

COLOURFUL ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN DUTCH CITIES: A REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF BUSINESS PERFORMANCE

Mediha Sahin

Dept. of Regional Economics, VU University Amsterdam m.sahin@vu.nl

Alina Todiras

Dept. of Regional Economics, VU University Amsterdam todiras.alina@gmail.com
and

Peter Nijkamp

Dept. of Regional Economics, VU University Amsterdam p.nijkamp@vu.nl

Abstract

Entrepreneurship has clearly evolved as a critical element in the organization and restructuring of modern economies. It has been further fostered by the deregulation and privatization process in many Western countries. In addition, governments have acknowledged and started promoting the role of entrepreneurship in stimulating economic growth and development. In recent decades, we witness an increasing importance of migrant (or ethnic) entrepreneurs, in particular in big cities in the Western world. The aim of the present study is to provide both a contextual and empirical framework for assessing the business performance of migrant entrepreneurs in major cities in the Netherlands. The study is organized as follows. After an exposition of entrepreneurship and migrant entrepreneurship, the urban orientation of this new form of entrepreneurship is highlighted. Then the database and the methodology are presented. Next, the statistical findings are provided, followed by a concluding section.

Key words: Entrepreneurship, migrants, Netherlands

1. Entrepreneurial Heroes and New Entrepreneurship

The old American myth praises the entrepreneur, who has built his business from scratch, as a hero who embodies the values of freedom and creativity. The 'entrepreneurial heroes' are those who come up with new ideas, and then – despite much resistance – turn them into reality. They take the initiative, are proactive, come up with technological and organizational innovations, and find new solutions to old problems. They are the architects of vibrant new companies and the rescuers of the failing ones. The term 'entrepreneurial hero' has been persistently used in the small and medium-size enterprise (SME) literature, even though it has also been questioned whether it is an appropriate term describing the struggle of a single man or a collective force (Reich, 1987). Various scholars have agreed on the idea that, rather than giving praise to the individual, more focus should be on collective entrepreneurship, since the whole of the effort is greater than the sum of individual contributions (Cooney and Bygrave, 1997).

'Entrepreneurial heroes' are not born in a passive environment, but are the offspring of challenging conditions that facilitate and induce new business activities. Such conditions may partly be found in competitive local situations, but also in socio-economic background factors (e.g. unemployment, social exclusion) that prompt economic actors to look for alternative and daring endeavours. Especially in an age of mass migration – often into metropolitan areas – many newcomers are encouraged or forced to become self-employed or to start their own business. There is an increasing body of literature on the implications of cultural, ethnic or migrant diversity for new business formation (for a review, see Baycan-Levent, 2010).

The concepts of 'ethnic entrepreneurs', 'ethnic minority entrepreneurs', 'migrant entrepreneurs' and 'new entrepreneurs' are often used interchangeably (van den Tillaart, 2007). Light and Gold (2000) speak in this context of 'the ethnic economy', which they define as any ethnic or immigrant's self-employed group, its employers, their co-ethnic employees, and their unpaid family workers. Ethnic entrepreneurship finds its origin in "a set of connections and regular patterns of interaction among people sharing a common national background or migration experiences" (Waldinger et al., 1990).

An alternative term to 'ethnic' that is used is 'immigrant entrepreneurs', but this only includes individuals who have actually immigrated over the past few decades. This definition therefore excludes those members of ethnic minority groups who have been living in a country for several centuries, such as Afro-Americans in the US, Jews in Europe, or aboriginals in Australia. In our study, however, we use these terms 'ethnic' and 'immigrant' interchangeably.

This study is organized as follows. In the next section we provide a concise general orientation on entrepreneurship, followed by a focus on migrant entrepreneurship, which is the subject matter of the present study. Next, we highlight the urban orientation of migrant entrepreneurship. After a description of the database of our research, the methodological approach based on Multiple Response Questions is presented. The paper offers an extensive concluding section on migrant entrepreneurship.

2. The Entrepreneur as a Catalyst

Entrepreneurship has been the subject of numerous debates and investigations over the last few decades. It has gained a wealth of attention, and it has become an important factor in the organization of economies and the creation of innovations. According to Audretsch and Thurik (2004, p. 144): "Entrepreneurship has emerged as the engine of economic and social development throughout the world." Entrepreneurship is recognized as a source of economic growth through job creation, knowledge spillovers, the stimulation of competition, etc. The rise of interest in entrepreneurship over the last decades has been caused by multiple factors, among which are globalization, ICT revolutions, flexibilization and decentralization, etc.

Entrepreneurship in the classical sense refers to the combining of resources in novel ways so as to create something of value (Aldrich and Waldinger, 1990). Another definition of an entrepreneur is "someone who specializes in taking responsibility for and making judgemental decisions that affect the location, form and the use of goods, resources and institutions" (Hébert and Link, 1982). This definition is based on a more economic point of view. The importance of entrepreneurship as a strategic tool for economic growth has been clearly recognized for many decades by politicians and policy makers. However, it was not until the mid-1970s that entrepreneurship was given due attention; until then the dominant form of organization was mainly the large enterprise characterized by mass production and economies of scope. A dramatic shift toward smaller enterprises has occurred as a result of the joint effect of globalization and the ICT revolution, which subsequently reduced the cost of moving capital and information to low-cost locations outside Europe and North America, and which also offered new and unprecedented opportunities for local economic vitality.

Entrepreneurship has clearly evolved into an imperative element in the organization and restructuring of economies. It has been further fostered by the deregulation and privatization process in many Western countries. Furthermore, governments have acknowledged and started to promote the role of entrepreneurship in stimulating economic growth and development. However, entrepreneurship has not emerged concurrently in all countries and regions: North America was far ahead of Europe in 'embracing the entrepreneurial energy' and absorbing its merits (Thurik, 2009). Currently, the European Union regards entrepreneurship as a central driver for an innovation economy. Multiple EU programmes for building and fostering a climate in which entrepreneurial initiatives and business activities can thrive are being put in place.

There is an abundance of definitions for the term 'entrepreneurship', but, despite that, there is no generally accepted definition. Most of the definitions, however, converge at certain points, and thus it can be said that the main key drivers of entrepreneurial activity according to various definitions are the sensing of opportunities, risk-taking propensity, efficient use of scarce resources, and innovative activities (Knight, 1921; Kirzner, 1973; Schumpeter, 1934; Sharma and Chrisman, 1999; Kuratko and Hodgetts, 2001). As there is no commonly agreed definition of entrepreneurship, there is also ambiguity about the functional definition of 'entrepreneur'. However, from the key drivers of entrepreneurship listed above, we can form the profile of an entrepreneur. Thus, the entrepreneur is an individual able to recognize business opportunities, willing to take a risk despite often encountering high degrees of uncertainty; he must also possess the ability and resources to follow the recognized opportunities rather than opting for employment or unemployment positions (Thurik, 2009). Schumpeter (1934) emphasized the role

of the entrepreneur as an innovator who creatively destroys existing market structures. In his view, entrepreneurs do not only invent things but rather also exploit the existing ones by introducing new processes and new types of organization, by identifying new markets and sources of supply, etc. According to Schumpeter (1934), these entrepreneurs can be found mainly in small firms, and they can evolve into entrepreneurial managers (intrapreneurs), or choose to start new ventures (serial entrepreneurs) (Carree and Thurik, 2010).

