FORSCHUNG AKTUELL
01 / 2021

Institut Arbeit und Technik

Characteristics of Migrant Entrepreneurs:

Asset in Times of Crisis?

Alexandra David, Susann Schäfer & Judith Terstriep

Key takeaways

- We identified three major characteristics of migrant entrepreneurs at the individual and organisational level: risk-taking and bricolage attitude, making extensive use of social and cultural capital, and transnational embeddedness.
- Perseverance and creativity not only prompt entrepreneurs to set up a business faster but possibly better cope with exogenous shocks and resulting uncertainty.
- Being embedded and acting in various transnational and socio-cultural settings allows them to access additional resources, including specific knowledge, experiences, and cultures, to use for business stabilisation.
- Based on concrete experiences of crises at the time of flight or migration specific behaviours and virtues emerge that may have a lasting impact on understanding and dealing with wicked situations such as the COVID-19 crisis.
- The joint project ReCOVery – Resilience of Migrant Entrepreneurs during the COVID-19 crises centres on the ability of migrant entrepreneurs to cope with the current crisis.

Zentrale Einrichtung der Westfälischen Hochschule Gelsenkirchen Bocholt Recklinghausen in Kooperation mit der Ruhr-Universität Bochum

Westfälische Hochschule

RUHR UNIVERSITÄT BOCHUM RUB

1 Introduction

The recent OECD migration outlook (2020) states that migration flows to Germany – one of the two top OECD receiving countries – continued to decrease in 2018 and 2019. However, the same report illustrates that despite the COVID-19 crises, migration flows did not fall to zero but sustained during the peak of the first wave of COVID-19 in spring 2020. In 2018 Germany received 631 000 new immigrants on a long-term or permanent basis, a general minus of -26.7% compared to the previous year (ibid). The EU's free mobility seems to be the central mechanism for people's movement to Germany (60.7%). Furthermore, Germany's figures comprise 10.3% labour migrants, 15.4% family members (including accompanying family) and 12.4% humanitarian migrants (ibid). Concerning asylum politics, for 2019, Germany's number of first asylum applicants decreased to -12%, to reach around 143 000. The majority of applicants came from Syria (39 000), Iraq (14 000) and Turkey (11 000) (OECD, 2020). The decrease mainly corresponds to the group of Syrian applicants. Generally speaking, 45.6% of decisions taken in Germany were positive (OECD, 2020).

Despite these figures, Germany is still struggling to integrate newcomers into the labour markets (David et al., 2018). In that line, the so-called *Long Summer of Migration* in 2015 (Yurdakul et al., 2017) and the related challenges of, e.g. integration (David et al., 2019a; Knuth, 2016) have in general revived the discourse on migrant entrepreneurship in Germany. Distinct from other countries such as the UK and the Netherlands (Ram, 2019), this discussion has largely been neglected in Germany. In the course of the reignited debate, again, the characteristics of the so-called target group of *migrant entrepreneurs* came into focus (David & Coenen, 2017). The COVID-19 crises reinforced the discussion by examining the 'characteristics' of migrant entrepreneurs as being possible assets in challenging (economic) times. For instance, arguing that target groups' embeddedness in different (trans-)national settings (also referred to as *mixed embeddedness,* Klostermann & Rath, 2003) could positively impact their endurance and acting as entrepreneurs, brings potential new/additional resources of migrant entrepreneurs into play. Such resources might be valuable for the entire local entrepreneurial ecosystem (Schäfer and Mayer, 2019) in terms of job creation, business endurance, innovation and in addition to that general social integration (David et al., 2019b). Reinforced through the current COVID-19 crises based on earlier findings, the ongoing debate on migrant entrepreneurship raises the following question:

> *Are migrant entrepreneurs' characteristics (e.g. behaviours, mindsets, values, norms, attitudes, habits) an asset in crises?*

The underlying assumption is that migrants are willing to take risks and are characterised by perseverance and creativity, which not only prompts them to set up a business faster (Metzer, 2016; Balaz & Williams, 2011) but better cope with exogenous shocks and resulting uncertainty. Risk-taking attitude and embeddedness in (trans-)national environments and multi-scale processes (i.e. multi-scale processes) are typical to refugee and migrant companies (David et al., 2020). The latter possibly gives leeway to access further supplementary resources beyond the funding programs established at the various governance levels (EU, national, regional). Thus, they may enable more flexible management of crisis and the resulting economic consequences.

In the following, we draw on the IQ Network's definition of migrant entrepreneurship which refers to:

> "[t]he entirety of companies founded by people with a migration background, including those who have lived in Germany for several decades (with or without a German passport), their descendants and recently immigrants - this includes groups of people from EU countries, non-EU countries and new arrivals of refugees".

The remainder paper is organised as follows. We depart from an overview of migration and migrant entrepreneurship in Germany (section 2). A step forward in answering the research question appears from the complementary theoretical approaches of ecosystems, mixed embeddedness and Bourdieu's capital forms we introduce in section 3. Migrant entrepreneurs' characteristics identified from the conducted literature review and secondary analysis of earlier studies are presented in section 4. We conclude with a discussion of our findings and an outlook of future research.

