The section to follow will provide an overview of the sharing economy and HE, thereafter the theoretical framework is introduced. This is followed by the methodology, results and conclusions, implications and finally the limitations of the research.

2. The Sharing Economy

Demary (2014) suggests that the heterogeneity of the sharing economy and the number of business models and markets involved creates a challenge in establishing a single definition. Thus, placing a greater focus on the cross-industry characteristics of the sharing economy assists with the operationalisation of the concept. First, the sharing economy pertains to the sharing of underutilised goods and services, such as skills or physical assets, which ultimately increases the efficiency of goods and services (Stanoevska-Slabeva et al. 2020; Bouncken and Reuschl 2018; Richter et al. 2017; Sundararajan 2016). Second, the nature of sharing allows for individuals to gain access to assets without any requirement for ownership (Bouncken and Reuschl 2018; Frenken and Schor 2017; Belk 2014). The notion of sharing may conjure up images of philanthropic sharing, and rightfully the sharing of private goods may be either for or without payment (Stanoevska-Slabeva et al. 2020). However, Price and Belk (2016, p. 193) state that the notion of sharing has become somewhat distorted with traditional marketplace exchanges, suggesting that a degree of ‘share washing’ exists to tout a marketplace, by any other name, as sharing. Habibi, Davidson and Laroche (2016), discuss a sharing/exchange continuum characterising the extent of pure sharing and pure exchange, plotting commonly cited sharing economy firms on the continuum. The implication thereof is that the sharing economy does most often include some resource exchange, albeit to varying degrees (Habibi et al. 2016). Third, the act of sharing is typically facilitated through a digital platform and is thus reliant on access to the Internet (Paik et al. 2018; Richter et al. 2017;

Belk 2014). The digital nature of the platforms facilitate sharing between strangers as opposed to within friend or family networks, this facilitates peer-to-peer relationships amongst users (Ravenelle 2017; Sundararajan 2016), which are typically private consumers and not established businesses (Schor and Fitzmaurice 2014). The platforms are facilitated by intermediaries, such as online marketplaces, community-based online platforms or social networking technologies (Stanojevska-Slabeva et al. 2020; Barnes and Mattsson 2016; Allen 2015). While firms operating in the sharing economy rely on these technologies to facilitate their engagement, they operate in a 'grey area' between the less regulated realm of private ownership and the highly regulated realm of public commerce (Elert and Henrekson 2016, p. 10). The lack of clarity pertaining to the business operations of these firms allows them to circumvent a number of existing institutional frameworks and regulations (Bruno and Faggini 2017; Elert and Henrekson 2016). The sharing economy brings with it a number of benefits for its users – ensuring that owners of assets can earn an income from idle assets while consumers face lower costs than purchasing or renting from an established business (Zervas et al. 2014; Proserpio and Byers 2014). Living in a time of great uncertainty and rising living costs, it is no surprise that consumers are drawn to platforms that increase their choice, allowing them to escape overly regulated industries that impose substantial costs on them (Allen 2015).

Beyond the sharing of physical assets, the advent of the sharing economy has created a number of new forms of employment typically embedded in new labour practices (Ahsan 2018). For example, there is an argument for individuals working through platforms that have emerged as a result of the gig economy, to be categorised as a distinct group of entrepreneurs (Ahsan 2018). The sharing economy has allowed for a number of individuals to pursue their entrepreneurial initiatives (Friedman 2014), with enhanced access to the assets needed for business development. Sundararajan (2014, p. 5) suggests that platforms of the sharing economy will be the new engines for innovation through the creation of the 'micro-entrepreneurship' opportunities that they offer to users. These opportunities offered to potential entrepreneurs assist with smoothing the path to entrepreneurship, lowering barriers to entry and perceived risk. This may lead one to think that the sharing economy would bring with it a surge of new start-ups enhancing global entrepreneurship rates, however this is not necessarily the case. Several researchers have discussed the fact that entrepreneurship, particularly in developed markets, is in decline (Cooke 2019; Naudé 2019). On the surface, this may seem counterintuitive in light of the expansion of the sharing economy, but the operationalisation of entrepreneurship may be at fault. When considering entrepreneurship as the traditional dichotomy of choice, one finds that global entrepreneurship is indeed in decline. However, when one considers the true complexity of entrepreneurship, we find that a certain category of entrepreneurship, namely HE, is flourishing as a result of the sharing economy.

3. The Blurred Lines of Hybrid Entrepreneurship

HE can be defined as the phenomenon that occurs when individuals choose to maintain salaried employment while simultaneously engaging in self-employment through an entrepreneurial venture (Bögenhold 2019; Luc et al. 2018; Solesvik 2017; Thorgren et al. 2014; Petrova 2011; Folta et al. 2010). It is typically associated with the early stages of venture development, where less-confident entrepreneurs may opt to limit their commitment, or to evaluate their entrepreneurial potential (Folta et al. 2010).

The apparent merger of the traditional labour market and entrepreneurship has resulted in a somewhat ambiguous area of employment classification. Traditional definitions of entrepreneurship categorise the creation of a new venture as an all-or-nothing activity (Demetry 2017), with HE not being recognised as an independent state of entrepreneurship (Folta et al. 2010). This dichotomous classification of entrepreneurship does not fully encapsulate the varying degrees of entrepreneurial activity that are commonplace in practice (Petrova 2011). The complexity associated with the classification of HE is ever increasing due to the heterogeneous nature of this group of individuals (Bögenhold 2018). Whilst two individuals may both be classified as hybrid entrepreneurs, the extent to which they are both invested and engaged in their salaried employment and entrepreneurial ventures are likely to differ. Despite the constant state of flux between salaried employment and entrepreneurship, labour statistics are not able to incorporate this movement due to commonly used definitions precluding HE from being classified as a type of entrepreneurship (Bögenhold 2018). Concerns relating to the binary nature of traditional definitions of entrepreneurship tend to form the basis of enquiry for HE research (Bögenhold 2018; Bögenhold and Klinglmair 2017; Xi et al. 2017; Bögenhold and Klinglmair; 2016; Viljamaa and Varamäki 2015; Folta et al. 2010). Existing literature appears to be relatively consistent in suggesting that HE can be used as an entry strategy into full-time entrepreneurship that presents a far lower risk (Solesvik 2017; Raffiee and Feng 2014), however, it is important to note that this is but one of a number of complex motivations.