The main determinants of entrepreneurial activity can range from psychological, demographic and social to economic determinants. Verheul et al. (2001) have combined these perspectives in a structured framework on entrepreneurship. According to their framework, entrepreneurship may be analysed on three different levels: the micro-, industry and macro- level. At the micro-level we refer to the decision process and the motivation to become self-employed. Here, we also look at the entrepreneur's personal factors, psychological traits, age, education, work experience, financial assets, etc. At the industry level, we consider market determinants, such as profit opportunities, competition, business networks, etc. The third level is the macro-level, which covers environmental factors, policy factors, and technological, economic, and cultural variables.

Carree and Thurik (2010) present a rather comprehensive definition of entrepreneurship; according to them it is 'the manifest ability and willingness of individuals, on their own, in teams, within and outside existing organizations to perceive and create new economic opportunities and to introduce their ideas to the market in the face of uncertainty and other obstacles by making decisions on location, form, and the use of resources and institutions'. Porter (1990) realized early on that entrepreneurship is at the heart of national advantage, being a catalyst for new firm formation, innovations, and market rivalry. Furthermore, these authors consider that market rivalry is more conducive to knowledge externalities than local monopolies (Jacobs, 1969; Porter, 1990). Acs et al. (2006) also emphasize that there is a strong relationship between knowledge spillover and entrepreneurial activity. Therefore, one way in which entrepreneurship capital generates economic growth is by knowledge spillover, when firms can appropriate some of the returns by taking advantage of the investments made externally (Cohen and Levinthal, 1989). Another way is by increasing the number of firms, which in turn augments the competition for new ideas, and facilitates the entry of new firms specializing in a particular new product niche (Thurik, 2009). Entrepreneurship can also generate economic growth by promoting diversity among firms. Another important contribution is often the element of 'newness', through the transformation of inventions and ideas into economically viable entities (Carree and Thurik, 2010). We will now present some important characteristics of a new class of entrepreneurship, viz. migrant (or ethnic) entrepreneurship.

3. Colourful Entrepreneurship

Over the past decades, we have thus clearly witnessed a significant shift in the orientation of migrant groups, namely, towards self-employment (Baycan-Levent et al., 2003). This movement has prompted the rise of migrant entrepreneurship (van Delft et al., 2000; Kourtit and Nijkamp, 2011; Masurel and Nijkamp, 2003; Waldinger et al., 1990). The latter phenomenon distinguishes itself from 'normal' entrepreneurship through its orientation on migrant products, on migrant market customers, or on indigenous migrant business strategies (Choenni, 1997). Migrant entrepreneurship is also generally regarded as an important self-organizing principle, by means of which migrant minorities are able to improve their weak socio-economic position (Baycan-Levent et al., 2003) (for a further comprehensive explanation, see Dana, 2007).

In the 'age of migration' many migrants of foreign origin have thus had to resort to starting their own business. A tendency over the last decades has also been the choice of migrants to become self-employed, which has led to the emergence of the term 'migrant entrepreneurship'. Kloosterman and Rath (2003) suggest that self-employed migrants play an important role in the emergence of small firms. In most of the cases, they are pushed to engage in entrepreneurial activities due to restricted access to jobs and blocked opportunities for upward social mobility. Numerous studies attest that most of the entrepreneurial activity of migrants takes place in the traditional labour-intensive industries, e.g. retail, catering, hospitality, which have lower access

barriers and require fewer skills (Sahin et al., 2011; Baycan-Levent et al., 2009; Hermes and Leicht, 2010). Hermes and Leicht (2010) argue that the more advanced is a country's economic development, the higher the probability of migrant entrepreneurial activity in simple routine services. However, self-employment rates vary more between countries than between migrants and natives (Tubergen, 2004).

The level of entrepreneurship varies substantially between different countries, and, furthermore, between different populations within countries. These levels of both native and migrant entrepreneurship within countries are influenced, on the one hand, by the opportunity structures on the demand side and, on the other, by the talents of entrepreneurs and their resources or individual capital on the supply side (Hermes and Leicht, 2010). The opportunities in small business are usually available for both native and migrant entrepreneurs, but the latter group experiences various restrictions, and consequently develops different strategies (Waldinger et al., 1990). Therefore, the migrants have a different self-employment trajectory than the natives, one of the most obvious being the divergence in sectoral choice.

The merits of migrant entrepreneurs have been recognized by many host societies, which have subsequently introduced various policy measures to stimulate self-employment among migrants and create a business environment where ethnic enterprises can thrive. Among the most well-known merits of migrant entrepreneurship is the stimulation of economic growth, new job creation, and promotion of diversity, which, according to Jacobs (1969), is the main cause of the prosperity of urban economies. Furthermore, immigrant entrepreneurship may especially improve the economic position of immigrants from non-Western countries and support the general integration of these immigrant groups in the host society. Therefore, the field of migrant entrepreneurship calls for more research and insight into the main motives to become self-employed and the success factors for the survival of the migrant enterprises.

In Europe, the main reason for migration has usually been employment-seeking in established industries in host countries. However, because of the present adverse economic conditions, high unemployment, restrictions and limited opportunities, many immigrants have chosen to become entrepreneurs. The main perspective from which migrant entrepreneurship has been studied in the past decades is the sociological perspective, which revolves around the ethno-cultural characteristics of the ethnic populations.

Currently, in many European countries, the number of immigrants starting their own businesses surpasses that of the self-employed native population. The European Commission attests to the fact that ethnic minorities exhibit a great entrepreneurial capacity and potential (European Commission, 2011). The European immigrants have freedom of establishment within the EU, and, moreover, their qualifications are more easily recognized, whereas the non-EU immigrants have to face a complex set of barriers when setting up a business (institutional and legal barriers, acknowledgement of qualifications). Immigrants to Europe are often characterized by lower educational attainment, and this disadvantage coupled with limited access to labour market, pushes them into self-employment in marginal positions. The immigrant businesses are thus concentrated in less attractive and more labour-intensive sectors such as retail, hospitality, catering, etc. Hermes and Leicht (2010) argue that the more advanced a country's economy, the higher is the self-employment rate of immigrants in traditional sectors. While members of the majority population or host society are self-employed in modern employment sectors and serve the mainstream market with a mainstream product, ethnic entrepreneurs are entrenched in ethnic enclaves. On the supply side, the immigrants can benefit from their ethnic resources: social networks, ethnic labour force, and ethnic products. On the demand side, ethnic entrepreneurs serve a predominantly ethnic clientele. However, the opportunity structures for immigrants also develop outside their own ethnic enclaves: and some manage to 'break out' in the mainstream market which satisfies the needs of the majority of the population.

One of the countries that has witnessed a large influx of migrant entrepreneurs is the Netherlands. In that country, most of the immigrants originate from non-EU countries. These people belong to the first-generation migrants if born outside the Netherlands, and to second-generation migrants if at least one of their parents is of foreign descent. Furthermore, a distinction is often made between Western (European countries, North America, Oceania, Japan and Indonesia – including the former Dutch East Indies) and non-Western immigrants (Turkey and all

countries in Africa, Latin America, and Asia – excluding Japan and Indonesia (CBS, 2001). We will now first provide some descriptive statistical information on immigration in the Netherlands.

Table 1: Share of non-Western and Western entrepreneurs in the population, according to generation of ethnic entrepreneurs, 2000-2007

Year	Non-western		Western	
	1 st generation	2 nd generation	1 st generation	2 nd generation
2000	30%	4%	24%	43%
2001	31%	5%	23%	41%
2002	32%	5%	23%	40%
2003	33%	5%	22%	40%
2004	33%	6%	22%	39%
2005	33%	6%	22%	39%
2006	33%	7%	23%	38%
2007	33%	7%	23%	36%

Source: Bleeker et al., 2011.