2 Migrant Entrepreneurship in Germany – An Overview

The boom in migrant entrepreneurship in the mid-1980s was related to several factors. One can be identified as the post phase of the so-called 'German economic miracle' of the 1950s and 60s, followed by the economic crisis in the late 1970s and 1980s. The developments during these years led to considerable rationalisation measures in the coal and steel industry. A high proportion of migrants as dependent employees marked these industries (David et al., 2019a; Yildiz, 2017; Hillmann & Sommer; 2011). This period's main characteristic was the massive reduction in jobs and the German labour market restructuring. As a side effect, the emergence of irregular and often precarious employment relationships was observed (David et al., 2019a; Yildiz, 2017; Wilpert, 2000). Migrants' low education levels accelerated these developments at the time (Hillmann & Sommer, 2011). As a result of these transition processes, self-employment among migrants in Germany reached a share of almost 9.5% and approached the start-up rate (10%) of the German entrepreneurs (Wilpert, 2000). The parallel increase in start-up rates and unemployment rates among migrants left the impression that migrant entrepreneurship emerges primarily due to a lack of economic alternatives. However, recent developments show that migrant entrepreneurship is rather opportunity-driven than necessity-driven (David et al., 2019a).

Years later, in 2014, 915 000 people became self-employed in Germany, including around 179 000 migrants (Metzger, 2016). In 2018 the number of self-employed in Germany accounted for approximately 4 million, 300 000 below 2012, the year with the most self-employed people in the last two decades (Mikrozensus, 2019). 'Migrant entrepreneurship' in Germany today presents an umbrella term that grasps several groups of migrants: For example, (1) established migrants from countries marked by chain migration over decades such as Poland and Turkey; (2) groups of EU migrants, who migrated in the course of the 'freedom of movement' anchored in the Treaty of the Functioning of the EU; (3) refugees who arrived in Germany in 1990s from former Yugoslavia or the Summer of 2015 from Syria.

The official figures also confirm this picture. In 2016, more than half of the 755 000 self-employed in Germany with a migration history came from the EU (Leicht et al., 2017). Between 2005 and 2016, the number of self-employed from a European origin increased by 46% from 375 000 to 548 000. In 2016, Polish migrants took the top position among the self-employed with a migration history with a share of around 14%. Their number almost doubled to 110 000 between 2005 and 2016 (ibid). The sharp rise of the polish entrepreneurs can probably be attributed to the EU's eastward expansion.

Regarding the variety of ethnic groups among migrant entrepreneurs, the Polish and Turkish entrepreneurs were followed in 2016 by the Italian self-employed with 6% and the Greeks with 3%, as the largest foreign groups among the self-employed. However, their total numbers decreased slightly between 2005 and 2016, while other countries of origin from Eastern Europe, such as Romania (+16 000), increased (Leicht et al., 2017). The number of Russian self-employed doubled up to 35 000 in the same period. The countries of origin that are less associated with migrant entrepreneurship in the public perception, such as France, the Netherlands, Great Britain, Austria and Switzerland, amounted to 71 000 self-employed in 2016 (ibid).

Also, among the newcomer groups, e.g. refugees of 2015-2017, there exists an entrepreneurial potential. A survey of refugees shows that a significant proportion (27%) of those who immigrated from 2015 to 2017, especially from Syria, was already self-employed in their home country (Brücker et al., 2016). Besides, there is the division in the first and the second generation of migrants. While the first generation refers to people who experienced the migration process by themselves, the second-generation group are people born in Germany with migrant ancestors.

On average, in 2013/2014, around 21% of new business start-ups took place by migrants (Metzger, 2016). The evaluations of the IAB/ZEW start-up panel (2016) in cohorts from 2009 to 2015 show that trade, with a share of around 24%, is one of the most relevant branches of the economy which migrants set up businesses: other consumer-related services and the construction sector with shares of 11.8% and 10% follow. These numbers are not surprising because migrant founders were also most frequently employed in percentage terms in these sectors (IAB/ZEW, 2016).

3 Theoretical Anchoring

To advance understanding why specific characteristics of migrant entrepreneurs may function as assets in times of crises, we need to discuss their origins. Following Schäfer and Henn (2018), we assume that migrant entrepreneurs play a crucial role in linking local and distant ecosystems. Here migrant entrepreneurs' mixed embeddedness is particularly important as it allows access to and the (re-)combine distinct forms of capital (social, cultural and economic). In the following, the three theoretical approaches are introduced.

3.1 Migrants in Entrepreneurial Ecosystems

Entrepreneurial ecosystems defined as 'conceptual umbrella for the benefits and resources produced by a cohesive, typically regional, community of entrepreneurs and their supporters that