3.1. Examining the Motives of Hybrid Entrepreneurs

The field of research examining HE, whilst in its infancy, has produced several notable contributions. Solesvik (2017) improved existing conceptualisations of HE, while Block and Landgraf (2016) sought to establish motivations that aid the transition from hybrid to full-time entrepreneurship. Research conducted by Raffiee and Feng (2014) further described the treatment of HE as a transitory phase prior to full-time entrepreneurship. Much research examining HE continues to describe this hybrid state as a transitory phase along the

entrepreneurial journey towards full-time entrepreneurship, despite Viljamaa and Varamäki (2015) establishing clear differences between transitory and persistent hybrid entrepreneurs.

Despite a slowly growing body of literature pertaining to HE, very few studies have examined the key motivating factors that result in individuals pursuing HE, none of which have considered how the expansion of the sharing economy has influenced these factors. Studies that have examined motivating factors, have largely been conceptual in nature, or presented pilot studies with small sample sizes (see for example Solesvik 2017). A number of researchers have provided insight for fertile ground for future research in the field of HE. Folta et al. (2010), for example, suggest that further research is needed to ascertain the role of psychological factors that could motivate an individual to pursue HE, more so than a financial incentive. While Viljamaa and Varamäki (2015) propose that future researchers consider evaluating the motivations of hybrid entrepreneurs in greater depth. This research seeks to evaluate the motivations of individuals to become hybrid entrepreneurs, a category of entrepreneurship that is largely predicated on the expansion of the sharing economy. This research makes use of self-determination theory as the theoretical framework through which to evaluate these motives.

4. Self-Determination Theory

Self-determination theory (hereafter referred to as SDT) is a theory of human motivation and development (Al-Jubari, Hassan and Lián 2019; Niemiec and Ryan 2009). SDT investigates an individual's inherent growth tendencies and their innate psychological needs that are seen as the basis for self-motivation (Deci and Ryan 2000; Ryan and Deci 2000). The needs for competence, relatedness and autonomy have been identified as essential for the optimal functioning of one's natural propensity for growth (Ryan and Deci 2000), allowing for a better understanding of the 'what and why of goal pursuits' (Deci and Ryan 2000, p. 228). Competence 'refers to the perception that one is capable of influencing their environment in desirable ways' (Al-Jubari et al. 2019, p. 1328), while relatedness refers to the desire to feel connected to others in some way (Al-Jubari et al. 2019; Deci and Ryan 2000). Autonomy refers to volition, more specifically examining the desire to self-organise one's experience and behaviour (Deci and Ryan 2000).

SDT suggests that there are two categories of motivated behaviours, those that are consciously chosen, referred to as self-determined behaviours, and those that are not consciously chosen but rather automated behaviours (Deci and Ryan 1980). The key difference between these two types of behaviour is that the former is the result of conscious information processing, while the latter is not (Deci and Ryan 1980). Examining conscious, or self-determined behaviours, we find that

sources of motivation for behaviour can be either intrinsic or extrinsic (Hamari et al. 2016). Intrinsic motivation is sustained by the satisfaction of one's basic psychological needs for autonomy and competence (Niemiec and Ryan 2009). When one is intrinsically motivated to complete an activity, they find the activity interesting and are able to derive satisfaction from the activity itself (Gagné and Deci 2005). In an instance where an individual may not find enjoyment in a particular task, intrinsic motivation may not be present and as such will require other, extrinsic, incentives. Extrinsic motivation occurs when behaviours are performed to obtain an outcome that is separable from an activity in and of itself (Niemiec and Ryan 2009; Ryan and Deci 2000). In this instance, satisfaction is not derived from the activity itself but rather from extrinsic consequences that the activity creates (Gagné and Deci 2005).

Entering into an entrepreneurial venture is the result of an intentional process and planned behaviour (Al-Jubari et al. 2019; Bird and Jelinek 1988). SDT proposes that individuals have tendencies to grow and therefore move towards specific activities that are able to satisfy inner resources of development and optimal functioning (Al-Jubari et al. 2019). SDT considers individuals with satisfied psychological needs as intrinsically motivated and therefore more likely to persist at completing a task (Al-Jubari et al. 2019; Deci and Ryan 2000). Motivation plays a vitally important role in the formation of entrepreneurial intentions, with individuals being intrinsically and/or extrinsically motivated to pursue entrepreneurship (Al-Jubari et al. 2019). Previous research has examined the role of both intrinsic and extrinsic motivations, finding that both exert a positive influence on entrepreneurial intention under specific circumstances (Antonioli et al. 2016). An empirical exploration of these motivators will serve to establish an innate comprehension of the choice behind entering a hybrid state of entrepreneurship. The current research seeks to examine the motivators for entry into HE, employing SDT as the lens through which to evaluate these motives.

5. Methodology

This research made use of an exploratory research design, notably employing the principles of qualitative research. Kothari (2004) suggests that qualitative research is most desirable when examining human motivations as this research seeks to do. Personal, depth interviews were selected as the research method, given their common use in the social sciences (Tracy 2013), the flexibility offered in the interview process (Bryman and Bell 2011; Kothari 2004) and the ability to produce a wealth of information on a particular phenomenon (Marczyk et al. 2005). The interviews were semi-structured and made use of a laddering technique (Malhotra 2010), allowing for conversations to flow naturally to explore deep-rooted motivations. The use of interviews offered a number of advantages, such as obtaining large amounts of detailed information, extracting

personal information, enhanced sample control and spontaneous and natural reactions from participants (Kothari 2004). The interviews provided the opportunity for mutual discovery and understanding, through conversation that is organic and adaptive to the participant's experience (Tracy 2013). This was vital as no two participants had the same experiences in their salaried employment and entrepreneurial ventures. Given the semi-structured nature of the interviews, probing questions specific to each participant's responses were used to help clarify, expand on and explain certain responses. Yin (1994) suggests that the use of a semi-structured interview guide could enhance the reliability of the results obtained.