Table 1 provides the share of Western and non-Western ethnic entrepreneurs in the total population of ethnic entrepreneurs. We can see that the second-generation Western entrepreneurs (36 per cent) and the first-generation non-Western entrepreneurs (33 per cent) in 2007 have the largest share in the population of ethnic entrepreneurs. The proportion of non-Western ethnic entrepreneurs has increased from 34 per cent in 2000 to over 40 per cent in 2007 (Bleeker et al., 2011).

The biggest non-Western groups in the Netherlands are the Turks, Moroccans, Surinamers and Antilleans. Table 2 shows the entrepreneurial rates of the four major ethnic groups in the Netherlands. For three of the four groups the ratio in 2005 is lower than that of the natives. Only the Turkish entrepreneurs in the Netherlands are relatively more entrepreneurial than the native population. According to Van den Tillaart (2007), the rate of the four large entrepreneurial ethnic groups grew quite fast.

Table 2: Entrepreneurship rate* of the four major ethnic groups

	1998 (1 st generation)	2000 (1 st generation)	2004 (1 st generation)	2004 (1 st and 2 nd generation)	2005 (1 st and 2 nd generation)
Turkish	7.6%	9.0%	9.7%	11.5%	13.5%
Moroccan	3.4%	5.1%	5.4%	6.3%	7.3%
Surinamese	3.9%	4.4%	4.4%	5.6%	6.4%
Antillean/Aruban	3.4%	3.5%	3.7%	4.2%	4.7%

Source: Chambers of Commerce and CBS, processing and analysis: ITS, Van den Tillaart, 2007.

* Self-employed as a percentage of the total workforce.

Of all these groups, the Turks are the most entrepreneurial, and their rate of self-employment approaches that of the native population. This can be explained by the existence of ethnic enclaves of immigrants of the same ethnicity in areas with a high concentration of Turkish immigrants. The factors that favour the formation of these ethnic enclaves are, in the first place, the common language, religion, and culture of the immigrants. Furthermore, most of the Turkish immigrants come from families with an entrepreneurial background, which explains the high degree of entrepreneurship for this ethnic group in the Netherlands.

The entrepreneurship rate of immigrants from Morocco, Suriname, and the Antilles is less than half compared with that of Dutch entrepreneurs. Moroccans are very similar to Turks in terms of demographic composition, and they often share the same religion, but are less well-educated. On the other hand, the Surinamese immigrants are very similar to the Antillean immigrants, but they are usually better educated than the other two groups, and are more familiar with the Dutch language and culture. Another common characteristic of all these immigrant groups is that they are relatively young compared with the native population. Clearly, an

important question is whether such background factors matter for their business performance. One of the goals of the present study is to trace such factors.

4. The Urban Seedbed of Migrant Entrepreneurs

In an open and global world characterized by rising urbanization, modern cities function as the habitat of international migrants and magnets of economic growth, in which small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) are a source of new jobs, business dynamism, and innovation. Migrant entrepreneurs form a significant part of the SME sector in our cities, and may hence be important vehicles for urban vitality. Usually, these migrant entrepreneurs have to work in an unfamiliar and risky business environment. Consequently, they may be less entrepreneurially-oriented in terms of risk attitudes concerning undertaking innovative business activities, and they usually concentrate on their own socio-cultural group.

The Netherlands is a good illustration of the above megatrends. The steady influx of immigrants since the 1960s has led to a diverse ethnic composition in the Netherlands, mainly in major cities. Cities like Amsterdam, The Hague, Rotterdam and Utrecht are the breeding grounds of multicultural activity (Van den Tillaart, 2007). This ethnic diversity in the city tends to lead to an enrichment of social and economic opportunities, and a higher variation in the range of talents in employment, which thus improves creativity. Ethnic (or, perhaps better, migrant) entrepreneurship is a visible manifestation of ethnic and cultural diversity, where work is provided for precisely those groups where unemployment is relatively high, because immigrants are often low-skilled. This can also lead to a further integration of immigrants into the official labour market and social cohesion, and, at the same time, it also contributes to the strengthening of the urban economy. Immigrant entrepreneurship not only provides employment and economic growth but also makes the city more vibrant and more colourful.

Entrepreneurship among immigrants is of great importance to cities for economic, political, and social reasons. The contribution of immigrants to employment creation is not limited to ethnic and niche markets, but is increasingly expanding into new sectors ('break-out strategies'), for example, the creative industries. Moreover, their behaviour has significantly contributed to urban economic growth in recent years. Urban diversity is thus important, for both business facilities, and knowledge-sharing. Diversity will therefore lead to new and innovative combinations, which in turn will attract new businesses and talent. Because of their diversity, immigrant entrepreneurs tend to develop a differentiated urban economy, and thus contribute to stimulating its further growth (see Sahin et al., 2007). More and more districts in the Netherlands are coming to have a multicultural character. The presence of ethnic shops and restaurants brings vibrancy and diversity and can also enrich the neighbourhoods. In these ethnically colourful neighbourhoods, migrants can experience their own identity, express themselves and maintain their culture. They will find the necessary informal support, security and solidarity in social networks to pursue economic activities and to take some risks (Snel and Burgers, 2000). These areas therefore offer unique opportunities for immigrants to start their own business. Enterprising immigrants are of great importance for the economic potential of the city, and, in their own way, contribute to the diversity of the neighbourhood, and strengthen the local economy. Thanks to the positive development of immigrant entrepreneurship, these neighbourhoods are often now the scene of thriving enterprise and a good quality of life, enabling more customers (both locals and foreigners) to find and visit specific stores in a particular neighbourhood setting. In short, the economic potential in these areas, which is reflected in a growing immigrant entrepreneurship, is a source of creative possibilities for multicultural neighbourhoods.

Reliance on social networks of their own socio-cultural group may guarantee a certain market share, but may at the same time hamper an outreach strategy towards new and innovative markets (e.g., high-tech/ICT). Woolcock (1998) claimed that reliance on one's own migrant group and its related network is both developmental and destructive. However, according to Menzies et al. (2003), an orientation on one's own group can actually be a benefit to migrant entrepreneurs. And Portes and Jensen (1998) referred to the effects of some degree of monopolistic power in migrant entrepreneurship regarding better access to a relatively protected market. Nevertheless, Lyster and Shapiro (1999) have suggested that competition amongst migrant

entrepreneurs serving the same limited market niche may also increase business failure, especially if the market size is relatively small. Thus, the empirical findings are not unambiguous, and call for more fundamental research. Our study will address in particular the external backgrounds (e.g., social networks) and internal drives (e.g., motivation) with a view to the identification of Critical Success Factors (CSFs) for business performance and entry into new business markets by migrant entrepreneurs of different ethnic origin in Dutch cities. To that end, a micro-based survey among various categories of migrant entrepreneurs has been organized. This database as well as the methodological framework employed – based on the so-called GALAXY model (see Sahin, 2012) – will be presented in Section 5, followed by some general statistical findings from our survey. Then, Section 6 will present some specific statistical results from our survey among migrant entrepreneurs in Dutch cities, while the paper will be concluded with some retrospective and prospective remarks.