help new high growth ventures form, survive, and expand' (Spigel & Harrison, 2018) have become a popular concept in various disciplines dealing with entrepreneurial activities. The concept stresses that the foundation of new firms and the management of enterprises are embedded in a regional ecosystem that nurtures or limits entrepreneurial opportunities and resources. Migrant entrepreneurs belong to those entrepreneurial ecosystems. Due to their own migration experience and/or ethnic networks, they possess unique characteristics that influence access to entrepreneurial opportunities and resources (see section 4). Although the current literature has given attention to the life cycles of those systems (Mack & Mayer, 2016), exogenous shocks like the COVID-19 pandemic have not been considered systematically for ecosystem development. Current studies, however, indicate that especially financial resources will dramatically decrease in entrepreneurial ecosystems making it difficult for entrepreneurs to access capital for the establishment of firms and to maintain financial liquidity (Mason, 2020). Under these circumstances, migrant entrepreneurs may have an asset in dealing with such external shocks due to their transnational linkages to other entrepreneurial ecosystems (Schäfer & Henn, 2018) or transnational diaspora networks enabling them to access distant resources (see section 4). A precondition for this to happen is that migrant entrepreneurs have access to and are embedded in the local entrepreneurial ecosystem. In so doing, migrant entrepreneurs can engage in co-creation and co-production processes in the local economy (Krüger & David, 2019). Also, it is to be acknowledged that the reaction of migrant entrepreneurs in ecosystems cannot be generalized across sectors.

3.2 Mixed Embeddedness

To better comprehend the relations of migrant entrepreneurs, Kloosterman et al. (1998) developed the '*mixed embeddedness'* concept. The concept emphasises the interaction between the social, economic and institutional contexts in which migrants are embedded. In this view, the rise of migrant entrepreneurship is, theoretically, primarily located at the intersection of changes in socio-cultural frameworks on the one side and transformation processes in (urban) economies on the other (ibid). The authors argue that the interchange between these two different sets of changes occurs within a larger, dynamic framework of institutions, neighbourhoods, cities, nations, or economic sectors (ibid).

Regarding migrant entrepreneurship, the mixed embeddedness approach explicitly acknowledges that opportunity structures embedded and implemented in wider national institutionalised regulatory and socio-cultural contexts (Kloosterman & Rath, 2018) intervene with international or even transnational multi-scalar processes. This interlinkage of diverse power dynamics, ecosystems, habitus and milieus may be creative space of the 'new' and a resource that differs in capital forms (see section 2.3) from the mainstream. Forasmuch, the mixed embeddedness concept considers migrant entrepreneurship as a mutually constitutive interaction between the individual, the local and further outer social contexts. In this respect, a close connection to the work of Granovetter (1985 & 2005) and Polanyi (1957) becomes apparent. Both Granovetter and Polanyi posit that all forms of economic action and actors' behaviours do not occur in a socio-cultural and institutional vacuum but are embedded in concrete systems of social relations (Granovetter, 1985: 487). More precisely, Granovetter (ibid) argues that economic transactions necessarily

have to be embedded in social ties of trust, mutual obligation, personal sentiment and face-to-face communication rather than formal, contractual and official bureaucratic procedures.

It follows that transnational mixed embeddedness of migrant entrepreneurs is likely to be an explanatory factor for their ability to better cope with exogenous shocks. Being embedded and acting in various transnational and socio-cultural settings allows entrepreneurs to access additional resources, including specific knowledge, experiences, and cultures, to use for business stabilisation. Migrant entrepreneurs' multi-scalar settings can provide all sorts of capital, such as human or economic capital (see next section).

3.3 Bourdieu's Forms of Capital

Drawing on Bourdieu's (1986) writing on 'forms of capital', more recently, scholars apply transnational forms of capital to the mixed embeddedness approach (Omrahne, 2015; Solano, 2016). Given that we live in a globalised world with extensive transnational interactions, such endeavour makes much sense. Many migrant entrepreneurs are progressively embedded in social networks reaching out to different countries and often different continents simultaneously. Bourdieu (1986) refers to capital as the sum of assets put to productive use. The materialisation of these assets, he understands as forms of capital. Based on his criticism of the main viewpoint, that everything should be exclusively materialised on economic capital, Bourdieu points out that priceless things also come at a price and that this price cannot be fixed by economic values (ibid). Thus, next to *economic capital*, which he considers as being immediately and directly convertible into money and mundane consider financial capital, he also identifies *cultural*, *social* and *symbolic capital*. Here symbolic capital is not merely a different form of capital but is viewed as the legitimated, recognised form of the other capitals (Lawler, 2011).

Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) and Bourdieu (1983) define *social capital* as a sum of actual and potential resources that accrue to an individual or a group by possessing a durable network of more or less institutionalised relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition. In the case of migrant entrepreneurs, this may be the transnational networks of friends and family. David (2015) argues that being defined as individual-focused, (bringing advantages for individuals) and group-focused (common benefits within and throughout a network) both definitions of social capital are understood as a network resource. Putnam (1993) argues that a specific regional stock of social capital can be essential for economic development. He (ibid: 36) posits that *'[s]ocial capital enhances the benefits of investments in physical and human capital'*. In that line, *human capital* can usually be defined as the skills, knowledge, and experience possessed by an individual or population, viewed in terms of their value or cost to an organisation or country (Crook et al., 2011). It is the stock of habits, social and personal attributes, including creativity which lay the ground to perform labour. Thus, human capital is inherent to social and cultural capital. Applied to the field of (migrant) entrepreneurship research, above arguments are crucial for potential (additional) resources informally sourced by migrant entrepreneurs from family, friends, community, and other personal relationships be they local or transnational (Ram et al., 2008). In that sense, migrant entrepreneurs can use these additional resources to create innovative hybrid business plans (Rabadjieva & Terstriep, 2017), different leadership concepts, scale their business faster

etc. However, the simple assumption that social capital is necessarily a positive force in all circumstances would fall short to account for the divisive nature of social capital when it takes the form of 'bonding' to similar people, groups or communities while excluding other (Cheonget al., 2007; Li et al., 2003; Smith, 2007). In this line, Ram (2008: 430) claims that *'[i]nternal exclusiveness can actually exclude entrepreneurs from external possibilities.'*