In order to attract hybrid entrepreneurs, requests for participation in the research were made on a number of online social platforms, whereby individuals were requested to contact one of the researchers if they were able to partake in the research. Those exposed to the request were asked to share amongst their own networks to ensure a population beyond the researchers network was made aware of the research. The use of social platforms as a recruitment tool for research has become increasingly popular and is likely to continue to grow (Gelinis et al. 2017). In the request for participation, potential participants were provided with a standard definition of HE as adapted from Folta et al. (2010) to ensure a standardisation of the understanding of HE. When potential participants contacted the researcher, they were asked to indicate whether their employment status adhered to the definition. The definition provided to participants was as follows: *A hybrid entrepreneur is an individual who maintains salaried employment while pursuing their own entrepreneurial venture simultaneously* (Folta et al. 2010). Those that aligned with the definition were asked to participate in the interview, while those that did not were dismissed. In line with the observation of ethical principles, all participants were made aware of the purpose of the research, together with their rights as a participant as it pertains to their voluntary participation (Vanclay, Baines and Taylor 2013), the confidentiality of their responses (Kaiser 2009) and their right to withdraw from the research (Schaefer and Wertheimer 2010). All interviews were recorded following the explicit consent of the participants.

The research made use of an iterative analysis as suggested by Tracy (2013), which recommends active reflection upon current literature and theories that the researcher brings to the data. The researchers made use of manual coding using the process outlined by Tracy (2013), creating descriptive, first-level codes while using a constant comparative method which allowed for modifications in the coding scheme to create new codes. This ensured the iterative nature of the data analysis process. In order to reduce the subjectivity of the data analysis and the possible presence of bias, the use of independent coders sought to enhance the reliability of the data generated. The use of multiple coders allowed researchers to ensure the consistency, and by extension the validity, of their findings. In

addition, collaboration in the coding process enhanced the systematicity and transparency of the coding procedures (Cornish et al. 2014).

A valid sample of twenty participants was realised, with all participants self-identifying as hybrid entrepreneurs. Recent research by Weller et al. (2018) suggests that a small sample ($n = 10$) with extensive probing is able to collect most of the salient ideas, while a larger sample ($n = 20$) is more sensitive and can collect more prevalent and salient ideas together with less prevalent ideas. This paper made use of these guidelines offered by Weller et al. (2018), seeking to obtain a larger sample to ensure that data saturation could be reached and that both the more and less prevalent ideas would be able to be extracted from the interviews.

6. Findings and Discussion

The sample had ten males and ten females ranging from 27 to 50 years of age. The participants represented a diverse range of industries including both the public and private sectors with representation from the creative, technology, food and financial services industries. The salaried employment and entrepreneurial activities of the participants is summarised in Table 1 below. The extent to which participants were engaged in the sharing economy differed greatly. Some were actively using platforms to source customers and develop a broader network base, some made use of on-demand marketplaces, while others used platforms as a marketing mechanism to enhance the awareness of their brand.

Table 1: Sample composition

No.	Name*	Gender	Salaried employment	Entrepreneurial activity
1	Simon	Male	Project manager	Launching a freelancing platform
2	Alex	Female	Marketing professional	Social media manager
3	Tessa	Female	University lecturer	Music performer and composer
4	Aileen	Female	University lecturer	Photographer
5	Ismail	Male	Bar/Restaurant manager	Social media and content creator
6	Rob	Male	Logistics business	Application developer
7	Susan	Female	Visual communicator	Graphic designer
8	Steve	Male	Fashion and entertainment industry	Application developer
9	Zubaida	Female	Manager of a publishing house	Caterer
10	Adrienne	Female	Art director	Events and exhibition coordinator
11	Josh	Male	Accountant	Financial director of a sound company
12	Richard	Male	Operations manager	Various entrepreneurial ventures
13	David	Male	Investment banker	Runs a printing company
14	Tanya	Female	Visual merchandiser	Events coordinator
15	Mike	Male	Underwear retailer	Skin care company
16	Keisha	Female	Medical doctor	Photographer

17	Harold	Male	Software developer	Bespoke digital agency partner
18	Chris	Male	Government employee	Urban planner
19	Christine	Female	Kitchen and furniture refurbishment	Clothing designer
20	Angela	Female	Wedding boutique stylist	Clothing designer

*Note: All names have been changed.

Factors that emerged were classified as either an extrinsic or intrinsic motivator in line with SDT. When individuals are motivated by the satisfaction associated with the behaviour itself, they are intrinsically motivated to pursue the task, however when a behaviour is performed solely for an outcome that is separable from the activity in and of itself, one is extrinsically motivated to pursue the behaviour (Niemic and Ryan 2009; Ryan and Deci 2000).

6.1. Extrinsic Motivators

6.1.1. Expansion of Social Capital

The first extrinsic motivator related to the use of HE as a means to build one's social capital and expand one's professional network. The classification of this as an extrinsic motivator is based on the acknowledgment of participants that in order to be successful in their entrepreneurial venture they needed to invest in building their social capital. Thus participants were motivated to engage in HE due to a resultant outcome of this activity. The pursuit of HE allowed individuals to establish their social capital while developing and maintaining professional relationships, ensuring the eventual success of their ventures. It was apparent that the need to create a professional network pushed individuals towards HE prior to full-time entrepreneurship, thereby allowing time to establish a network and build rapport before placing reliance on them. Participants discussed the importance of developing and maintaining networks to ensure not only a steady customer base, but also to ensure a support structure of mentors and other like-minded businesspeople.

There were a number of contrasts made between the professional networks used in the course of one's salaried employment and those used in the course of one's entrepreneurial venture. Several participants highlighted the often-complementary nature of these networks. Josh suggested that *'from a result of constantly being forced to engage with people and network as a result of having a job it pretty much happens naturally...With a professional career in accounting, your professional network is a lot bigger'*. Beyond establishing a network that could assist with the daily operations of the business, including outsourcing key business components and developing strong relationships with suppliers, Harold discussed the importance of using one's time as a hybrid entrepreneur to establish

a loyal customer base. He states, *'we were just trying to build up a solid client base and...that's been growing in the last couple of months'*. Susan echoed the importance of establishing a customer base, suggesting *'I need experience...because you need a job first to build up the clientele and build up your connections and that kind of thing. That's also what helps in the industry. You build up your clients so it's like a good way to start'*. In some instances this networking was established as a means through which to obtain information on potential competitors, as explained by Christine, *'I am very aware of people in the marketplace and I do ask a lot of questions and try to network to see what I am up against all the time'*. As identified by Solesvik (2017), the development of social capital contributes to successful entrepreneurship. Social capital acts as a critical resource to overcome both individual-level and greater environmental constraints (Viswanathan et al. 2014).