5. Database and Methodology

5.1. General description

Our study analyses the main factors that impact on the economic performance of second-generation migrant entrepreneurs in the high-tech sector in four large cities in the Netherlands: Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Utrecht, and The Hague. The sample in our study consists of a total of 212 entrepreneurs, who are predominantly of Turkish origin, and also a few of Moroccan, Surinamese, and Antillean origin, who are active in the high-tech sector (e.g. ICT), and non-traditional sectors (e.g. FIRE (Finance, Insurance and Real Estate) and tourism services) that all require highly-educated and skilled labour. The empirical data of our research was gathered from a self-administered on-line survey conducted in the fall of 2010.

The response rate was rather low, only 10 percent of the targeted entrepreneurs have submitted complete answers to our questionnaire. In order to determine a sufficient sample size needed we had to take into consideration several factors, such as how representative the sample size is expected to be and the methods expected to be used for the data analysis. A sample size of 212 entrepreneurs was used in this study. The distribution of the sample across the four biggest cities in Netherlands is shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Distribution of sample

Origin	Cities					
	Amsterdam	Rotterdam	The Hague	Utrecht	Other	Total
Turks	14	15	18	1	26	74
Dutch	7	7	8	14	7	43
Moroccans	7	8	6	9	9	39
Suriname/Antilles	2	10	9	5	12	39
Other	3	1	7		6	17
Total	33	42	48	29	60	212

Our strategy for the design of the survey questionnaire was to keep it focused and short, targeting completion within 5 to 10 minutes. Our survey comprises a total of 36 questions, and most of them are questions with multiple response possibilities. Multiple Response Questions (MRQ) will always be a useful feature for descriptive surveys. These type of questions are unique in that they require a different mode of data entry utilizing dichotomous variables and dummy coding. When properly handled, MRQ variables can be related to other numerical variables through regression and correlation, and can also be used as predictor variables in multiple regression analysis.

The survey asked for the respondents' key characteristics, home country, educational background, gender and firm size etc. To help maximize response rates, we attended network events, and asked two assistants to help approach entrepreneurs and complete questionnaires.

The questionnaire was designed in accordance with the GALAXY model, a theoretical model that takes into consideration multiple factors that are presumed to affect the business performance of migrant entrepreneurs (see for details Sahin, 2012). Therefore, in order to empirically test this model we have connected the questions in the questionnaire with the key factors in the model. When constructing the questionnaire, we wanted to capture all the dimensions of our GALAXY model in order to be able, at a later stage to determine the level of influence of each factor on the business performance of the migrant entrepreneurs. The questionnaire used has 3 parts. The first part covers the general information about the enterprise, including information about age, gender, ethnicity, education of the entrepreneur, as well as the sector and type of the organization etc. The second part comprises questions relating to the main factors in the GALAXY: motivational factors, business environment, socio-economic contextual factors and policy factors. The final part comprises questions that will help us assess the business performance of the enterprises. The questionnaire was initially written in English. Afterwards, as suggested by Saunders et al. (2006), a pilot study of the questionnaire was carried out on a sample of 20 people among which entrepreneurs of different nationalities and fellow colleagues. It helped us determine whether all the questions were interpreted properly, but, it also helped us to test the reliability and validity of each question in capturing the desired information. Therefore, the feedback from the test prompted us to make the final adjustments to the questionnaire before sending it out to the targeted groups. We also removed a few questions that were not relevant enough for our study, especially some of the open-ended questions, as recommended by the test respondents. Furthermore, the pilot study has helped us determine the time required to complete the questionnaire. After all the improvements were made, the questionnaire was translated from English to Dutch and sent out to our target group.

5.2 Database

The database contains extensive information on age and gender composition of the ethnic entrepreneurs under consideration (see Table 4). Most of these entrepreneurs belong to the younger age cohorts and are predominantly male.

Table 4: Age and gender distribution of the entrepreneurs

Age	N	%
21-30	38	17.9
31-40	63	29.7
41-50	69	32.55
>50	42	19.8
Total	212	100
Gender		
Male	165	77.8
Female	47	22.2
Total	212	100

In regard to education, our data shows that the largest group of self-employed migrants have a higher vocational training (43.4), followed by those with a University degree (see Table 5). The entrepreneurs with pre-vocational education are the least represented group in our sample.

Table 5: Education level of the entrepreneurs

Education	N	%
University level or higher	64	30.2
Higher vocational training (HBO)	92	43.4
Middle vocational training (MBO)	39	18.4
Prevocational education	1	0.5
Secondary education	16	7.5
Total	212	100

The composition of our sample in regard to place of birth of the entrepreneur and his/her parents is illustrated in Table 6. We see that the biggest group is Dutch-born. However, if we look at the origins of their parents, we can note that Turkish are the predominant group in our sample, followed by the Dutch and Moroccans, respectively.

Table 6: Birthplace of the entrepreneurs

Birthplace	Entrepreneur		Father		Mother	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Netherlands	111	52.4	42	19.8	44	20.8
Turkey	45	21.2	73	34.4	74	34.9
Morocco	18	8.5	36	17.0	37	17.5
Suriname	14	6.6	31	14.6	26	12.3
Dutch Antilles	10	4.7	9	4.2	8	3.8
Other	14	6.6	21	9.9	23	10.9
Total	212	100.0	212	100.0	212	100.0

As regards the generational distribution of our sample, it can be seen that second-generation entrepreneurs are overrepresented in our sample, with a share of 57,5% (see Table 7). We have also included here the native population, which participated in our survey. However, we were not able to make any generation distribution for this group.

Table 7: Generation distribution of the entrepreneurs

Generation	N	%
First-generation	51	24.1
Second-generation	122	57.5
Native Dutch	39	18.4
Total	212	100.0

We have also looked into the occupation of the entrepreneurs in our sample prior to their self-employment in the current company. The data shows that the biggest share of the entrepreneurs, 57.1%, was previously full-time or part-time employees, whereas the smallest share is attributed to those entrepreneurs that were formerly unemployed (see Table 8).

Table 8: Prior occupation

Prior occupation	N	%
Entrepreneur same sector	20	9.4
Entrepreneur different sector	37	17.5
Full-time/part-time employee	121	57.1
Training/study	26	12.3
Unemployed	3	1.4
Other	5	2.4
Total	212	100.0

Our data shows that most of the enterprises were started in the period from 2005 to 2010 (53.8%). Furthermore, they were in the inception phase predominantly home-based (51.4%), while their current business location is predominantly in own office or own office building (see Table 9).

Table 9: Start date and location of the entrepreneur

Start date	N	%	Start location	N	%	Current location	N	%
2005-2010	114	53.8	Home	109	51.4	Home	56	26.4
2000-2004	50	23.6	Incubator	5	2.4	Incubator	4	1.9
1995-1999	23	10.8	Enterprise	53	25.0	Enterprise	74	34.9
< 1995	25	11.8	Own office	39	18.4	Own office	70	33.0
Total	212	100	Other	6	2.8	Other	8	3.8
			Total	212	100.0	Total	212	100

In regard to the innovative activities, our results show that the biggest share of the companies in our sample have in the preceding year introduced a new service on the market (37.5%), followed by those that introduced a service process (23.3%). Furthermore, in the previous year few companies have launched new products (15.83%), have entered new markets (15%) and/or have introduced a new production process (10%) (see Table 10).

Table 10: Innovation

Innovation	N	%
New product	19	15.83
New service	45	37.5
New production process	10	8.33
New service process	28	23.3
New market	18	15
Total	120	100

In respect to the future strategy of the company, the predominant part (56.4%) of our respondents have mentioned the plan to change the structure of the company (management style / organizational structure), while others are planning to eventually sell the company (23.1 %) or to reorient towards a different sector (20.5%) (see Table 11).