Cultural capital, according to Bourdieu (1986) exist in three forms, as (1) the *embodied state* (mind-body disposition), (2) the *objectified state* (cultural goods) and (3) the *institutionalised state* (educational qualifications for instance). Cultural capital is closely linked to a person or even to entire groups such as family in the embodied state. First theorised by Nowotny (1981) *emotional capital* is part of embodied cultural capital and is defined as knowledge, contacts, and relations and access to emotionally valued skills and assets. *Embodied cultural capital* emerges from the mindful body's cultural socialisation (Scheper-Hughes & Lock, 1987) – where bodily capacities and cultural requirements meet (Scheer, 2012: 202). Arguing that these forms of capital are essential assets for each human being, we assume that they could be even more critical for entrepreneurs. Based on market competition, factors such as employees (human capital), liquidity (economic and financial capital in forms of remittances), innovation and flexibility (social and cultural capital), leadership (emotional capital) can be decisive for success or failure of a business.

Relating the ecosystems approach to the debate on mixed embeddedness allows us to advance our understanding of what migrant entrepreneurs specific characteristics are. It can be assumed that these characteristics not only serve migrant entrepreneurs' performance but also affect the local ecosystem by, for example, acting as network facilitators (Kenny et al., 2013) or agents of (cultural) change (Msabah, 2019; Grabowska et al., 2017; Feakins, 2017). Next, we argue, that based on concrete experiences of crises at the time of flight or migration specific behaviours and virtues emerge that may have a lasting impact on understanding and dealing with wicked situations such as the COVID-19 crisis.

4 Migrant Entrepreneurs Characteristics

Based on the outlined theoretical consideration, a secondary analysis of existing studies (cf. David et al., 2020; Dienes & Schlepphorst, 2019; Metzger, 2016), allowed us to identify three major characteristics of migrant entrepreneurs at the individual and organisational level: risk-taking and bricolage attitude, making extensive use of social and cultural capital, and transnational embeddedness.

Risk-taking and bricolage attitude

As outlined in section 2, the frequency of migrant start-up activities exceeds the level of all start-ups in Germany, indicating a lower risk aversion compared to all founders. Migration requires courage and prepares people for other uncertain events such as job search and start-up activities in receiving countries. In this vein, Klostermann and Rath (2003) find that migrants are less risk-averse in entrepreneurship, especially when their migration process is not far away. Williams and

Krasniqi (2018) underpin this observation and illustrate that migration experience positively impacts the likelihood of starting a business in the country of arrival. Viewing the step into self-employment as a risky undertaking associated with uncertainties and the possibility of failure, the higher propensity to start a business can be interpreted as an indicator of a greater willingness to take risks. Also, migrants are said to often differ from the Western European workforce in that they exhibit a more vital entrepreneurial spirit. This spirit may be attributed to the migration decision itself as well as the general conditions of the migration or refuge history (David & Coenen, 2017). Cassarino (2004), for example, confirms the power of migration experience on subsequent (labour market) integration or business start-up, both of which are directly linked to the success stories or the failures of migrants' histories. Metzger (2016) and Leicht et al., (2017) show that although general numbers of those who seek advice on start-up opportunities are declining (DIHK, 2019), it is mainly people with a migration history who take the risk of starting a business.

Same studies (Metzger, 2016; Leicht et al., 2017) argue that people with a migration history are younger than non-migrants when starting a business. A look at both founders' age structure and established self-employed shows differences between people with and without a migration history. Migrants who have been self-employed since 2009 are on average 36 years old (Metzger, 2016) and thus one and a half years younger than German founders. Evaluations of the start-up cohorts from 2009 to 2015 unveil that migrants start a business at an average age of 39. In contrast, founders of German origin are around four years older on average at approximately 43 years (IAB/ZEW, 2016). The age of founders is a possible indicator that migrant entrepreneurs are more confident in the start-up context.

Bijedić et al. (2017) find that migrant companies often enter into price competition to establish their business in highly competitive markets. Kloosterman et al. (1999) indicate something similar and address the informal structures of migrant companies, which are often attributed to their risk-taking attitude.

These findings suggest a certain degree of *bricolage attitude*, i.e., migrant entrepreneurs' capability to use the resources at hand to make do and recombine them to create something new or make use of new opportunities (Baker & Nelson, 2005). As highlighted by Baier et al. (2020: 23), *'[t]he concept of bricolage is directly linked to resource constraints and can therein influence the entrepreneurial process in two ways – internal and external'.* For migrant entrepreneurs, it is often viewed as necessary as they experience difficulties in entering labour markets (David et al., 2019a; Rabadjieva & Terstriep, 2017; Knuth, 2016) and to counter the impact of the highly competitive sectors in which they operate (Kloosterman, 2010; see also section 2).

To conclude, in addition to their ability to access distant resources in other entrepreneurial ecosystems, migrant entrepreneurs might benefit from different entrepreneurial mindsets and risk-taking attitude compared to non-migrant entrepreneurs.