6.1.2. A Learning Opportunity

The second identified extrinsic motivator related to the use of HE as a means to advance learning, whereby again, participants engaged in HE as a means to an outcome separable from the activity itself. Existing entrepreneurship literature considers entrepreneurial learning as both an outcome and a process (Warren 2006). As an outcome, the learning focuses on the experiences of an entrepreneur, while learning as a process refers to knowledge creation (Ettl and Welter 2010). It became apparent that learning plays an important role in the venture development of the participants. The hybrid state not only provided the opportunity to learn key business skills, but also provided the opportunity for individuals to take learnings from their salaried employment and implement them in their entrepreneurial venture. For those participants whose entrepreneurial ventures were in similar fields to their salaried employment, a mutually beneficial relationship for both forms of employment was noted. Simon explicates this, suggesting that *'skills that you learn doing one job, can apply to the other'*. Participants further discussed the learned hard skills that were transferable between their forms of employment, as evidenced by Alex, *'I would take that learning and apply it to [salaried employment] and vice versa...Where some of my clients didn't have budgets...I would take those learnings from this sort of experimental phase we were in at [salaried employment] and apply it to my own clients'*.

Learning as a process (Warren 2006) appeared to be a strong motivator for entering HE as suggested by David, *'what I am seeing in the entrepreneurial market is that you kind of need to just do it and you learn from doing'*. However, learning, or the lack thereof, was also noted as a motivator for remaining in the hybrid state as opposed to transitioning towards full-time entrepreneurship as suggested by Adrienne, *'I haven't gone into my business full time because I feel*

like I haven't learnt as much as I should'. Whilst all participants suggested that their entrepreneurial ventures provided them with the opportunity to learn a number of vital business skills, Susan on the contrary, suggested she needs to maintain her salaried employment in order to gain the relevant experience that would allow her to ultimately establish herself as a credible entrepreneur. She suggests that, *'in order for me to do that I actually need experience, like practical experience within my field. So I need to stay in my job'*. Many applications of learning theory in the entrepreneurial context propose that learning is experiential in nature (Politis 2005; Sullivan 2000), with suggestions that HE has the ability to act as a significant learning opportunity (Petrova 2010). These results provide support for the findings of Solesvik (2017) who found that HE allowed individuals the opportunity to grow in an evolutionary way, while offering the opportunity for key learning.

6.1.3. Financial Incentives

The third extrinsic motivator related to a financial motive for pursuing HE. Two distinct groups of participants with different financial motivations became apparent in the sample. First, there were participants who pursued HE as they were not able to support themselves on their income from their salaried employment alone. Several participants acknowledged that pursuing HE allowed them more than one income stream, even if this was not initially forthcoming. For example, Susan stated that she was required to pursue HE in order to supplement her income, *'I found that my salary was not enough firstly. I decided I need to get another income, because I have so many goals in life that I actually need another income'*. The second group comprised participants who pursued HE as they required the stable salary to either fund their entrepreneurial venture, or to reduce their risk of entrepreneurial entry. The financial stability of HE was also cited as a reason for not transitioning towards full-time entrepreneurship as suggested by Aileen, *'the only thing is the safety of a regular salary, and at the moment I have debit orders.'* It became evident that amongst many of the participants, their salaried employment was being used to fund the beginning stages of their entrepreneurial venture. In addition to the security offered by a stable income, Steve explained that if one wants to ultimately launch a successful career as an entrepreneur, he suggested that *'you will need to do something else to sustain yourself because it is difficult for the first little bit'*. Thereby recommending the use of HE as a transitory phase to ensure the financial viability of one's entrepreneurial venture. Tanya appeared to echo the sentiment of Steve by suggesting that *'obviously in the initial stages you can't really just go off and do your business, you need the support of your income from your work'*.

While Kirkwood (2009) suggests that a key driver of entrepreneurial motivation is a monetary motive, the current research established a more complex

financial motive amongst hybrid entrepreneurs. The research reinforces the theoretical findings of Folta et al. (2010) who suggested that supplementary income could motivate entry into HE, however the research further found a motivation for maintaining salaried employment as it was a key funder of the entrepreneurial venture. This seemingly indicates a tension that requires the maintenance of the hybrid state.

6.1.4. Opportunity Recognition

The final extrinsic motivator related to the pursuit of HE in order to seize an identified opportunity in the market. A number of participants indicated that they were compelled to pursue their entrepreneurial venture as they had identified a gap in the market that they had the skills or the ability to address. Mike stated that a market analysis indicated that no other products offered the uniquely differentiated benefits of his product in the market and offering the product through an online store further helped to differentiate his brand from similar brick-and-mortar offerings. Christine also explained the seizing of a market opportunity, stating that the launch of her new clothing range was designed to suit the needs of an older target market; one that she believes is seemingly forgotten by fashion retailers. Finally, Rob stated that, *'we saw that there was a gap in this market that just wasn't being solved and a lot of people needed the services that we were offering'*. This factor has been identified and discussed in the literature and relates to one of the key entrepreneurial competencies identified by Morris, Webb, Fu and Singhal (2013), that of opportunity recognition.

6.1.5. Extrinsic Motivators and the Sharing Economy

The extrinsic motivators to enter HE offer insight into the increasing rates of HE globally, due to the exponential impact that the sharing economy exerts on these motivations. The expansion of HE is predicated on the existence of the sharing economy, as a result of the greatly reduced barriers to entry, allowing individuals the freedom to establish an entrepreneurial venture while readily maintaining salaried employment. For those seeking to enhance their social capital, learn new skills, bolster their income or exploit an opportunity – the sharing economy has dramatically eased the burden of achieving these outcomes.

The sharing economy brings with it a multitude of opportunities to enhance one's social capital, thus rendering the process of developing a professional network significantly more efficient. Ferrari (2016) suggests that the sharing economy allows for the development of complementary frameworks to connect and collaborate with others – with varying degrees of familiarity. Cloud-based and open-source software (Schurenberg 2016) removes the need for a number of

in-house departments, while online labour platforms allow new entrepreneurs to outsource functions to freelancers working remotely around the globe on an ad-hoc basis to reduce costs, whereas social platforms allows entrepreneurs to readily build an online presence and engage with potential consumers. These online platforms allow new entrepreneurs to establish networks and develop business connections, significantly reducing their liability of newness and enhancing their likelihood of success.