Table 11: Future strategy of the entrepreneur

Future strategy	N	%
Orienting to different sector	40	20.5
Change structure of company	110	56.4
Sell company	45	23.1
Total	195	100

Table 12 illustrates the sector distribution of the companies in our sample. As we notice, most of the companies are active in different sectors than the one listed in the table. Among these are: the marketing sector, event and project management, e-business etc.

Table 12: Sector distribution of the entrepreneur

Sector distribution	N	%
Banking	5	2.4
IT services	34	16.0
Holdings and management consultancies	20	9.4
Rentals and commercial real estate	8	3.8
Renting of movables	1	0.5
Legal Services / Administration	22	10.4
Insurance and pension funds	4	1.9
Recruitment / Employment	17	8.0
Travel agencies and tour operators	5	2.4
Accountancy/Consultancy	18	8.5
Development agency	6	2.8
Other, please specify.....	72	33.9
Total	212	100

6. Analysis of Multiple Response Questions

Multiple Response Questions (MRQ) are a useful toolkit for descriptive surveys. These types of questions are unique in that they require a different mode of data entry utilizing dichotomous variables and dummy coding (see Multiple Response in SPSS). When properly handled, MRQ variables can be related to other numeric variables through regression and correlation, and can also be used as predictor variables in multiple regression analysis.

If the objective is to rank the items individually according to their importance (frequency), then the next step is to analyze the responses such that when an item is checked, a module records the count and credits to the same item. The procedure posts the frequency count for each of the items separately without regard to combination responses. An obvious advantage of this approach is its simplicity, which makes it easy to further discuss and interpret the results. One objection to this procedure could be that the contributions of the combination items in measuring a particular dimension are always confounded with the single-item responses and therefore are often ignored.

Our survey comprises 36 questions in total. Some of them are questions with multiple response possibilities. The following questions were multiple response questions: 7b, 9b, 9c, 11a, and 11b, and will be given some more attention. First, we need to get the relative frequency counts of each item as a basis for deducing its importance as a confirmatory source for verifying the influence on business performance. These answers, each requiring a dichotomous (i.e., yes/no) answer and subsequent dummy coding (i.e. "yes" numerically coded as 1, "no" is 0), will now concisely be discussed.

Q7b refers to the start-up problems of the business. The objective of this question is to identify the most important start-up problems of the entrepreneur. The entrepreneur could provide more answers. 212 entrepreneurs indicated 575 times that they had the following problems: 1) administration, 2) financing, 3) competition, 4) access to market, 5) the economic situation, 6) business environment, 7) legislation, 8) access to business support, 9) availability of suitable staff, 10) debt fear, 11) development of management skills, 12) lack of business idea, and 13) bad experiences in the past. 102 out of the 575 (17.7%) indicated that they had problems with access to the market, while 80 out of 575 times (13.9%) indicated that they had problems with finance (see Table 13).

Table 13 : Results for multiple response questions

		Responses	
		N	%
Start-up problems	Administration	59	10.3%
	Financing	80	13.9%
	Competition	80	13.9%
	Market access	102	17.7%
	General economic situation	58	10.1%
	Business environment	23	4.0%
	Legislation	39	6.8%
	Access to business support	14	2.4%
	Availability of suitable staff	43	7.5%
	Debt fear	28	4.9%
	Development of management skills	36	6.3%
	Lack of a business idea	5	0.9%
	Bad experiences in the past	8	1.4%
Total	575	100.0%	

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

Question 9b was intended to gather information about the organizations or the contacts that have been used by our respondents to get business support or advice for the startup of their

business. When we look at the multiple responses to this question, 212 entrepreneurs indicated at least 2631 times that they have consulted other people and authorities during the startup of their business. 212 entrepreneurs indicated 2631 times that they consulted: 1) an accountant, 2) a consultant, 3) clients, 4) family, 5) franchise organizations, 6) network organizations, 7) Chamber of Commerce, 8) banks, 9) a coach, 10) suppliers, 11) friends, 12) branch organizations, and 13) municipality. 120 out of the 2631 times (4.6%) consulted the Chamber of Commerce for advice. 164 out of 2631 times (6.2%) consulted an accountant for advice (see Table 14).

Table 14: Results for multiple response questions

Advice in starting business Frequencies			
		Responses	
		N	%
Advice in starting business	Accountant	164	6.2%
	Consultant	194	7.4%
	Customers	178	6.8%
	Family	125	4.8%
	Franchise organisation	210	8.0%
	Network organisation	163	6.2%
	Chamber of Commerce	120	4.6%
	Business Angel	207	7.9%
	Bank	166	6.3%
	Own coach	197	7.5%
	Suppliers	200	7.6%
	Friends	102	3.9%
	Trade Association	196	7.4%
	Retailers Association	212	8.1%
	Municipality or district	197	7.5%
Total		2631	100.0%

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

Question 9c aims to get an overview of which organizations or contacts have the respondents used for business support or advice in their current situation; 212 entrepreneurs indicated at least 2617 times that they consulted other people and authorities for advice in the current situation; 169 out of 2617 times (3.0%) consulted an accountant in the present situation. Consulting a network organization is indicated 144 out of the 2617 (5.5%) as a source of advice (see Table 15).

Table 15 : Results for multiple response questions

Advice in current situation for business Frequencies			
		Responses	
		N	%
Advice in current situation	Accountant	79	3.0%
	Consultant	169	6.5%
	Customers	173	6.6%
	Family	156	6.0%
	Franchise organisation	207	7.9%
	Network organisation	144	5.5%
	Chamber of Commerce	191	7.3%
	Business Angel	210	8.0%
	Bank	184	7.0%
	Own coach	193	7.4%
	Suppliers	200	7.6%
	Friends	105	4.0%
	Trade Association	191	7.3%
	Retailers Association	211	8.1%
	Municipality or district	204	7.8%
Total		2617	100.0%
a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.			

Next, question 11a looks at the level of innovation within the enterprises with respect to any of the following categories: product, process, organization, marketing innovation, and tapping into a new market. 212 entrepreneurs indicated at least 919 times one of the four options mentioned above. There were 919 responses divided between: 1) a new good or service introduced to the market (product innovation), 2) a new production process or method (process innovation), 3) a new organization of management (organizational innovation), 4) a new way of selling your goods or services (marketing innovation), and 5) tapping into a new market. 173 times entrepreneurs (18.8%) indicated option 5: tapping into a new market. 202 of 919 (22.0%) indicated a new production process or method (process innovation) (see Table 16).

Table 16: Results for multiple response questions

Innovation Frequencies			
		Responses	
		N	%
Innovation	New product on the market	193	21.0%
	New service on the market	167	18.2%
	New production process on the market	202	22.0%
	New service process on the market	184	20.0%
	Entered a new market	173	18.8%
Total		919	100.0%
a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.			

Finally, question 11b refers to the key factors behind the success of the entrepreneur. The objective of this question is to identify the most important success factors of the entrepreneur. The entrepreneur could indicate multiple answers. We recoded again the question in a dichotomous (i.e., yes/no) answer and subsequent dummy coding (i.e. “yes” numerically coded as 1, “no” is 0). Again using Multiple Response in SPSS, we defined the factors in one group and obtained the following results (see Table 17).