Making extensive use of social and cultural capital

A Bertelsmann Stiftung (2016) survey indicates that migrant entrepreneurs rely less on public funding when planning a business. In the IAT interviews with self-employed migrants, 8 out of

11 interviewees confirmed that they either used their savings or family financial resources for their start-up projects. This observation identified a similar tendency among migrant founders of the second generation in Germany. Some of the respondents indicated that they are more likely to resort to family-based financing sources than borrowed capital.

Metzger (2016) also points out that migrants set up businesses in teams more often than non-migrant founders. Conducting interviews with migrant entrepreneurs David et al. (2020) find that migrants are often co-founders and start businesses in their familiar environment (family, friends, good acquaintances, usually belonging to the same ethnic group). Leicht and Berwing (2017) report that team start-ups show a greater propensity for innovation than individual start-ups. The authors claim that this is partly due to the group start-ups' better resource endowment, be it financial or personal. With a view to activities in the area of research and development and the introduction of market innovations, the Leicht and Berwig (2017) revealed that it is primarily nationally mixed teams bearing the most significant innovation potential. It can be concluded that diversity seems to have positive effects on the innovative strength of start-ups. Both the financial situation and the team start-ups suggest that friends and family networks could be an additive resource for migrant entrepreneurs, especially in challenging times.

In this regard, Dienes and Schlepphorst (2019) point out that the family seems to have a special place within their network in migrant-led businesses. Not only are family members employed more than average in their own company (human capital), but they utilise transnational familial networks when resources of all kinds are required (David & Terstriep, 2018; Kloosterman & Rath, 2003). In addition to the personal and financial resources made available by the family and the transnational settings, it is foremost the exchange of knowledge and experiences that constitutes cultural capital. Hence, mixed embeddedness is accompanied by a continuous influx of new knowledge that ideally diffuses into the local settings (David & Coenen, 2019; Schmiz, 2014; Pries, 2011; Stockhorst, 2011). Having a necessary level of absorptive capacities (Terstriep, 2019; Rabadjieva & Butzin, 2019), migrant entrepreneurs combine diverse sources of knowledge and translate them into innovative solutions which spread in the local ecosystem. Transnationality may become a regional resource (David & Coenen, 2017; Schmiz, 2014; Asheim & Gertler, 2005) and an element of possible regional crisis management for businesses companies.

For example, the embedding in transnational corporate ecosystems, which are characterised by national and regional regulations, customer relationships, market requirements and country-specific understanding of an entrepreneur's status, could enable migrant businesses in times of crisis to combine informal with formal business structures/models.

Transnational embeddedness

Integration in global networks and the use of knowledge generated in an international context is viewed as a prerequisite for the innovativeness of migrant companies (David et al., 2019a). Leicht und Berwing (2017) consider these characteristics to be advantageous for migrants in the start-up phase. The authors observe that the business models of migrant companies are based more than average on international networks (ibid). Founders who have acquired their knowledge and skills abroad are more likely to develop innovative products and market innovations (ibid; see also

David et al., 2019). Metzger (2016) also confirms that migrants offer market innovations somewhat more frequently (20% compared to 18% of Germans). As an explanation for this, the author regards the stronger tendency of migrant entrepreneurs to start a retail sector business. Among the market innovations, Metzger (ibid) identifies products and services new to the relevant market. He considers it irrelevant whether the offers are technologically innovative. The evaluation of the IAB/ZEW start-up panel (2016) with the cohorts 2009 to 2015 confirms that entrepreneurs with a migration history, compared to entrepreneurs without a migration history, introduce fewer national and global market innovations. They instead introduce regional market innovations with a share of 5%.

5 Discussion and Outlook

Based on the assumption that migrant entrepreneurs are willing to take risks and are characterised by perseverance and creativity, in this article we conceptually addressed the research question: *Are migrant entrepreneurs' characteristics an asset in crises?* In so doing, we combined Kloosterman's and colleagues mixed embeddedness approach with Bourdieu's forms of capital and the entrepreneurial ecosystem approach to identify characteristics of migrant entrepreneurs. Assuming that migrant entrepreneurs are not only anchored in the local entrepreneurial ecosystem but act simultaneously in several social, cultural and economic settings, the following considerations arise:

Mixed embeddedness brings in additional resources. As illustrated in previous sections, these resources are essential for migrant entrepreneurs when dealing with unstable situations characterised by uncertainty, human capital shortage, financial constraints, such as slumps in sales and other exogenous factors. As yet, migrant entrepreneurs' characteristics are mainly discussed from an individual or organisational level. Although these characteristics are considered positive, distinguishing migrant entrepreneurs from other entrepreneurial groups may perpetuate (positive) discrimination and unintended labelling. In addition, migrant entrepreneurs' characteristics are likely to not only be beneficial at the individual and entrepreneurial level. The fact that migrant entrepreneurs operate in transnational socio-cultural settings and are exposed to transnational change processes is likely to affect their local ecosystems. In this sense, migrant entrepreneurs can be ascribed a bridging function regarding continuous capital inflows (cultural, social, economic).