For the hybrid entrepreneur, online labour platforms enable entry into work arrangements with little upfront investment and the flexibility to engage in entrepreneurial activities while maintaining the support of salaried employment. These engagements offer the individual the opportunity to learn and refine their entrepreneurial skills (D'Cruz and Noronha 2016). As such, platforms that have emerged as a result of the sharing economy enable hybrid entrepreneurs to incubate ideas and test entrepreneurial competencies. In addition to learning through experience, the democratisation of education through massive open online courses (MOOCs) and other open learning platforms allows for the development of hard skills. Digitisation associated with the sharing economy 'expedites knowledge sharing, sourcing and creation' which readily increases the ability to learn new skills (Browder et al. 2019, p. 12).

6.2. Intrinsic Motivators

6.2.1. Self-fulfilment

The first intrinsic motivator related to the pursuit of HE as a means of self-fulfilment, which allowed one to grow in a way that they otherwise wouldn't have experienced. This aligns to the research of Bögenhold and Klinglmair (2017), which found that entrepreneurship is often seen as the best way to achieve personal fulfilment. Several participants discussed the need to pursue something beyond their salaried employment in order to grow personally beyond rigid corporate structures as identified by Harold: *'[It] was for me and my personal growth and as I said before, the reason why it's important for me to do that is sometimes in a corporate environment you do get a little bit restricted in the things that you can do, the type of projects you can work on and the type of technologies you can explore, simply because they have certain ways of working and have to work within certain boundaries'*. Steve discussed the importance of being able to achieve his dreams and using HE as a means through which to achieve these goals. He stated, *'I just keep going and I guess my dreams and my kinetic energy within me that I feel every day, that possibility of having so much potential to do bigger and greater things and seeing where I am and knowing that*

I can soar so much higher and that I am still not close to where I want to be is something that is quite motivational for me'.

6.2.2. Independence

The second intrinsic motivator related to the pursuit of HE as a means through which to achieve independence. This independence not only related to freedom from corporate structures and processes, but also the freedom to become financially independent and the freedom to make independent decisions. Tanya expressed her desire to be independent through a flexible work schedule stating *'there's also this idea of not wanting to be employed for the rest of your life. You also want to build something for yourself and you want to be able to be in control of your time'*. While Josh addressed independence as *'freedom of thought, and movement is where I see the best results personally with my career.'* Harold discussed his pursuit of HE as a means to *'explore different avenues'* that could not be explored in his salaried employment as business decisions were governed by corporate structures. He further suggested that HE while providing freedom, also provides responsibility, stating *'I feel there is a lot of growth that happens for me in the sense that I have to learn to manage my time have, I have to learn to have my business hat on at the same time, have to manage my clients expectations without sort of shooting myself in the foot'*.

Steve suggests that the independence that he achieves through his entrepreneurial venture provides him with a greater sense of ownership over his work. He describes this sense of ownership as *'something that you have raised on your own accord, something that you can call your baby because it's given you sleepless nights and you work that much extra harder than you would for anything else or anyone else'*. While independence was noted as a strong motivator for a number of participants, it is important to note that independence took on many different forms and was found to be a complex, and often emotional, driver of pursuing HE.

6.2.3. Passion

A number of participants frequently spoke of having a passion for their entrepreneurial ventures. Thorgren et al. (2014) examined the role of passion in pursuing HE, finding that it was a vitally important motive. Our research wholly supports this notion and in addition to the research of Thorgren et al. (2014), we often found that the pursuit of HE not only indicated a passion for the entrepreneurial venture, but also a passion for the salaried employment, making it difficult to transition to full-time entrepreneurship. Josh described how his status as a hybrid entrepreneur allowed him to merge his career in accounting

with his passion for the music industry, stating *'my belief is that passion drives you, and for me to be fulfilled I need to be involved on a daily basis with things I love and enjoy doing'*. Zubaida echoed the importance of passion driving her towards HE, affirming that *'the catering and the cooking [entrepreneurial venture] is actually my passion, with the cooking and being in the kitchen I can really be myself to do what I want'*.

In addition to passion driving one towards HE, this same passion can also motivate one to remain in this hybrid state. Both Keisha and Tanya discussed a strong passion for their salaried employment as well as their entrepreneurial ventures, resulting in them becoming persistent hybrid entrepreneurs (Viljamaa and Varamäki 2015). Adrienne explained that her passion allowed her to cope with the daily hybrid tensions *'if it wasn't for passion we wouldn't still be in it by now, because once you're frustrated the passion keeps you going'*.

6.2.4. A Creative Outlet

The final intrinsic motivator related to the pursuit of a creative outlet and the use of HE as a means through which to achieve such a creative outlet. Folta et al. (2010) implicitly allude to this by suggesting that HE could provide individuals with psychological benefits. Our research suggests that a creative outlet that allows one to use their creativity in a different capacity is one such psychological benefit. As Harold explains, *'So in that sense it [salaried employment] is very restrictive and it [entrepreneurial venture] is an outlet for me and gives me a chance to go and be creative and to go and try different things and interact with different people and allow myself the opportunity to grow outside all the requirements of work because sometimes that work becomes a bit monotonous'*.

Of import, is the fact that not all participants saw their creative outlet as a viable venture for full-time entrepreneurship. Zubaida, for example, discussed the fact that the competitive marketplace meant that she would not likely be able to support herself on her entrepreneurial venture alone, suggesting that *'making my bread and butter out of that [entrepreneurial venture] would not actually be the best option, I see it more as my creative outlet and my love'*. This is of import in the sense that despite the understanding that one's entrepreneurial venture could not grow to the point where it would become financially viable, the desire for the creative outlet supersedes business interests. This aligns to the suggestions of Folta et al. (2010), which stated that some may pursue HE purely for the psychological, non-monetary benefits.