Table 17: Results for multiple response questions

Success factors Frequencies			
		Responses	
		N	%
Success Factors	Access to market and clients	112	17.2%
	Access to finance	18	2.8%
	Access to suppliers	22	3.4%
	Motivation and dedication	99	15.2%
	Reliability	136	20.9%
	Availability of suitable personnel	52	8.0%
	Location of enterprise	43	6.6%
	Innovation	53	8.1%
	Quality	116	17.8%
Total		651	100.0%

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

All entrepreneurs together indicated at least 651 times a success factor; 116 (17.8%) indicated quality as a success factor. In the table we can see that there is a total of 651, which refers to the total of at least one indication of a success factor. Access to markets and clients appears to be 112 of the 651 (17.2%) indications of a success factor (see Table 17).

7. Migrant Entrepreneurship in Perspective

It is noteworthy that the past decades have shown a remarkable growth in entrepreneurship among migrants. Recent studies on ethnic entrepreneurship have observed an increasing share of migrants in urban small- and medium-sized entrepreneurial businesses. The phenomenon of migrant entrepreneurship deserves more in-depth scientific investigation, on the basis of, *inter alia*, comparative studies in terms of incubator conditions and critical success factors (CSFs) for a promising and efficient business performance. Given the growing importance of entrepreneurship, there is practical value in being able to identify these CSFs. Due insight into entrepreneurial behaviour and the relative performance of migrants is needed to develop an effective business policy, in which migrants are seen as a source of new socio-economic opportunities, for both the migrant groups and the city concerned. Strategic information will also be necessary for the development of fine-tuned policy strategies to enhance the participation of traditionally less-privileged groups and to improve their business performance potential.

The Netherlands is a great example of an ethnically colourful country with strong multiculturalism, where migrant enterprises enrich the economy. The rise of migrant entrepreneurship, in general, appears to have had a favourable effect on the economy of the Netherlands. During the economic decline of recent years, the presence of migrant entrepreneurs has been one of the factors which have kept the urban economy running. Migrant entrepreneurship reflects different cultures and open-ended capacities for the creation of economic growth in cities, and contributes to economic diversity. Different migrant groups and different cultures can show different characteristics in terms of driving forces, motivation, performance, and conditions for success. Moreover, besides the most obvious cultural differences that exist between peoples, such as language, attire, and traditions, there are also significant variations in how societies organize themselves, in their shared perception of morality, and in the ways they interact with their environment. It is debatable whether these differences are merely incidental artifacts arising from patterns of human migration, or whether they represent an evolutionary trait that is key to our success as a species.

In order to evaluate migrant entrepreneurship, we have in our empirical study addressed different groups of migrant entrepreneurs in the Netherlands by comparing their socio-economic and cultural differences. We focused mainly on four active and dominant migrant groups, *viz.* Turks, Moroccans, Surinamese, and Antilleans in the Netherlands, and we compared these groups in terms of their entrepreneurial behaviour and performance. In the Netherlands, the migrant

populations from Turkey and Morocco are rather similar regarding their demographic composition. They are, on average, less well-educated, and most likely to be married, and most migrants from these countries consider themselves to be Muslim. The migrants from Surinam and Antilles are better educated, more familiar with the Dutch culture and language, and more often single or single parents. Migrants from Surinam and the Antilles also have similar demographic characteristics. Regarding the labour force participation rate of women and the share of married couples in the total number of households, the Surinamese and Antilleans have much in common with the native Dutch population. The educational level is lowest for migrant groups from Turkey and Morocco. Migrants from Surinam and the Antilles have, on average, higher educational levels, yet not as high as those of the native population. First-generation migrants are far more entrepreneurial than the second-generation migrants. Among the Turkish and Moroccan migrant groups, it can be seen that men are relatively more entrepreneurial. The other two major groups of migrants from Suriname and the Dutch Antilles show that entrepreneurship is more or less evenly distributed among males and females.

Our study was instigated by the conviction that migrant entrepreneurs deserve more attention. Migrant minorities are usually a highly motivated and qualified entrepreneurial group. Migrant entrepreneurs are seen as the future entrepreneurs of the Netherlands. The country's welfare is increasingly dependent on the success of this group of entrepreneurs. The ambition and desire of migrant entrepreneurs to start their own businesses is much higher compared with the motivation of the native population of the Netherlands. In addition, migrants are becoming more professional and often have sky-high ambitions. Migrant minority businesses mostly fall into the category of Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (SMEs). Such SMEs play a significant role in the domestic economies of most countries. Each and every successful self-employed migrant or minority business contributes to improved social and economic integration. A growing migrant economy creates a virtuous circle: business success gives rise to a distinctive motivational structure, breeding a community-wide orientation towards entrepreneurship.

Differences among migrant entrepreneurs may be caused by differences in their entrepreneurial behaviour and context. Besides the migrant network and support, the success of migrant entrepreneurs depends on their personality and work discipline; and on their inclination to be ambitious, patient, obstinate, and self-confident. Other reasons for success could be to work hard and conscientiously, and have good relationships with clients. To like the job and to do a good job, and to be supported by spouse and family members are also explanations for the success of migrant entrepreneurs (Baycan-Levent et al., 2003). Within a multicultural society it is plausible that differences in basic cultural values, attitudes and behaviour of the various ethnic communities influence their attitude towards entrepreneurship.

A growing number of the second-generation migrant entrepreneurs and an orientation to non-traditional sectors have become the new trends in migrant entrepreneurship in recent years. Although traditional sectors are still most popular among the first-generation migrant entrepreneurs, due to the increasing pressure and high competitiveness in traditional areas, new niches are developing. While the first-generation has more often become active in the traditional sector areas, the second-generation has been more active in advanced producer services, such as finance, insurance, real estate and business-related professional services (FIRE), and has also contributed to the emergence of new areas of immigrant business activity, such as ICT and the creative industries. Similar trends are also observed in the Netherlands. A general evaluation of immigrant entrepreneurship in the Netherlands highlights a sectoral change towards producer services, characterized by an increasing number of second-generation immigrant entrepreneurs.

This paper has then addressed in particular ethnic entrepreneurship as a major force field in the SME sector in many contemporary urban areas. Research studies on motivation and critical success conditions for ethnic entrepreneurs demonstrate that performance conditions vary across ethnic groups. The studies that consider differences by race and ethnicity find that human capital, access to finance, and industry structures may produce systematic differences (Bates, 1993; Fairlie, 1999; Butler and Greene, 1997).

Migrant businesses tend to lag behind non-migrant businesses in terms of sales, profits, survivability, and employment: coming up against greater obstacles in obtaining financing for their business implies that an already difficult situation is growing worse. According to Holguin

et al. (2006), there are several significant barriers that are specifically faced by some groups of ethnic entrepreneurs in the US. Access to financial capital, access to mentors and networks, access to labour market, and barriers to the marketplace are highly important when starting a business and these factors can discourage the development of the business. Studies of migrant and ethnic communities, in particular, show that minority businesses that are better embedded in the local community, serve a large share of residents in the neighbourhood, and help their community as a whole to do better than they might have otherwise.

Our findings brought to light new patterns in business performance of ethnic entrepreneurs. It turns out that the business profile of migrant entrepreneurship is changing from the first generation to the second. This 'break-out' strategy positions migrant entrepreneurs in a mature competitive context, and herealds essentially a socio-economic emancipation of this class of entrepreneurs. Our study has identified the success conditions for business performance of this new class of migrant entrepreneurs.