However, the identified characteristics are to be validated considering their uniqueness for migrant entrepreneurs. In a globalised world, they might also increasingly apply to all internationally active entrepreneurs – an aspect which concerns the mixed embeddedness concept in general. It will also be a task for future research to consider whether migrant entrepreneurs possess an asset in these critical times and whether they contribute to the evolution of entrepreneurial ecosystems. To further advance our understanding of discussed issues, the joint project ReCOVery – Resilience of Migrant Entrepreneurs during the COVID-19 crises centres on the ability of migrant entrepreneurs to cope with the current crisis. Specifically, the project strives to capture characteristics that likewise constitute vulnerability and success in the course of migrants' business activities.

References

Asheim, B. & Gertler M. S. (2005): The Geography of Innovation – Regional Innovation Systems. In: J. Fagerberg, D. C. Mowery & R. R. Nelson (eds): *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 291-317.

Baier, S., Fuhs, D., Gießelmann, J., Krah, J., Kroczak, A. & Knemeyer, F. (2020): Entrepreneurs in Poverty through the Lens of Bricolage. *LEMEX Research Papers on Entrepreneurship,* 4, 21-29.

Baker, T. & Nelson, R. E. (2005): Creating Something from Nothing: Resource Construction through Entrepreneurial Bricolage, *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 50(3), 329-366.

Balaz, V. & Williams, A. M. (2011): Risk Attitudes and Migration Experience, *Journal of Risk Research*, 14(5), 583-596, doil:10.1080/13669877.2010.547256.

Bertelsmann Stiftung/ Sachs, A. Hoch, M. Münch, C. & Steidle, H. (2016): Migrantenunternehmen in Deutschland zwischen 2005 und 2014. Ausmaß, ökonomische Bedeutung, Einflussfaktoren und Förderung auf Ebene der Bundesländer.

Bijedić, T., Kay, R., Schlepphorst, S., Suprinovič, O. & Ettl, K. (2017): Familienunternehmen von Migranten. In: IfM Bonn (Hg.): IfM-Materialien Nr. 261, Bonn.

Bourdieu, B. (1983): Ökonomisches Kapital, kulturelles Kapital, soziales Kapital. In: Reinhard Kreckel (Hg.), *Soziale Ungleichheiten* (Soziale WeltSonderband 2), Göttingen 1983, 183-198.

Bourdieu, P. (1986): The Forms of Capital. In: Richardson, J., Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education. Westport, CT: Greenwood: 241–258.

Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L. (1992): *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Brücker, H., Rother, N. & Schupp, J. (Hg.) (2016): Politikberatung kompakt. IAB-BAMF-SOEP-Befragung von Geflüchteten: Überblick und erste Ergebnisse. DIW Berlin.

Crook, T. R., Todd, S. Y., Combs, J. G., Woehr, D. J., & Ketchen, D. J., Jr. (2011): Does Human Capital Matter? A Meta-Analysis of the Relationship Between Human Capital and Firm Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 96(3), 443–456. doi:10.1037/a0022147

David, A. (2015): *Scientia Est Potentia: Human Capital and the Role of Networks; Migration, Inclusion and New Qualification for A Sustainable Regional Economy*. [dissertation]. Twente: University of Twente.

David, A. & Coenen, F. (2017): Immigrant Entrepreneurship - A Chance for Labour Market Integration of Refugees? In: David, A./Hamburg, I. (eds.): *Entrepreneurship and Entrepreneurial Skills in Europe,* Leverkusen: Barbara Budrich Publishers.

David, A. & Coenen, F. (2019): Knowledge in Motion: Highly-skilled Migration and the Role of Regional Networks. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal,* 6(4), 274-293.

David, A. & Krüger, D. (2020): Entrepreneurial Education for Persons with Disabilities: A Social Innovation Approach for Inclusive Ecosystems. In: Frontiers in education, no. 5, 1-17.

David, A. & Terstriep, J. (2018): Innovation of Informal Ethnic Entrepreneurship: A Result of the Opening of the EU's Borders? In: V. Ratten & P. Jones (eds.): *Transformational Entrepreneurship*, Abingdon: Routledge.

David, A., El Masri, T. & Terstriep, J. (2019b): Migrantisches Unternehmertum als regionaler Wirtschaftsfaktor: das Hamburger Beispiel. In: A. David, M. Evans, I. Hamburg & J. Terstriep (Hg.): *Migration und Arbeit: Herausforderungen, Problemlagen und Gestaltungsinstrumente*. Leverkusen: Verlag Barbara Budrich, 129-152.

David, A., Evans, M., Hamburg, I. & Terstriep, J. (Hg.) (2019a): Migration und Arbeit. Herausforderungen, Problemlagen und Gestaltungsinstrumente. Leverkusen: Budrich.

David, A., Terstriep, J., Atibioke, O., Siegel, J. & Giustolisi, A. (2020): ‚Ich will andere Geschichten erzählen': Migrantische Unternehmen in der Praxis. Gelsenkirchen: Institut Arbeit und Technik. (online)

Dienes, Ch. & Schlepphorst, S. (2019): Krisen in KMU: Herausforderungen, Verlauf und Resilienz frauen- und migrantengeführter Unternehmen. Durchgeführt vom Institut für Mittelstandsforschung (ifm) Bonn, unterstützt von J.P Morgen.