6.2.5. Intrinsic Motivators and the Sharing Economy

In the current research, all intrinsic motivators to pursue HE were psychological and non-pecuniary in nature, indicating the inherent satisfaction achieved through HE. Several participants spoke about the reduction in perceived risk that was offered by HE (as opposed to full-time entrepreneurship) suggesting that the reduced risk allowed them to establish an entrepreneurial venture that otherwise they would have never been able to do. HE allows individuals to work towards self-fulfilment by pursuing their passion, sometimes through a creative outlet, ultimately helping them to achieve independence while not risking their financial stability or pecuniary benefits. While Folta et al. (2010) suggested that they expected there would be psychological motivations for pursuing HE, they requested that further researchers delve into what these specific motives were. Following an examination of the intrinsic factors, it could appear that several of these factors outweigh the financial motive pursued by some – as this would explain the pursuit of an entrepreneurial venture as opposed to the pursuit of further wage work (Viljamaa and Varamäki 2015). The sharing economy allows individuals to greatly expand their skillset in fields far removed from their salaried employment, through upskilling and the free exchange of information. Zhang et al. (2019) identified personal growth as a key motivator for engaging in micro-entrepreneurship in the sharing economy. The results of the current research seemingly extend this insight to those engaging in hybrid entrepreneurship in the sharing economy, as a number of the intrinsic motivators are rooted in the need for personal growth.

7. Implications of the Research

This research offers a number of implications for different stakeholders of the sharing economy, as such the implications are four-fold. First, many researchers continue to examine the importance of regulation in the sharing economy (Erickson and Sørensen 2016), with Ahsan (2020) establishing a case for certain regulation to ensure that the sharing economy does not become a misused concept that disguises worker exploitation under the guise of entrepreneurship. However one needs to be cognisant of the monumental changes that the sharing economy has brought to the entrepreneurial journey. In particular, the reduced costs and barriers to entry afforded to those launching their entrepreneurial ventures, enhancing the development and scalability thereof. Given the important macroenvironmental implications of entrepreneurship, many governments around the world have implemented initiatives to support small business (Lougui and Nyström 2014). Enhancing the visibility of HE as a result of the sharing economy further reinforces the notion that these initiatives be expanded beyond full-time entrepreneurs.

Second, for established business owners not currently operating in the sharing economy – the research has examined the ease with which one is able to launch an entrepreneurial venture often at reduced costs. The implication thereof for established businesses is to evaluate how their existing business models could be affected by the entrance of a competitor whose business operations are dependent on the sharing economy. This establishes a need for consistent innovation, in terms of business models and basic operations, if established firms wish to compete against those using sharing economy models. Third, the current research has highlighted that the psychological benefits offered to hybrid entrepreneurs may in some cases supersede business interests. As such, one cannot assume that all hybrid entrepreneurs wish to transition towards full-time entrepreneurship. In light of this the current study supports the establishment of hybrid entrepreneurship as a valid and independent state of entrepreneurship, challenging traditional conceptualisations thereof. Fourth, this research provides possible implications for entrepreneurship curricula. Solesvik (2017) discusses the importance of incorporating HE into existing entrepreneurship curricula, equipping students with the necessary skills to be able to use the hybrid state to further hone their hard and soft skills. We provide further insight into the motivators of individuals to engage in HE, which could be used to further focus HE education. In addition to this, incorporating how sharing economy platforms could be used to develop and scale entrepreneurial ventures could further guide the development of fledgling ventures.

8. Limitations and Recommendations for Future Researchers

The limitations of this research, all of which pertain to methodological decisions, are three-fold. The first limitation pertains to the use of a qualitative methodology and the lack of generalisability associated with this selection. While the rationale for making use of a qualitative method was established, ultimately due to the subjectivity of the approach, the sample size and the nature of sample selection, the results are not able to be generalised to a broader target population. Second, the ability for participants to self-select to partake in the research, may result in self-selection bias being present in the final sample. Third, the use of social media as a participant recruitment tool tailors those that are exposed to the request for participation. In light of this a majority of the participants were from the same country as one of the researchers, namely South Africa, and thus the results of the research may not be able to be replicated in another country.

There are a number of avenues for future research aligned to the existing research. The recommendations for researchers examining hybrid entrepreneurs are two-fold. First, an evaluation of self-efficacy prior to and post engaging in HE could provide fertile ground for further research. This recommendation is made on the basis of the number of participants that suggested their hybrid state

provided them the opportunity to learn a number of key business skills. An empirical evaluation of this learning could offer insights into entrepreneurial transition behaviour. Second, future researchers should consider examining the relationship between an individual's work background and their motivations to engage in HE, in order to determine if those in certain industries are primarily motivated by particular motivations over others.

The dynamic nature of the sharing economy renders it rife for future research. The recommendations for future researchers examining aspects of the sharing economy are three-fold. First, one could argue that the growth of sharing economy platforms could mirror in some regards a resurgence of consumer-to-consumer dot com firms referred to by Laffey (2004). Future researchers could examine the extent to which the characteristics of dot com firms align with the characteristics of sharing economy firms – in the hopes that this could offer further insight into the future growth prospects of these firms. Second, given the complexities surrounding the establishment of regulation in the sharing economy, future researchers should consider the extent to which the market could be regulated. In particular, establishing how regulatory processes could be used to eliminate exploitation while at the same time maintaining the benefits of the sharing economy to its users. Third, future researchers could evaluate the impact of the sharing economy on established businesses, developing strategies for competition as opposed to the continuing view that the sharing economy is a 'disruption' to established businesses (Acquier et al. 2019, p. 17).

9. Conclusion

This research sought to establish the motivations of individuals for entering HE, a category of entrepreneurship largely predicated on the development of the sharing economy. This research has established HE as an independent employment state that individuals enter for a number of reasons. Using SDT as a theoretical framework, both extrinsic and intrinsic motivators have been identified. Despite the stressors associated with HE, it appears that the multitude of non-pecuniary benefits offered to hybrid entrepreneurs may be in some cases sufficient to willingly remain in this hybrid state. This research has shown that in some instances, these psychological benefits tend to supersede business interests with limited concern for the long-term financial benefits offered by one's venture. For a number of participants, the motivations guiding their employment status as hybrid entrepreneurs were complex, interlinked and incorporated a number of motivations. The sharing economy has reduced a number of barriers to entry for hybrid entrepreneurs, including effective means of connection, collaboration and communication with online networks, enhanced access to capital through crowdfunding platforms (Kaartemo 2017) and a reduction in the perceived risk associated with launching an entrepreneurial venture. The ease with which one is

able to launch a new venture, while maintaining their salaried employment, enhances opportunities for learning, and allows individuals to pursue personal growth. The sharing economy has allowed individuals around the globe to readily establish and develop their entrepreneurial ventures, not only paving the way for successful full-time ventures, but also offering a wide-reaching range of psychological benefits to its users.