The results of our investigation suggest that a new orientation to the non-traditional sector, or, in other words, an external orientation with a combination of personal characteristics, skills and experience, may produce a very high economic performance and success level of the second-generation Turkish entrepreneurs. Therefore, this new orientation may also help them to escape from the ethnic enclave and break out from their ethnic dependency. Moreover, this external orientation may also help them to expand their market. The results of our study show that the motivation and driving forces of the second-generation Turkish entrepreneurs stem from both their personal characteristics shaped by their higher educational level and their previous working experience as an employee or entrepreneur in the same sector. The demand for and the growing and promising structure of the sector play also an important role in pulling the second-generation Turkish immigrants to become entrepreneurs in these new sectors.

In the Netherlands, in the last two decades the rate of migrant entrepreneurship has grown at a faster pace than that of the native Dutch population. In the Netherlands, policy measures may have to be directed towards improving the educational levels of immigrants and towards encouraging the general integration of the immigrants in Dutch society. In addition, policy measures should facilitate the access of migrants to financial support and other support measures. Furthermore, aside from the general policy measures to stimulate ethnic entrepreneurship, attention should be focused on specific minority groups which have dissimilar entrepreneurial behaviour. For instance, the Turkish group is characterized by a high tendency to become self-employed, and thus their rate of entrepreneurship is expected to grow even without additional policy measures. On the other hand, Moroccans usually have a more closed nature, and thus are less likely to be inclined to become self-employed and are reluctant to communicate with official institutions (Jansen et al, 2003). Therefore, in this case, the policy measures might stimulate the general integration of this group in Dutch society, and provide incentives for them to pursue entrepreneurial activities.

One way to improve possibilities for migrant entrepreneurs in the Netherlands is for them to go beyond their own ethnic frontiers and expand their activities into broader and other market segments and business lines, competing or associating with the native Dutch entrepreneurs in their own markets. This new strategy may require the migrants to improve their skills and knowledge of the Dutch language. Here established associations can play a role in order to improve the relationship between migrant entrepreneurs and private and public institutions in the Netherlands.

The main objective of our study was to examine the most important determinants and success factors behind the success of migrant entrepreneurs in a broader study (see Sahin, 2012). We have looked at the motivation factors of individuals to become self-employed. Due attention was given to the migrants' specific motivation factors which drive them to pursue entrepreneurial activity to a greater extent compared with the natives. Besides the entrepreneurial animal spirit and the bounded rationality shared by both the native and migrant entrepreneurs, social networks appeared to be a crucial determinant to become self-employed in the case of the migrants. Next, it is evident that the business environment can have a great impact on the performance of migrant-owned companies. It is plausible that location conditions, business markets, and the business network have an effect on the trajectory of migrant businesses. Clearly,

also socio-economic contextual factors play an important role in the process of setting-up and further developing the business, especially the business culture, operational characteristics and access to new markets (widely referred to as 'break-out' strategy), in order to avoid being trapped in ethnic enclaves. Lastly, policy factors may significantly impact on ethnic enterprise formation and its consequent growth. Therefore, support measures and policy initiatives are crucial in helping migrants to overcome those barriers that prevent them from starting their own businesses.

In conclusion, the migrant entrepreneur is often considered to be an 'entrepreneurial hero'. Clearly, migrant entrepreneurs make up a significant share of the urban business economy and they contribute considerably to urban vitality. Our analysis also shows, however, that – despite the 'signs of hope' offered by migrant entrepreneurship for urban vitality – they do not create an entirely innovative business climate in the urban economy. They are a solid and, in the meantime, established part of the normal urban-economic business sector – and as such are indispensable – but it remains to be seen whether they deserve to be called 'entrepreneurial heroes'. They offer many job opportunities in a modern city, but the 'jump' towards a high-tech sector is still modest. This holds for both first- and second-generation entrepreneurs, although the second generation clearly demonstrates a more knowledge-oriented business attitude. A converging pathway from specific, often ethnic-oriented, market niches to mainstream economic branches is a plausible consequence of the gradual transition of first-generation to second-generation migrant entrepreneurs. Clearly, this converging transition may take several decades. Nevertheless, it is likely not too speculative to argue that the distinct nature of migrant entrepreneurship – as a special modern business activity *sui generis* – will vanish in the future, to begin with large metropolitan areas.

References

1. Acs, Z. J., Audretsch, D. B., Braunerhjelm, P. and Carlsson, B. (2006). "The Knowledge Spillover Theory of Entrepreneurship", *Center for Economic Policy Research*, London, UK, December No. 5326.
2. Aldrich, H.E. and Waldinger, R. (1990). "Migrantity and Entrepreneurship", *Annual Review of Sociology*, 16: 111-135.
3. Audretsch, D. and Thurik, R. (2004). "The Model of the Entrepreneurial Economy", *International Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 2(2): 143-166.
4. Barney, J. (1991). "Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage", *Journal of Management*, 17 (1): 99-120.
5. Barney, J.B. (2001). "Resource-Based Theories of Competitive Advantage: A Ten-Year Retrospective on the Resource-Based View", *Journal of Management*, 27: 643-50.
6. Bates, T. (1997). "Financing Small Business Creation: The Case of Chinese and Korean Immigrant Entrepreneurs", *Journal of Business Venturing*, 12: 109-124.
7. Bates, T. (1993). *Assessment of State and Local Government Minority Business Development Programs*, US Department of Commerce: Washington, DC.
8. Baycan-Levent, T. (2010). "Diversity and Creativity as Seedbeds for Urban and Regional Dynamics", *European Planning Studies*, 18(4): 565-594.
9. Baycan-Levent, T. and Nijkamp, P. (2009). "Characteristics of Migrant Entrepreneurship in Europe", *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 27(4): 375-397.
10. Baycan-Levent, T., Masurel, E. and Nijkamp, P. (2003). "Diversity in Entrepreneurship: Ethnic and Female Roles in Urban Economic Life", *International Journal of Social Economics*, 30(11-12): 1131-1161.
11. Baycan-Levent, T., Nijkamp, P. and Sahin, M. (2009). "New Orientations in Ethnic Entrepreneurship: Motivation, Goals and Strategies of New Generation Ethnic Entrepreneurs", *International Journal of Foresight and Innovation Policy*, 5: 83-111.
12. Bleeker, D., Bruins, A. and Braaksma, R. (2011). "Monitor Vrouwelijk en Etnisch Ondernemerschap 2010", *EIM. Zoetermeer*.
13. Butler, J. S. and Greene, P. G. (1997). "Ethnic Entrepreneurship: the Continuous Rebirth of American Entrepreneurship", in: Sexton D. L. and Smilor, R. W. (eds), *Entrepreneurship 2000*, Upstart Publishing: Chicago, pp 267-289.