DIHK-Gründerreport (2019): Trotz regen Gründungsinteresses – Der Funke zündet nicht. Berlin: Deutscher Industrie- und Handelskammertag e.V. (DIHK).

Feakins, M. (2017): Off-shoring from Russia to Ukraine: How Russian Transnational Entrepreneurs Created a Post-Soviet IT-Offshore. Economic Geography, 98(4), 397-417. doi: 10.1080/00130095.2017.1308222.

Granovetter, M. (1985): Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness, *The American Journal of Sociology*, 91(3), 481–510.

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

Hillmann, F. & Sommer, E. (2011): Dönner und Bulette revisited oder: was man über migrantische Ökonomien genau wissen kann. In: F. Hillmann, (Hg.) (2011): Marginale Urbanität: Migrantisches Unternehmertum und Stadtentwicklung. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag, 23-86.

IQ – Förderprogramm „Integration durch Qualifizierung" (2017): Migrantenökonomie in Deutschland. iQ Factsheet, 11/2017. https://www.netzwerk-iq.de/fileadmin/Redaktion/Downloads/IQ_Publikationen/Fact_Sheets/IQ_FactSheet_Migrantenoekonomie.pdf.

Kloosterman, R. (2010): Matching opportunities with resources: A framework for analysing (migrant) entrepreneurship from a mixed embeddedness perspective. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development,* 22(1), 25–45.

Kloosterman, R. & Rath, J. (2018): Mixed Embeddedness Revisited: A Conclusion to the Symposium. Sociologica. V.12 N.2 (2018) ISSN 1971-8853; Symposium: From the Mixed Embeddedness Approach to What? – peer-reviewed Edited by Eduardo Barberis and Giacomo Solano https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1971- 8853/8625

Kloosterman R. & Rath J. (eds) (2003) *Immigrant Entrepreneurs: Venturing Abroad in the Age of Globalization*. Oxford: Berg.

Kloosterman, R., van der Leun, J. & Rath, J. (1999): Mixed Embeddedness. (In)formal Economic Activities and Immigrant Business in the Netherlands, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 1999, 23(2), 253-267.

Kloosterman, R.C., van der Leun, J., & Rath, J. (1998). Across the Border: Immigrants' Economic Opportunities, Social Capital and Informal Business Activities. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies,* 24(2), 249–268. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.1998.9976632

Knuth, M. (2016): Arbeitsmarktintegration von Flüchtlingen. Arbeitsmarktpolitik reformieren, Qualifikationen vermitteln. WISO Diskurs, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, 21/2016.

Lawler, S. (2011). Symbolic capital. In: D. Southerton (Ed.), Encyclopedia of Consumer Culture, Vol. 1, SAGE Publications, 1418-1420.

Leicht, R. & Berwing (2017): Gründungspotenziale von Menschen mit ausländischen Wurzeln. Entwicklungen, Erfolgsfaktoren, Hemmnisse. Studie des Instituts für Mittelstandsforschung (ifm) der Universität Mannheim und des Instituts für sozialpädagogische Forschung Mainz (ism), im Auftrag des Bundesministeriums für Wirtschaft und Energie (BMWi). Kurzfassung.

Leicht, R., Berwing, S., Philipp, R., Block, N., Rüffer, N., & Ahrens, J.-P. und Co-Autor/innen: Förster, N., Sänger, R. & Siebert, J.: (2017): Gründungspotenziale von Menschen mit ausländischen Wurzeln. Entwicklungen, Erfolgsfaktoren, Hemmnisse. Studie des Instituts für Mittelstandsforschung (ifm) der Universität Mannheim und des Instituts für sozialpädagogische Forschung Mainz (ism), im Auftrag des Bundesministeriums für Wirtschaft und Energie (BMWi).

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

Mack, E. & Mayer, H. (2016): The evolutionary dynamics of entrepreneurial ecosystems. Urban Studies, 53, 2118–2133.

Mason, C. (2020): The Coronavirus Economic Crisis: Its Impact on Venture Capital and High Growth Enterprises, JRC Working Papers JRC120612, Joint Research Centre (Seville site).

Metzger, G. (2016): Migranten überdurchschnittlich gründungsaktiv – Arbeitsmarkt spielt eine große Rolle. Fokus Volkswirtschaft Nr. 115, KfW Research.

Mikrozensus (2019): Statistisches Bundesamt (Destatis), Stand: 09.10.2019/ 09:56:18.

Msabah, B. A. (2019): Refugee migrants as agents of change: Strategies for improved livelihoods and self-reliance. *Verbum et Ecclesia,* 40(1), 1-8. doi:10.4102/ve.v40i1.1851.

Nowotny, H. (1981): Austria: Women in Public Life. In: C. F. Epstein & R. L. Coser (Eds.), *Access to Power: Cross-national Studies of Women and Elites*, 147–156, London: George Allen & Unwin.

OECD (2020): International Migration Outlook 2020. Paris: OECD Publishing. doi:10.1787/ec98f531-en.

Omrane, A. (2015): Entrepreneurs' Social Capital and Access to External Resources: The Effects of Social Skills. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business,* 24(3), 357-382, doi.org/10.1504/IJESB.2015.067463

Polanyi, K. (1957). The Great Transformation. New York: Rinehart & Company.