References:

- Acquier, A., Carbone, V. and Massé, D. (2019), "How to create value(s) in the sharing economy: business models, scalability, and sustainability", *Technology Innovation Management Review*, 9(2): 5-24.
- Ahsan, M. (2018), "Entrepreneurship and ethics in the sharing economy: a critical perspective", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 161(1): 19-33.
- Allen, D. (2015), "The sharing economy", *IPA Review*, 67(3): 25-27.
- Al-Jubari, I., Hassan, A. and Liñán, F. (2019), "Entrepreneurial intention among university students in Malaysia: integrating self-determination theory and the theory of planned behaviour", *International Entrepreneurship Management Journal*, 15(4): 1323-1342.
- Antonioli, D., Nicolli, F., Ramaciotti, L. and Rizzo, U. (2016), "The effect of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations on academics' entrepreneurial intention", *Administrative Sciences*, 6(4): 15.
- Barnes, S. and Mattsson, J. (2016), "Building tribal communities in the collaborative economy: an innovation framework", *Prometheus*, 34(2): 95-113.
- Belk, R. (2014), "You are what you can access: sharing and collaborative consumption online", *Journal of Business Research*, 67(8): 1595-1600.
- Bird, B., and Jelinek, M. (1988), "The operation of entrepreneurial intentions", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 13(2): 21-29.
- Block, J. and Landgraf, A. (2016), "Transition from part-time entrepreneurship to full-time entrepreneurship: the role of financial and non-financial motives", *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 12(1): 259-282.
- Bögenhold, D. (2018), "From hybrid entrepreneurs to entrepreneurial billionaires: observations on the socioeconomic heterogeneity of self-employment", *American Behavioral Scientist*, 63(2): 129-146.
- Bögenhold, D. (2019), "Are hybrids the new normal? A labour market perspective on hybrid self-employment", *International Review of Entrepreneurship*, 17(4): 429-448.
- Bögenhold, D. and Klinglmair, A. (2017), "One-person enterprises and the phenomenon of hybrid self-employment: evidence from an empirical study", *Empirica*, 44(2): 383-404.
- Bouncken, R. and Reuschl, A. (2018), "Coworking-spaces: how a phenomenon of the sharing economy builds a novel trend for the workplace and for entrepreneurship", *Review of Managerial Science*, 12: 317-334.
- Browder, R., Aldrich, H. and Bradley, S. (2019), "The emergence of the maker movement: Implications for entrepreneurship research", *Journal of Business Venturing*, 34(3): 459-476.
- Bruno, B. and Faggini, M. (2017), "Sharing economy: for an economic taxonomy", *International Journal of Economics and Finance*, 9(6): 174-178.
- Bryman, A. and Bell, E. (2011), *Research Methodology Business and Management Contexts*, Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa.
- Cohen, B. and Kietzmann, J. (2014), "Ride on! Mobility business models for the sharing economy", *Organization and Environment*, 27(3): 279-296.
- Cooke, P. (2019), "World Turned Upside Down: Entrepreneurial Decline, Its Reluctant Myths and Troubling Realities", *Journal of Open Innovation Technology, Market and Complexity*, 5(22): 1-16.
- Cornish, F., Gillespie, A. and Zittoun, T. (2014), "Collaborative analysis of qualitative data", In Flick, U. (ed.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*, London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Deci, E. and Ryan, R. (1980), "Self-determination theory: where mind mediates behaviour", *The Journal of Mind and Behavior*, 1(1): 33-43.
- Deci, E. and Ryan, R. (2000), "The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4): 227-268.
- Demary, V. (2014), *Competition in the Sharing Economy*, Cologne Institute for Economic Research IW Policy paper 19/2015.
- Demetry, D. (2017), "Pop-up to professional: emerging entrepreneurial identity and evolving vocabularies of motive", *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 3(2): 187-207.
- D' Cruz, P. and Noronha, E. (2016), "Positives outweighing negatives: the experiences of Indian crowdsourced workers", *Work Organisation, Labour and Globalisation*, 10(1): 44-63.

- Elert, N. and Henrekson, M. (2016), "Evasive entrepreneurship", *Small Business Economics*, 47: 95-113.
- Erickson, K. and Sørensen, I. (2016), "Regulating the sharing economy", *Internet Policy Review*, 5(2): 1-13.
- Ettl, K. and Welter, F. (2010), "Gender, context and entrepreneurial learning", *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 2(2): 108-129.
- Ferenstein, G. (2014). Airbnb CEO spells out the end game for the sharing economy, in 7 quotes. Accessed 18 June 2020. Available: <https://venturebeat.com/2014/07/02/airbnb-ceo-spells-out-the-end-game-for-the-sharing-economy-in-7-quotes/>
- Ferrari, M. (2016), "Beyond uncertainties in the sharing economy: Opportunities for social capital", *European Journal of Risk Regulation*, 4, 664-674.
- Folta, T. B., Delmar, F., and Wennberg, K. (2010), "Hybrid entrepreneurship", *Management Science*, 56(2): 253-269.
- Frenken, K. and Schor, J. (2017), "Putting the sharing economy into perspective", *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 23: 3-10.
- Friedman, G. (2014), "Workers without employers: Shadow corporations and the rise of the gig economy", *Review of Keynesian Economics*, 2(2): 171-188.
- Gagné, M. and Deci, E. (2005), "Self-determination theory and work motivation", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26: 331-362.
- Gelinas, L., Pierce, R., Winkler, S., Cohen, I., Lynch, H. and Bierer, B. (2017), "Using social media as a research recruitment tool: Ethical issues and recommendations", *American Journal of Bioethics*, 17(3): 3-14.
- Habibi, M., Davidson, A. and Laroche, M. (2016), "What managers should know about the sharing economy", *Business Horizons*, 60(1): 113-121.
- Hamari, J., Sjöklint, M. and Ukkonen, A. (2016), "The sharing economy: Why people participate in collaborative consumption", *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 67(9): 2047-2059.
- Kaartemo, V. (2017), "The elements of a successful crowdfunding campaign: a systematic literature review of crowdfunding performance", *International Review of Entrepreneurship*, 15(3): 291-318.
- Kaiser, K. (2010), "Protecting respondent confidentiality in qualitative research", *Qualitative Health Research*, 19(11): 1632-1641.
- Kirkwood, J. (2009), "Motivational factors in a push-pull theory of entrepreneurship", *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 24(5): 346-364.
- Kothari, C. (2004), *Research Methodology Methods and Techniques, 2nd ed.*, New Delhi: New Age International Publishers.
- Laffey, D. (2004), "The rise and fall of the dot com entrepreneurs", working paper, Kent Business School, Canterbury, United Kingdom.
- Luc, S., Chirita, G., Delvaux, E. and Kepnou, A. 2018. "Hybrid Entrepreneurship: employees climbing the entrepreneurial ladder", *International Review of Entrepreneurship*, 16(1): 89-113.
- Lougui, M. and Nyström, K. (2014), "What obstacles do entrepreneurs encounter?" *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Public Policy*, 3(2): 275-291.
- Malhotra, N. (2010), *Marketing Research an Applied Orientation, 6th ed.*, New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.
- Marczyk, G., DeMatteo, D. and Festinger, D. (2005), *Essentials of Research Design and Methodology*, New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons.
- Morris, M., Webb, J., Fu, J. and Singhal, S. (2013), "A competency-based perspective on entrepreneurship education: conceptual and empirical insights", *Journal of Small Business Management*, 51(3): 352-369.
- Naudé, W. (2019), "The decline in entrepreneurship in the west: is complexity ossifying the economy?" *Discussion Paper Series – Institute of Labor Economics*, No. 12602.
- Niemiec, C. and Ryan, R. (2009), "Autonomy, competence and relatedness in the classroom: Applying self-determination theory to educational practice", *Theory and Research in Education*, 7(2): 133-144.