14. Carree, M. A. and Thurik, A.R. (2010). "The Impact of Entrepreneurship on Economic Growth", In: Acs, Z. J. and Audretsch, D. B. (eds), *Handbook of Entrepreneurship Research*, International Handbook Series on Entrepreneurship, Springer: New York.
15. Casson, M. (1994). *The Economics of Business Culture: Game Theory, Transaction Costs and Economic Performance*. Oxford University Press: New York.
16. CBS (2001). *Allochtonen in Nederland*. Voorburg/Heerlen.
17. Chakrabarti, A.K. (1990). "Scientific Output of Small and Medium Size Firms in High-Tech Industries", *Engineering Management, IEEE Transactions*, 48: 52.
18. Chrysostome, E. and Arcand, S. (2009). "Survival of Necessity Immigrant Entrepreneurs: An Exploratory Study", *Journal of Comparative International Management*, 12(2): 3-29.
19. Choenni, A. (1997). *Veelsoortig Assortiment*. Het Spinhuis: Amsterdam.
20. Cooney, T. M. and Bygrave, W. D. (1997). "The Evolution of Structure and Strategy in Fast-Growth Firms Founded by Entrepreneurial Teams", Working Paper presented at the Babson Entrepreneurship Conference.
21. Cohen, W. and Levinthal D. (1989). "Innovation and Learning: the Two Faces of R&D", *Economic Journal*, 99: 569-596.
22. Cormack, J. and Niessen, J. (2002). "Supplier Diversity, The Case of Immigrant and Ethnic Minority Enterprises", Background paper prepared for the Transatlantic Round Table on Supplier Diversity, Brussels.
23. Dana, L. P. (ed.) (2007). *Handbook of Research on Ethnic Minority Entrepreneurship*, Edward Elgar: Cheltenham.
24. Deeds, D.L. and Rothaermel, F.T. (2003). "Honeymoons and Liabilities: The Relationship Between Age and Performance in R&D Alliances", *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 20 (6): 468-84.
25. Delft, H. van, Gorter, C. and Nijkamp, P. (2000). "In Search of Migrant Entrepreneurship Opportunities in The City: A Comparative Policy Study", *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 18: 429-451.
26. European Commission (2011). "Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs), Migrant Entrepreneurs / Ethnic Minority Entrepreneurs", http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/promoting-entrepreneurship/migrants-ethnic-minorities/index_en.htm
27. Fairlie, R. W. (1999). "The Absence of the African-American Owned Business: An Analysis of the Dynamics of Self-Employment", *Journal of Labor Economics*, 17: 80-108.
28. Hébert, R. F. and Link, A.N. (1982), *The Entrepreneur*, New York: Praeger.
29. Hermes, K. and Leicht, R. (2010). "Scope and Characteristics of Immigrant Entrepreneurship in Europe: A Cross-National Comparison of European Countries", Working Paper.
30. Holguin, J., Gamboa E. and Hoy, F. (2006). "Challenges and Opportunities for Hispanic Entrepreneurs in the United States, in: Dana, L. P. (ed), *Migrant Entrepreneurship*, Edward Elgar: Aldershot, pp 99-113.
31. Jacobs, J. (1969). *The Economy of Cities*, Random House: New York.
32. Jansen, M., Kok de, J., Spronsen, J. and Willemsen, S. (2003). "Immigrant Entrepreneurship in The Netherlands", Research Report No. H200304, Scientific Analysis of Entrepreneurship and SMEs, Zoetermeer.
33. Kirzner, I. (1973). *Competition and Entrepreneurship*, University of Chicago Press: Chicago.
34. Kloosterman, R. and Rath, J. (eds) (2003). *Immigrant Entrepreneurs. Venturing abroad in The Age of Globalization*. Oxford/New York: Berg: 213-231.
35. Knight, F. (1921). *Risk, Uncertainty and Profit*, Houghton Mifflin: New York.
36. Kourtit, K. and Nijkamp, P. (2011). The New Dutch Economy: New and Colourful Entrepreneurship. In: M.W. van Gelderen en E. Masarel (eds), *Entrepreneurship in Contest*, Routledge, London (forthcoming).

37. Kuratko, D.F. and Hodgetts, R.M. (2001). *Entrepreneurship: A Contemporary Approach*, The Dryden Press, Harcourt Brace College Publishers: Orlando, FL.
38. Light, I. and Gold, S.J. (2000). *Ethnic Economies*, Academic Press: San Diego.
39. Lyer, G.R. and Shapiro, J.M. (1999). "Ethnic Entrepreneurial and Marketing Systems: Implications for the Global Economy", *Journal of International Marketing* 7: 83–110.
40. Masurel, E. and Nijkamp, P. (2003). "Allochtoon Ondernemerschap", In: Risseuw P. and Thurik R. (eds), *Handboek Ondernemers en Adviseurs: Management en Economie van het Midden – en Klein Bedrijf*, Kluwer: Dordrecht, pp. 207-216.
41. Markman, G. and Baron, R. (2003). "Person-Entrepreneurship Fit: Why Some People Are More Successful as Entrepreneurs than Others", *Human Resource Management Review*, 13(2): 281-301.
42. Menzies, T.V., Brenner, G.A. and Fillion, L.J. (2003). "Social Capital, Networks and Ethnic Minority Entrepreneurs: Transnational Entrepreneurship and Bootstrap Capitalism", In: Etemad, H. and Wright, R.W. (eds), *Globalisation and Entrepreneurship: Policy and Strategy Perspectives*, Edward Elgar: Northampton, MA. pp. 125–151.
43. Porter, M. (1990). *The Competitive Advantage of Nations*. The Free Press: New York, NY.
44. Portes, A. and Jensen, L. (1989). "The Enclave and the Entrants", *American Sociological Review*, 54: 929-949.
45. Reich, R.B. (1987). "Entrepreneurship Reconsidered: The Team as Hero", *Harvard Business Review*, 3: 77-83.
46. Sahin M., Nijkamp, P. and Rietdijk, M. (2009). "Cultural Diversity and Urban Innovativeness: Personal and Business Study on the Performance of Migrant Workers in the Dutch Service Sector", *Studies in Regional Science*, 37 (2): 535-552.
47. Sahin, M., Nijkamp, P. and Baycan-Levent, T. (2007). "Multicultural Diversity and Migrant Entrepreneurship: The Case of the Netherlands", *ITU A/Z*, 4(1): 22-46.
48. Sahin, M., Todiras, A. and Nijkamp, P. (2012). "An Explanatory Model for the Economic Performance of Migrant Entrepreneurs in the High-tech Sector", In: Nijkamp, P., Poot, J., and Sahin, M. (eds), *Migration Impact Analysis: New Horizons*, Edward Elgar: Cheltenham (forthcoming).
49. Sahin, M., (2012). *Studies on Migrant Entrepreneurship in Dutch Cities*. Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Spatial Economics, VU University Amsterdam.
50. Schumpeter, J.A. (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development*, Harvard University Press: Cambridge Mass.
51. Sharma, P. and Chrisman, J. J. (1999). "Toward a Reconciliation of the Definitional Issues in the Field of Corporate Entrepreneurship", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 23(3): 11–27.
52. Thurik, A. R. (2009). "Entreprenomics: Entrepreneurship, Economic Growth and Policy", In: Acs, Z. J. D., Audretsch, B. and Strom, R. (eds), *Entrepreneurship, Growth, and Public Policy*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, pp. 219–249.
53. Tillaart, van den, H. (2007). "Etnisch Ondernemerschap in Nederland: Ontwikkelingen en Perspectieven", *Migrantenstudies*, 23(2): 76-98
54. Tubergen F. van (2004). *The Integration of Immigrants in Cross-National Perspective*, Origin, Destination, and Community Effects, Utrecht: ICS.
55. Verheul, I., Wennekers, S., Audretsch, D. and Thurik, R. (2001). "An Eclectic Theory of Entrepreneurship: Policies, Institutions and Culture", Research Report 0012, EIM, Zoetermeer.
56. Waldinger, R., Aldrich, H. and Ward R. (eds) (1990). *Ethnic Entrepreneurs*, Sage Publishers: Newbury Park, CA.
57. Ward, R. and Jenkins, R. (1984). *Ethnic Communities in Business: Strategies for Economic Survival*, Cambridge University Press.
58. Woolcock, M. (1998). "Social Capital and Economic Development: Toward a Theoretical Synthesis and Policy Framework", *Theory and Society*, 27: 151–208.