Pries, L. (2011): Transnationale Migration als Innovationspotenzial. In: K. Engel, J. Großmann & B. Hombach (Hrsg.): *Phönix flieg! Das Ruhrgebiet entdeckt sich neu*. Essen: Klartext.

Putnam, R. (1993): The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and Public Life. *The American Prospect,* 13, 13-45.

Rabadjieva, M. & Butzin, A. (2019): Emergence and Diffusion of Social Innovation Through Practice Fields. *European Planning Studies,* 28(5), 925-940, doi:10.1080/09654313.2019.1577362.

Rabadjieva, M. & Terstriep, J. (2017): Micro-entrepreneurship in the sharing economy - new labour market opportunities? In: David, Alexandra / Hamburg, Ileana (eds.): *Entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial skills in Europe: examples to improve potential entrepreneurial spirit*. Opladen: Barbara Budrich, 32-46.

Ram, M. (2019): The Centre for Research in Ethnic Minority Entrepreneurship: A Vehicle for Critical Engagement. In: Czaika, M., Rossl, L., Altenburg, F. & Pfeffer, T. (Eds.) *Migration & Integration 8: Dialog zwischen Politik, Wissenschaft und Praxis*, Krems: Donau-Universität Krems.

Schäfer, S. & Henn, S. (2018): The evolution of entrepreneurial ecosystems and the critical role of migrants. A Phase-Model based on a Study of IT startups in the Greater Tel Aviv Area. Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society, 11(2), 317-333. doi:10.1093/cjres/rsy013.

Schäfer, S. & Mayer, H. (2019). Entrepreneurial Ecosystems: Founding Figures and Research Frontiers in Economic Geography. *Zeitschrift für Wirtschaftsgeographie,* 63(2-4), 55-63, doi.org/10.1515/zfw-2019-0008

Scheer, M. (2012). Are Emotions a Kind of Practice (And is That What Makes Them Have a History)? A Bourdieuian Approach to Understanding Emotion. History and Theory, 51(2), 193–220.

Scheper-Hughes, N., & Lock, M. M. (1987). The Mindful Body: A Prolegomenon to Future Work in Medical Anthropology. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly,* 1(1), 6–41.

Schmiz, A. (2014): Transnationalität als Ressource? Netzwerke vietnamisischer Mitgrantinnen und Migranten zwischen Berlin und Vietnam. Bielefeld: transcript.

Solano, G. (2016). Immigrant Self-Employment and Transnational Practices: The Case of Moroccan Entrepreneurs in Amsterdam and Milan. PhD Dissertation, University of Amsterdam/University of Milan.

Spigel, B. & Harrison, R. (2018). Toward a process theory of entrepreneurial ecosystems. Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 12, 151–168.

Stockhorst J. (2011): Verfügbarkeit von hoch qualifizierten Arbeitskräften abseits der Ballungsräume, Regionale Restriktionen und Chancen für Hochtechnologieunternehmen der Medizintechnik, Stadt- und Regionalforschung. Berlin: LIT Verlag.

Terstriep, J. (2019): *Bedeutung von Clustern für die Innovativität von Unternehmen. Innovation, Wissen, Relationen*. Wiesbaden: Springer Gabler, doi:10.1007/978-3-658-27818-2.

Williams, N. & Krasniqi, B. A. (2018): Coming Out of Conflict: How Migrant Entrepreneurs Utilise Human and Social Capital. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, 16, 301-323, doi:10.1007/s10843-017-0221-4

Wilpert, C. (2000): Migranten als Existenzgründer. In Dokumentation der vierten Tagung der Heinrich Böll Stiftung in der Reihe „Zukunft der Arbeit" am 10./11. November 2000 in Berlin (S. 45–54). Berlin: Heinrich Böll Stiftung.

Yildiz, Ö. (2017): Migrantisch, weiblich, prekär? Über präkere Selbständigkeiten in der Berliner Friseurbranche. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag.

Yurdakul, G, Römhild, R., Schwanhäußer, A. & Nieden zur, B. (Eds.) (2017): Witnessing the Transition: Moments in the Long Summer of Migration. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318761966_Witnessing_the_Transition_Moments_in_the_Long_Summer_of_Migration#fullTextFileContent

Autorinnen:
Dr. Alexandra David is senior researcher at IAT's Research Department „Innovation, Space & Culture".
Dr. Susann Schäfer ist researcher at the Friedrich-Schiller-University Jena, Institute of Geography
Dr. Judith Terstriep is Head of the Research Department „Innovation, Space & Culture" at the IAT.

Kontakt: david@iat.eu; terstriep@iat.eu; susann.schaefer@uni-jena.de

Forschung Aktuell 2021-01

ISSN 1866 – 0835

Institut Arbeit und Technik der Westfälischen Hochschule Gelsenkirchen – Bocholt – Recklinghausen

Redaktionsschluss: 05.01.2021

http://www.iat.eu/forschung-und-beratung/publikationen/forschung-aktuell.html

Redaktion

Claudia Braczko

Tel.: 0209 - 1707 176
Fax: 0209 - 1707 110
E-Mail: braczko@iat.eu

Institut Arbeit und Technik
Munscheidstr. 14
45886 Gelsenkirchen

IAT im Internet: http://www.iat.eu