- Paik, Y., Kang, S. and Seamans, R. (2018), "Entrepreneurship, innovation, and political competition: How the public sector helps the sharing economy create value", *Strategic Management Journal*, 40: 503-532.
- Petrova, K. (2010), "Part-time entrepreneurship: theory and evidence", *Atlantic Economic Journal*, 38(4): 463-464.
- Petrova, K. (2011), "Part-time entrepreneurship, learning and ability", *Journal of Management Policy and Practice*, 12(1): 64-75.
- Politis, D. (2005), "The process of entrepreneurial learning: a conceptual framework", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(4): 399-424.
- Price, L. and Belk, R. (2016), "Consumer ownership and sharing: introduction to the issue", *Journal of the Association for Consumer Research*, 1(2): 193-197.
- Raffiee, J., and Feng, J. (2014), "Should I quit my day job? a hybrid path to entrepreneurship", *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(4): 936-963.
- Ravenelle, A. (2017), "Sharing economy workers: selling, not sharing", *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 10(2): 281-295.
- Richter, C., Kraus, S., Brem, A., Durst, S. and Giselbrecht, C. (2017), "Digital entrepreneurship: innovative business models for the sharing economy", *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 26: 300-310.
- Ryan, R. and Deci, E. (2000), "Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being", *American Psychologist*, 55(1): 68-78.
- Schaefer, G. and Wertheimer, A. (2010), "The right to withdraw from research", *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal*, 20(4): 329-352.
- Schor, J. and Fitzmaurice, C. (2014), "Collaborating and connecting: the emergence of the sharing economy", in Reisch, L. and Thøgersen, J. (eds.), *Handbook of Research on Sustainable Consumption*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Schurenberg, E. (2016), "In the world of entrepreneurship, everyone can play", Available at: <https://www.inc.com/magazine/201604/eric-schurenberg/everyone-can-play.html>. Accessed March 5, 2020.
- Solesvik, M. (2017), "Hybrid Entrepreneurship: how and why entrepreneurs combine employment with self-employment", *Technology Innovation Management Review*, 7(3): 33-41.
- Stanoevska-Slabeva, K., Lenz-Kesekamp, V. and Suter, V. (2020), "Platforms and the sharing economy", EU H2020 Research Project Ps2Share: Participation, Privacy and Power in the Sharing Economy.
- Sullivan, R. (2000), "Entrepreneurial learning and mentoring", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*, 6(3): 160-175.
- Sundararajan, A. (2014), Peer-to-peer businesses and the sharing (collaborative) economy: Overview, economic effects and regulatory issues. *House Small Business Committee*. Available at: https://republicans-smallbusiness.house.gov/uploadedfiles/1-15-2014_revised_sundararajan_testimony.pdf Accessed March 18, 2020.
- Sundararajan, A. (2016), *The Sharing Economy: The End of Employment and the Rise of Crowd-based Capitalism*, Cambridge: MA MIT Press.
- Thorgren, S., Nordström, C. and Wincent, J. (2014), "Hybrid Entrepreneurship: the importance of passion", *Baltic Journal of Management*, 9(3): 314-329.
- Tracy, S. (2013), *Qualitative Research Methods: 5th ed.*, United Kingdom: Wiley and Sons.
- Vanclay, F., Baines, J. and Taylor, N. (2013), "Principles for ethical research involving humans: ethical professional practice in impact assessment part 1", *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, 31(4): 243-253.
- Viljamaa, A. and Varamaki, E. (2015), "Do persistent and transitory hybrid entrepreneurs differ?", *International Scholarly and Scientific Research and Innovation*, 9(3): 936-940.
- Viswanathan, M., Echambadi, R., Venugopal, S. and Sridharan, S. (2014), "Subsistence entrepreneurship, value creation, and community exchange systems: a social capital explanation", *Journal of Macromarketing*, 34(2): 213-226.
- Warren, L. (2006), "Rethinking the mentoring process for women micro-entrepreneurs", *International Journal of Innovation and Learning*, 3(4): 387-402.
- Weller, S., Vickers, B., Bernard, H., Blackburn, A., Borgatti, S., Gravlee, C. and Johnson, J. (2018), "Open-ended interview questions and saturation", *PLOS One*, 13(6): e0198606.

- Xi, G., Block, J., Lasch, F., Robert, F. and Thurik, R. (2017), "Mode of entry into HE: new venture start-up versus business takeover", *Discussion Paper Series - Institute of Labor Economics*, 2-31.
- Yin, R. (1994), *Case Study Research – Design and Methods Applied Social Research Methods Series*, California: SAGE Publications.
- Zervas, G., Proserpio, D. and Byers, J. (2014), "The rise of the sharing economy: Estimating the impact of AirBnb on the hotel industry", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54(5): 687-705.
- Zhang, T., Bufquin, D. and Lu, C. (2019), "A qualitative investigation of microentrepreneurship in the sharing economy", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 79: 148-157.